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4 Plea. That that Episcopacy was never approved by the Church, largely defeated Bishops, then constant Members of Assemblies.

That settlement approved by several Assemblies.

Largely pursued: And G. K. corrected.

A Recapitulation of what hath been said on these pleas.

The Rise and Progress of Presbyterianism in Scotland.

Mr. Andrew Melvin.

John Durer.

Episcopacy first quarrelled Aug. 6, 1575.

The Parity-men at that time defeated.

Petrie exposed.

Parity-men defeated also at the next Ass. held in April 1576.

Probable, That Morton and Q. Elizabeth were on the plot for introducing Presbytery into Scotland.

Second Book of Discipline when first projected.

The Prelatifs very much ignorant, then, of true Ecclesiastical Antiquity, &c.

Evident from the instance of Adamfone.

From their not challenging the unlearned positions in the 2d Book of Discipline.

Nor the unlearned positions in Beza's Book, De Triplici Episcopatu.

Presbyterianism weak at the Assembly helden in Octob. 1576.

Made no direct progress, in the Ass. helden in April 1577.
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This Article, which I have now examined, was no sooner established, in our Scottish Claim of Right, than I turn'd serious to satisfy my self about it. I thought it concern'd me as a Scottish man to understand, as well as I could, That which made such a Figure in the Original Contract between King and People. I thought I was no less concern'd as a Christian, to be Resolv'd about its Merits: I perceiv'd it might readily affect my practice; And tho' I abhor, as heartily as any man, all breaking of the Churches peace, for Rattles or Nutshels; Yet I could not but reckon of it as a matter of Conscience, to me, to Endeavour to be sure that I built neither my Faith nor
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nor my Obedience, in a matter of such Consequence, as I take the Government of the Church to be, on a Deceitful bottom. Perhaps I was bound to be inquisitive by some other Reduplications, not needful to be Named.

I had not spent much Application about it, when I was satisfied; and thought I had Ground to hope, the Wisdom of the Nation, after more Deliberate Researches, might find it Reasonable, either to Restore to the Church, Her Ancient and Just Government, or settle the New One, on some (at least) more Specious Basis. But I was Disappointed. For

Three Sessions of Parliament are now over; And the Article is so far from being either Retracted or Corrected, that, on the Contrary, It hath been still insisted on, and Deem'd sufficient to support very weighty Superstructures. Each Session hath Erected some new thing or other, upon it.

This, with the importunity of some Friends, at last, Determin'd me to Enquire more fully and minutely into
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into the value of the Article; And the Work hath swell'd to such a bulk as you see.

I confess I cannot Apologize sufficiently for my adventuring to Expose such an ill Composure to the publick view; Especially Considering how Nice and Critical, if not Picq't and Humorsome an Age we live in.

I ever thought that much of the Beauty, as well as of the Utility of Books, lay in Good Method, and a distinct Range of Thoughts: And I cannot promise that I have observed That, so punctually, as Clearer Heads might have done.

I have less Reason to be Confident of the Stile. 'Tis hard for most Scot-tish men to arrive at any tolerable Degree of English Purity. Our greatest Caution cannot prevent the Stealing of our own Words and Idioms into our Pens, and their dropping thence, into our writings. All things considered, I have as little Reason to think I have Guarded, or could Guard against them, as any Scot-tish man: For not only have mine opportunities, all my life, been none of the
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The best; but, for finding Materials for the following Papers, I was obliged to read so many Books written in Right Broad Scotch, and take so many Citations from them, that 'tis little to be wondered, if my Book abounds with Scotticisms. I thought my self bound to be faithful in my Citations: (and I can promise I have been that,) I could not reason from the Authority of these Citations, without using the Terms and Phrases which are in them: This, no doubt, makes the Scotticisms Numerous: And I shall not deny that my familiar acquaintance with these Books, together with the prejudices of Education, Custom, and Constant Converse in the plain Scottish Dialect, may have occasioned many more.

Neither shall I be over confident, that, where I have ventured to reason any point, I have done it to every man's conviction. I may have been (as other men) apt to impose on my self, and think I have advanced just propositions, and drawn fair Consequences, when I have not done it. No doubt, most men have such a kindness
Kindness for themselves, as, too commonly, inclines them to applaud their own thoughts, and judge their own Reasonings Just and Solid, when they are but Coarse enough; And others may very easily discover where the mistake lies: Yet, this I can say for my self, I have done, what I could to Guard against all such prejudice and partial Byas.

Sensible of these infirmities, I intreat the Readers favourable and benign Censures. This I can tell him ingenuously; If I could have done better, I should not have Grudged him the pleasure of it.

But, perchance, that which I am more concern'd to account for, is, what Assistancess I had for what I have advanced, in the following Sheets. And, here, I must Confess, I had not all the Advantages I could have wished. Such are my present Circumstances, That I could not Rationally propose to my self, to have Access to the publick Records, either of Church or State; And, no doubt, in this, I was at a Considerable loss: For he who Transcribes from Authen-
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Tick Records, Doth it more Securely, than he who has things only from Second hands.

Yet, I don't think this Disadvantage was such, as should have entirely Discouraged me from the Attempt I have made: For some of my Authors had Access to the publick Registers; And I am apt to believe there was not much to be found, there, Relating to the Controversies I have managed, which they have not published; So that, tho' 'tis possible, I might have been better, yet I cannot think I was ill provided of Helps: I cannot think any of my Presbyterian Brethren can be provided much better.

The principal Authors from which I have collected my Materials, are these; Buchanan's History published at Frankfort, Anno 1594. Leslie's History, at Edinburgh, 1675. King James the Sixth's Works, in English, at London, 1616. Archbishop Spotwood's History of the Reformation of the Church of Scotland, at London, Anno 1655. His Refutatio Libelli, &c, Lond. An, 1626. The True History of
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I have likewise considered our printed Acts of Parliaments. The printed Acts of the General Assemblies, from the year 1638. And as many Pamphlets as I could find, Relating to the Matters on which I insist: 'Tis needless to Name them here: You may find them named, as Occasion required, in my Book. There are two Books which I must insist on a little.

One is A Manuscript Copy of the Acts of our Scottish Assemblies from the year 1560 till the year 1616. Our Presbyterian Brethren may be ready
ready to reject its Authority, if it Militates against them: I give My Reader, therefore, this brief account of it.

It was transcribed in the year 1638, when the National Covenant was in a flourishing state; For I find, at the end of it, the Transcriber's Name and his Designation, written with the same hand by which the whole M S. is written; And he says, "He began to transcribe upon the 15th day of January 1638, and completed his work on the 23d of April, that same year. He was such a Reader as we have commonly, in Scotland, in Country Parishes.

It is not to be imagined, it was transcribed, then, for serving the Interests of Episcopacy; For, as Petrie, and the Presbyterians, generally affirm, The Prelates and Prelatists dreaded nothing more, in those days, than that the Old Registers of the Kirk should come abroad: And it was about that time, that Mr. Petrie got his Copy, from which he published so many Acts of our Old General Assemblies: Nor is it to be doubted
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doubted but that, as several Copies, then, were, so particularly, that which I have perused, was transcribed for the Ends of the Good Old Cause. This I am sure of, the covenant as required, then, to be subscribed, by the Green Tables, is set down, at full length in the Manuscript. Besides,

The Stile and Language testify that there is no Reason to doubt, That the Acts of Assemblies, which it contains, have been transcribed, word for word, at first, from the Authentick Records: And if Calderwood's or Petrie's Accounts of these Acts, deserve any Credit, My M.S. cannot be rejected, for it hath all they have published; and, for the most part, in the same Terms, except, where these Authors have altered the Language, sometimes to make it more fashionable and intelligible; sometimes to serve their Cause, and the Concerns of their Party.

It hath Chasms, also, and Defects, where, they say, Leaves have been torn from the Original Registers: And I have not adduced many Acts from
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from it, which either one, or both these Authors have not likewise men-
tioned in their Histories.

Calderwood has indeed concealed very many, having intended, it seems, to publish nothing but what made for him; tho', I think, even in that, his Judgment hath not sufficiently kept pace with his Inclinations. Nay, His Supplement, which he hath subjoyn'd to his History, as well as the History it self, is lame, by his own Acknowledgment: For these are the very first words of it: I have in the proceeding History only inserted such Acts, Articles, and Answers to Que-
stions, as belonged to the Scope of the History, and Form of Church Govern-
ment; Some few excepted touching Cor-
rruptions in the Worship of God, or the Office and Calling of Ministers. But because there are other Acts and Arti-
cles necessary to be known, I have SE-
LECTED such as are of greatest Use; passing by such as were TEM-
PORARY, or concerned only TEM-
PORARY OFFICES, &c.

Here is a clear Confession that he has not given us all the Acts of As-
semblies:
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femblies: Nay, that he has not given all such as concerned Temporary Offices; and, amongst these, we shall find him, in the following Sheets, more confidently than warrantably, reckoning Superintendency and the Episcopacy which was agreed to at Leith, Anno 1572.

I have mentioned these things, that the World may see, it cannot be reasonable for our Presbyterian Brethren to insist on either Calderwood's Authority or Ingenuity against my Mfs. How ingenuous or impartial he has been, you may have opportunity to guess before you have got through the ensuing Papers.

Petrie hath, indeed, given us a great many more of the Acts of General Assemblies than Calderwood hath done; as may appear to any who attends to the Margin of my Book: But he, also, had the Good Cause to serve; and therefore, has corrupted some things, and concealed other things, as I have made appear: However, he has the far greater part of what I have transcribed from the Ms.

Spotswood
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Spotswood hath fewer than either of the two Presbyterian Historians; yet some he hath, which I find also in the M.S. and which they have both omitted. In short,

I have taken but very few from it, which are not to be found in some One or More of these Historians: Neither have I adduced so much as One from it, nor is One in it, which is not highly agreeable to the State and Circumstances of the Church, and the Genius of the times, for which it mentions them: So that,

Upon the whole matter, I see no reason to doubt of its being a faithful Transcript: And I think I may justly say of it, as Optatus said of another M.S. upon the like occasion, Vetusitas Membranarum testimonium perhibet, &c. (optat. Milev. lib. 1. f. 7. edit. Paris 1569) It hath all the Marks of Antiquity and Integrity that it pretends to; and there's nothing about it that renders it suspicious.

The other Book, which, I said, required some farther consideration is, The History of the Reformation of the Church of Scotland, containing five Books,

...
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Books, &c. Commonly attributed to John Knox, by our Presbyterian Brethren. That which I have to say about it is, chiefly, That Mr. Knox was not the Author of it.

A. B. Spotswod hath proven this by Demonstration, in his History, (pag. 267.) his Demonstration is, "That the Author, whoever he was, talking of one of our Martyrs, retmitteth the Reader for a farther Declaration of his Sufferings, to the Acts and Monuments of Mr. Fox, which came not to light till some twelve years after Knox's Death. Mr. Patrick Hamilton was the Martyr; and the Reference is to be seen pag. 4 of that History I am now considering. Besides this, I have observed a great many more infallible proofs that Knox was not the Author. I shall only instance in some 3 or 4.

Thus

Pag. 447. The Author, having set down a Copy of the Letter sent by the Church of Scotland to the Church of England, (of which, more, by and by) "Tells how the English Nonconformists wrote to Beza and Beza..."
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"to Grindal Bishop of London; which " Letter of Beza's to Grindal, he says, " is the Eight in order, amongst Be-
"za's Epistles: And in that same page, " he mentions another of Beza's Let-
ters to Grindal, calling it the " Twelfth in Number: Now, 'tis cer-
tain Beza's Epistles were not pub-
lished till the year 1573. i.e. after Knox's Death.

It may be observed also that he adds farther in that same page, That The sincerer sort of the Ministry in England, had not yet assaulted the Jurisdi- 
ction and Church Government, (which they did not till the year 1572, at which time they published their first and second Admonitions to the Parlia-
ment) but only had excepted against Superstitions Apparel, and some other faults in the Service Book. From which, besides that 'tis Evident, Knox could not be the Author, we may Learn from the Authors Confession, whoever he was, That the Contro-
versies about Parity and Imparity, &c. were not so early in Britain as our Presbyterian Brethren are earnest to have the present Generation believe. Again Pag.
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Pag. 449 The Author, Narrating how Henry, Queen Mary's Husband, &c. was buried. Adds, in Confirmation of his own Veracity, Thus. If there had been any Solemn Burial, Buchanan had wanted Wit, to Relate otherwise; Seeing there would have been so many Witnesses to testify the Contrary: Therefore, the Contriver of the late History of Queen Mary, wanted Policy, here, to convey a Lie. Thus, I say, the Author vouches Buchanan's Authority; And it must be Buchanan's History that he Refers to; For there's not a Syllable, about Henry's Burial, to be found in any of his other writings, Now,

Not to insist on the incredibleness of Knox's running for Shelter to Buchanan's Authority, concerning a matter of Fact so remarkable in its self, and which happened in his own time, in that very City in which he lived and was Minister: Not to insist on this, I say, Buchanan himself in his Dedication of his History to King James 6th, Clearly decides the matter.

He
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He tells his Majesty there were two Considerations which chiefly put him upon writing his History. First, "He perceived his Majesty had "Read, and Understood the Histories "of almost all other Nations; And "it was incongruous and unaccountable that he, who was so well acquainted with Foreign Affairs, "should be a Stranger to the History of his own Kingdom. Secondly, "He was intrusted with the King's "Education: He could not attend "his Majesty in that important Office, by Reason of his Old Age and "Multiplying infirmities; He applied himself, therefore, to write his "History, thereby, to Compensate "the Defects of his Non-Attendance, &c.

And from both Reasons it is evident, that Knox was Dead before Buchannan applied himself to the writing of his History: For Knox dyed Anno 1572. K. James was, then, but Six years of Age: And is it Credible, that at that Age he had Read and got by heart, the Histories of almost all other Nations? Indeed Buchannan
Buchanan survived Knox by ten years; and, for a good many of them was able to wait, and actually waited on the King; so that 'tis clear 'twas towards the end of his days, and after Knox's Death that he applied himself to his History. And 'tis very well known, it was never published till the year 1582. But this is not all.

The Author of that which is called Knox's History, adduces Buchanan's Authority for Convelling the Credit of the Contriver of the Late History of Queen Mary, which was written, I cannot tell how long, after Buchanan was Dead, as well as Knox. Further,

Pag. 306. The Author discourses thus, The Books of Discipline have been, of late, so often published, that we shall forbear to print them at this time. Now, there were never more than two Books of Discipline; and the Second was not so much as projected till the year 1576, i.e. 4 years after Knox had departed this life. Once more,

Pag. 286. We read thus, Some in France, after the sudden Death of Francis
Francis the Second, and calling to mind the Death of Charles the Ninth, in Blood, and the Slaughter of Henry the Second, did Remark the Tragical ends of these three Princes who had persecuted Gods Servants so cruelly. —And indeed the following Kings of France, unto this day, have found this true, by their unfortunate and unexpected Ends. Now

Charles the Ninth died not till the 30th of May, Anno 1574. i.e. 18 Months after Knox. The following Kings of France who made the Unfortunate and unexpected Ends were Henry the Third, and Henry the Fourth. Henry the Third was not Murthered till the year 1589. Henry the Fourth, not till May 1610. The former 17, the latter 38 years after the Death of Knox.

From this Taste it is clear, that that History at least, as we now have it, was not written by Knox. All that can be said with any Shadow of probability, is, that Knox provided some Materials for it. But Granting this, how shall we be able to separate that which is Spurious in it
it from that which is Genuine? All I can say is this.

'Tis plain to every one that Reads it, That he has been a thorough-paced Presbyterian, who framed it as we have it: By Consequence, its Authority is stark naught for any thing, in it, that favours Presbytery, or bespatters Prelacy; And if it ought to have any credit at all, it is only where the Controversies about Church Government are no ways interested; or where it mentions any thing that may be improven to the Advantages of Episcopacy; just as the Testimonies of Adversaries are useful for the interests of the opposite party, and not an Ace farther: So that, I had reason (if any Man can have it) to insist on its Authority, as I have frequently done; But no Presbyterian can, in equity, either plead, or be allowed the same priviledge.

I could give the Reader a surfeit of instances, which cannot but appear, to any considering person, to be plain and notorious Presbyterian corruptions, in it: But I shall only represent One, as being of considerable
importance, in the Controversie which I have managed in my Second Enquiry; and, by that, the Reader may make a Judgment of the Authors Candor and Integrity in other things.

The English Non-conformists, zealous to be rid of the Vestments, and some other Forms and Ceremonies retained by the Church of England, which they reckoned to be scandalous impositions, wrote earnestly (as is known) to several Reformed Churches, and Protestant Divines, beseeching them to interpose with the Church of England for an ease of these burdens. It seems they wrote to some in Scotland also; probably to Mr. Knox: He was of their acquaintance; and they could not but be secure enough of his inclinations, considering how warm he had been about these matters at Francfort.

However it was, the Church of Scotland did actually interpose. The General Assembly, met at Edinburgh, Decem. 27. Anno 1566, ordered John Knox to draw a Letter to the English Clergy, in favour of those Non-conformists. This Letter was subscribed
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Subscribed and sent. Now, consider the Tricks of the Author of the History attributed to Knox.

The Inscription of the Letter, as it is in Spotswood, Petrie, and the Manuscript Copy of the Acts of the General Assembly's, is this:

The Superintendents, Ministers and Commissioners of the Church, within the Realm of Scotland, To their Brethren the Bishops and Pastors of England, who have renounced the Roman Antichrist, and do profess, with them, the Lord Jesus in sincerity, with the increase of the Holy Spirit.

Thus, I say Spotswood hath it; (pag. 198.) And the MS. and Petrie (Tom. 2. p. 348.) have it in the same words; only where Spotswood hath [wish] they have [desire] which makes no material Difference. But the spurious Knox has it thus. (pag. 445.)

The Superintendents, with other Ministers and Commissioners of the Church of God, in the Kingdom of Scotland, To their Brethren the Bishops and Pastors of God's Church in England, who profess with us, in Scotland, the Truth of Jesus Christ.

c 3 Now
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Now consider if there are not Material Differences between these two Inscriptions. By the Inscription, as it is in Spotswood, Petrie, and the MS. the Dignity and Superiority of the Scottish Superintendents, above the rest of the Clergy, is clearly preserved: By the other account it is sadly obscured; and they are made (at least very much) to stand on a level with other Ministers, &c.

By the Inscription as in Spotswood, &c. The Sentiments Our Scottish Clergy had, then, about the English Reformation, and Constitution, are very plain, genuine and charitable: They were satisfied, that the Bishops and Pastors of the Church of England had Renounced the Roman Antichrist, and that they professed the Lord Jesus in SINCERITY; And they had for them, suitably, the Christian and Brotherly Charity, which the Orthodox and Sincere Christians of one Church, ought to have for the Orthodox and Sincere Christians of another Church: They wished, or desired to them, The Increase of the Holy Spirit. How highly this
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this was agreeable to the sentiments of the then Protestants in Scotland, I have made fully appear in the Discussion of my Second Enquiry.

But, To the Pseudo-Knox, it seems, it lookt highly scandalous, to own, That the Bishops and Pastors of England had Renounced the Roman Antichrist, or that they professed the Lord Jesus in sincerity: How could these things be said, so long as they retained Antichrists Hierarchy, or had so many Romish Mixtures? And therefore, to wish them the increase of the Holy Spirit, was too bold a prayer; It was founded on a false hypothesis: It supposed they had the Holy Spirit already. How suitable is all this to the Presbyterian temper and principles? And, by consequence, is it not evident that these alterations were not the effects of negligence or inadvertisence, but of the true Spirit of the party? But this is not all.

In the body of the Letter, as recorded by the Pseudo-Knox, there are several other Corruptions: I shall only
only point at one, but it is a considerable one.

The General Assembly which sent the Letter, after a Digression concerning the care that ought to be had of tender Consciences, &c. Resume their main purpose, thus, We return to our former humble supplication, which is, that our Brethren, who, amongst you, refuse these Romish Rags, may find of you, who are the PRELATS, such favour as our Head and Master commandeth every one of his members to shew to another.

So it is not only in the MS. Spotswood and Petrie, word for word, but also in a virulent Presbyterian Pamphlet, called Scotidromus, directed to all Noble Scots and kind Catholicks zealours for the Romish Religion; written Anno 1638, to cast dirt, at that time, upon Episcopacy, and render it odious to the People; which Pamphlet I have by me, in Manuscript: But

The Supposititious Knox has it thus, Now again we return to our former Request, which is, that the Brethren, among you, who refuse the Romish
mish Rags may find of you (not the PRELATES, but) who USE and URGE them, such favour, &c. How unfit was it for the world to know that a Scottish General Assembly had own'd the Bishops of England as PRELATES? It was scandalous, no doubt, to the Godly: It was expedient, therefore, to falsify a little, and fofit in more useful Epithets; to call them, not PRELATES, but USERS and URGERS of the Ceremonies.

I have insisted the longer on this Book, because our Presbyterian Brethren are so earnest to have the world believe that it was written by Knox: Particularly G. R. (in his First Vindication, &c. in Answer to Quest. i. s. 8.) where, too, observe by the way, how extravagantly that Author blunders. His words are, [Anno 1559. The Protestant Ministers and People held a General Assembly at St. Johnstown, faith Knox, Hist. Lib. 2. p. 137.] Now there is not so much as one syllable of a General Assembly in the Text. Upon the Margin, indeed, there are these words [The first Assembly at St.
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St. Johnstown] But no Presbyterian, I think, (unless he is one of G. R.'s kind) will be so impudent as to say that all that's on the Margin of that Book was written by Knox. And that Meeting which was then at Perth, was nothing like that Court, which we call a General Assembly: But enough of this.

To conclude, tho' I am firmly persuaded that Knox was not the Author of this History, yet because it passes commonly under his name, I have still cited it, so, on my Margin. The Edition I have used, is that, in 4to, published at Edinburg, Anno 1644.

The other Treatises attributed to Knox (and I know no Reason to doubt their being his) from which I have cited any thing, are in an Appendix to the History.

I have not made it my work to cite Acts of Parliaments, and represent the favourable countenance Episcopacy hath had from the State, so much, as to consider the sentiments of our Reformers, and those who succeeded them, in their Ecclesiastical capacity; part-
partly, because the Acts of Parliament have been diligently collected before; particularly, who so pleases may see a goodly train of them, from the year 1560 till the year 1617, in the Large Declaration pag. 333, &c. Partly, because our Presbyterian Brethren, are in use to insist more on the Books of Discipline, and the Acts of General Assemblies, &c. than on Acts of Parliaments.

One advantage, (amongst many disadvantages) I think, I have, it is, that the Authors I have most frequently cited, were Presbyterians, by consequence, Authors whose Testimony's can, least, be called in Question by my Presbyterian Brethren.

I do not pretend to have exhausted the subjects I have insisted on: Any Reader may easily perceive I have been at a loss as to several things in History. Perchance, I have sometimes started some things New, and which have not been observed before. I wish I may have given occasion to those who are fitter, and better furnished with helps, for such Enquiries, to consider, if they can bring more light to our
our History. In the mean time, I think, I have said enough to convince the Reader, that our Presbyterian Brethren have not reason to be so confident, as commonly they are, for their side of the Controversies I have managed.

Yet, after all this, I am not secure but that they will endeavour to have my Book Answered; for all Books must be Answered, that militate against them; and they can still find some G. R. or other who has zeal and confidence enough for such attempts.

Upon the supposition, therefore, that I must have an answer, I do, for once, become an earnest suiter to my Presbyterian Brethren, that they would employ some Person of ordinary sense and discretion, to Answer me, and not their common Vindicator of their Kirk, G. R. for I have got enough of him, and I incline not to have any more meddling with him.

Who so reads the following papers, I think, may find such a sample of him; such a swatch (pardon the word, if
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if it is not English) of both his Historical and his Argumentative Skill (a talent he bewails, much the want of, in his Adversaries) as may make it appear just and reasonable for any man to decline him. But left he is not represented, there, so fully as he ought to be, so fully as may justify my declining of him, I shall be at some farther pains, here, to give the Reader a fuller prospect of him.

To delineate him minutely, might, perchance, be too laborious for me, and too tedious and loathsome to my Reader: I shall restrict my self, therefore to his four Cardinal Virtues, his Learning, his Judgment, his Civility, and his Modesty: Or, (because we are Scottifhmen) to give them their plain Scotch names, his Ignorance, his Non-sence, his Ill-nature, and his Impudence.

Perhaps I shall not be able to reduce every individual instance to its proper Species: 'Tis very hard to do that, in matters which have such affinity one with another, as there is between Ignorance and Non-sence,
or between Ill-nature and Impudence: But this I dare promise, if I cannot keep by the Nice Laws of Categories, I shall be careful to keep by the Strict Laws of Justice: I shall entitle him to nothing that is not truly his own. So much for Preface, come we next to the Purpose. And in the

1. Place, I am apt to think, since ever writing was a Trade, there was never Author furnished with a richer stock of unquestionable Ignorance for it. To insist on all the Evidences of this, would swell this Preface to a Bulk beyond the Book.

I omit, therefore, his making Presbyterian Ruling Elders (as contradistinct from Teaching Elders) of Divine Institution; his making the SENIORES, sometimes mentioned by the Fathers, such Ruling Elders; and his laying stress on the old blunder about St. Ambrose's testimony to that purpose, (vide True Represent. of Presbyterian Government prop. 3.) These I omit because not peculiar to him.

I omit even that, which, for any thing
thing I know, may be peculiar to him; viz. That his Ruling Elders are called Bishops, and that their necessary Qualifications are set down at length in Scrip. e. g. 1 Tim. 3. 2. and Tit. 1. 6 (ibid. Prop. 3. 4.)

I omit his Learn'd affirmative, that Patronages were not brought into the Church till the 7th or 8th Centurie, or Later; And that they came in amongst the latest Antichristian Corruptions and Usurpations (ibid. Anfw. to Object. 9th)

I omit all such Assertions as these, that the most and most Eminent of the Prelatists acknowledge that by our Saviour's appointment, and according to the practice of the first and best Ages of the Church, she ought to be, and was Governed, in Common, by Ministers Acting in Parity (ibid. Prop. 12.) That Diocesan Episcopacy was not settled in St. Cyprian's time (Rational Defence of Nonconformity, &c. p. 157) That Diocesan Episcopacy prevailed not for the first three Centuries, and that it was not generally in the 4th Centurie (ibid. 158.) That the Bishop S. Cyprian all alongst, speaks of, was a Pres-
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Presbyterian Moderator (ibid. 179.) That Cyprian, Ausline, Athanasius, &c. were only such Moderators (ibid. 175, 176, 177, 178.)

I omit his insisting on the Authority of the Decretal Epistles attributed to Pope Anacletus, as if they were Genuine (ibid. 202.) And that great Evidence of his skill in the affairs of the Protestant Churches, viz. That Episcopacy is not to be seen in anyone of them, Except England (ibid. p. 10.) Nay,

I omit his nimble and learned Gloss he has put on St. Jerom's Toto Orbe Decretum, &c. viz. That this Remedy of Schism, in many places, began, then, (i.e. in St. Jerom's time) to be thought on; and that it was no wonder that this Corruption began, then, to creep in; it being, then, about the end of the fourth Century, when Jerome wrote, &c. (ibid. 170.)

Neither shall I insist on his famous Exposition of St. Jerom's Quid facit Episcopus, &c. because it has been sufficiently exposed, already, in the Historical Relation of the General Aff. 1690. Nor on his making Plutarch, Simo-
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Simonides, Chrysostom, &c. Every Græcian speaks Latin, when he had the confidence to cite them. These and 50 more such surprizing Arguments of our Authors singular learning, I shall pass over; And shall insist only, a little, on two or three instances, which, to my taste, seem superlatively pleasant. And

1. In that profound Book, which he calls a Rational Defence of Nonconformity, &c. in Answer to D. Stillingsfleet's Unreasonableness of the separation from the Church of England (pag. 172.) He hath Glossed St. Chrysostom, yet, more ridiculously than he did St. Jerom. The passage as it is in Chrysostom, is sufficiently famous, and known to all who have enquired into Antiquity, about the Government of the Church. The Learned Father having Discoursed concerning the Office and Duties of a Bishop (Hom. 10. on 1 Tim. 3,) and proceeding, by the Apostles Method, to Discourse next of Deacons (Hom. 11.) started this difficulty. How came the Apostle to prescribe no Rules about Presbyters? And he fol-
ved it thus, ὅτι ἐ πολὺ τῷ μέσῳ ἀυτῶν ὡς ἢ ἐπισκόπων. Καὶ γὰρ ἦν ἄυτοι διδασκάλιαν ἐστὶν ἀναθεματίζοντος, καὶ περισσότερον ἢ ἐκκλησίας ὡς ὅπει ἐπισκόπων ἐίπε, τάντα ἦ πρεσβυτερίς ἐμόν ἔτη. Τῷ γὰρ ἐκκόστοις μονὴ ἐκφθάνασι. Καὶ τάτοι μόνον δοκεῖς πασχάντειν τὰς πρεσβυτές ἐς. St. Paul, says he, did not in-
sist about Presbyters, because there's no
great difference between them and Bi-
shops: Presbyters, as well as Bishops,
have received Power to Teach and Go-
vern the Church: And the Rules he
gave to Bishops are also proper for Pres-
byters; For Bishops excel Presbyters,
only, by the Power of Ordination; and
by this alone they are reckoned to have
more Power than Presbyters. Vide

Now, 'tis plain to the most ordi-
mary attention, That in the Holy
Father's Dialect, ἀναθεματίζοντος signifies the
Power of conferring Orders, just as
didaskalia and περισσότερον signify the Pow-
ers of Teaching and Governing: Con-
 sider, now the Critical Skill of G. R.

Bellarmine had aduced this Testi-
mony, it seems, to shew that there
was a Disparity in point of Power,
between Bishops and Presbyters,
and had put it in Latin, thus, Inter
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Episcopum atque Presbyterum interest fere nihil; quippe & Presbyteris Ecclesiæ cura permissæ est: & quæ de Episcopis dicuntur, ea etiam Presbyteris con-grunt; Sola quippe Ordinatione Superiores illi sunt. So G. R. has it: I know not if he has transcribed it faithfully: 'Tis not his custom to do so: Nor have I Bellarmine at hand, to compare them. Sure I am the Translation doth not fully answer the Original: But however that is, go we forward with our Learned Author. These are his words.

What he (Bellarmine) alledged out of this citation, that a Bishop may Ordain, not a Presbyter, the Learned Fathers expression will not bear: For Ordination must signify either the Ordination the Bishop and Presbyter have, whereby they are put in their Office, to be different, which be doth not alledge: Or, that the difference between them was only in Order or Precedency, not in Power or Authority: Or, that it was by the Ordination or appointment of the Church, not Christ's Institution: But it can never signify the Power of Ordaining. Are not these pretty plea-
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fant Criticisms on χειροτονία? But the best follows. He gives a Demonstration, that Ordination as mentioned by Chrysoftom, can never signify the Power of Ordaining. For, then, says he) Chrysoftom (who was sufficiently a Master of words) would have said (mark it beloved, he would have spoken Latin, and said Potestate Ordinandi, not Ordinatione. And have we not our Author, now, a Deep-learn'd Glossator? I cannot promise a better instance of his Critical Skill: But I hope the next shall not be much worse.

2. Then, in that same Rational defence, &c. p. 199. Sect. 4. He undertakes to prove the Divine institution of Popular Elections of Ministers. His first Argument he takes from Acts 14. 23. The word χειροτονίσαντες must needs do it. Now, 'tis none of my present task to prove, that that word cannot do it: Whosoever has considered how 'tis used in the New Testament, may soon perceive that; and if our Author had but Read the Book called Jus Divinum Ministerii Evangel. i, written by a Provincial
The Preface.

Assembly of his own friends, he might have seen, that even *they* were Confident it could not do it. Nay, He himself, in that same 4th Section acknowledges, it cannot do it. *I deny not* (says he) that this word is sometimes used figuratively, for *potestative Mission*, the effect or consequent of *Election*, and that by one Person, without suffrages, as Acts 10:41. And I think, after this, it was pleasant enough to make it do it, for all that: But, as I said, 'tis none of my present business to debate the force of the word with him: All I am concerned for, is to represent his superfine *Skill in Critical learning*. For, He tells us gravely, *The word is most commonly used in his sense*, viz. as it signifies to *chuse by suffrages*: And he proves it, but how? These two ways. 1. *Of all the instances that Scapula, in his Lexicon, giveth of the use of the word*, not one of them *is to the contrary*. Twenty disparate significations, you see, would have imported nothing: And who can doubt but Scapula's *Lexicon* is ane Uncontroverted Standard for the Ecclesiastical
But our Author proceeds: 2. It cannot be instanced that ever the word is used for laying on of hands: Lifting up, and laying them down, being so opposite, it is not to be imagined that the one should be put for the other. And what needed more after this? Yet, lest this was not profound enough, our Author plunges deeper: He will needs have both the suffrages of the People, and the imposition of the Apostles hands, to be signified by the word χειροτονίσματι, in that same Text Acts 14:23. The Apostles appointed, by Ordination, Elders for the People, upon their Electing them by Suffrages. And then, in the close of the Section, I conclude, this being done \textit{πρὸ τῶν εὐαγγελίων}, in every Church, the People Respective choosing their Pastors, and the Apostles ordaining them, it is clear to have been, generally, the practice of these times, and so the Institution of Christ.

I told when I began with him, there might be Instances, I might have occasion to adduce, which it might be difficult to reduce to their proper Categories; And I am afraid this
this is one: The truth is, 'tis very hard to determine whither Ignorance or Non-sense can plead the better Title to it: For my part, let them share it between them. I shall only insist, a little, on one thing more.

3. Then, one of his Adversaries, whom he took to task in his Second Vindication of his Church of Scotland (the Author of the Second Letter) had used the Phrase [Christian Philosophy] when G. R. thought he should have said [Christian Divinity] but, if I mistake not, G. R. when he wrote his Answer, thought it had been for that Authors credit to have foreborn using such a Phrase. For never did Cock crow more keenly over Brother Cock when he had routed him, than G. R. did, over the Letter-man, on that occasion.

He told him (2 Vind. ad Let. 2. §. 24. p. 62, 63. Edit. Eden.) He thought the Commendation of a Minister had been rather to understand Christian Divinity, than Christian Philosophy, but we must not wonder (says he) that men so strongly inclined to Socinianism speak in the Socinian Dialect. — For indeed
indeed that which goeth for Religion, among some men, is nothing but Platonick Philosophy put into a Christian dress, by expressing it in words borrowed (some of them) from the Bible: And the Preaching of some men is such Morality as Seneca and other Heathens taught, only Christianized with some words, &c. In short, he pursued the poor Epifler (as he calls him) so unmercifully, that he never left him, till he concluded him ane Ignorant Talker, for using that Phrase. Now, Judicious Reader, was it not, indeed, a Demonstration of Deep thinking, and a penetrating wit, to make such a plain discovery, of such a prodigious Spawn, of Heresies, crowded into one single Phrase consisting of two words, or rather in one Solitary Vocabal? I say one Vocabal, for it was the word [Philosophy] which was the Lerna: I cannot think the word [Christian] was either Art or Part. Socinianism, Academicism, Stoicism (consistent or inconsistent, was all one to our Author) all throng'd together in one so innocent like ane expression! Sad enough! How
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How sad had it been for sorry Epifler, if there had been a greater confluence of such — isms in our Authors learn-ed Noddle when he wrote that Elabo-rate Paragraph? Had they been in it, 'tis very like, they had come out. However, even these were enough, especially, having, in their Society, the fundamental Heresie of Ignorance: And yet after all this,

I am apt to believe the poor Epifler was Orthodox and Catholick in his meaning: I believe he lookt on it as a very harmless Phrafe, and intended no other thing by it, than that which is commonly called [Christian Divinity.] 'Tis twenty to one, he used it, as having found it used before him, by very Honest men, who were never suspected of any of these Dreadful Heresies: The Ancient Lights (I mean) and Fathers of the Church, who had scarcely another Phrafe which they used more frequently, or more familiarly. Of this I am sure, If it was not so, it might have been so, with him.

My present circumstances do not allow me to Cite them so plentifully,
as might be done; yet I think, I can adduce the Testimonies of half a dozen, whose Authority might have stood between the Epistle and all Hazard, e. g.

Justin Martyr in his Excellent Dialogue with Trypho the Jew, not only asserts the insufficiency of the Platonic, the Peripatetic, the Pythagorean, the Stoick Philosophies, &c. But, expressly, makes the Ancient Prophets who were inspired of God, the only true and infallible Philosophers (Just. Opp. Grec. Edit. Rob. Steph. Lutet. 1551. p. 36.) And having told how he himself came to the knowledge of Christianity, he subjoyns (p. 37.) ἡ αὐτὴν μόνην ἑκείνον φιλοσοφιὰν ἀσφαλὴν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ φύσεως, ὡς ἐν τῇ ταὐταπιθολογοφθείσῃ. I have found Christianity to be the only infallible and useful Philosophy, and, on its account, I own myself a Philosopher.

Photius in his Μνειοβ. Discoursing of the same Justin, as may be seen at the beginning of Justin's works, Describes him thus, ἐτι ἐγείρῃς ἐνθευόμενος ὅτι οὐκ ἐπὶ καθ' ὑμᾶς. He was a man of our (that is, the Christian) Philosophy.

Origen,
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Origen, in his Learned work against Celsus (Edit. Cantab. 1658. p. 9.) tells him, if it were possible for all men, laying aside the cares of this life, ἀπολέσων τῷ φιλοσοφεῖν, to apply themselves to the Study of true Philosophy, what a blessing would it be to the world! And the very next words Declare what Philosophy he meant: εὐγενῆσθαι γὰρ ἐν τῇ καθισμῷ, &c. For there may be found (says he) in Christianity, most Noble and Mysterious disquisitions, &c. Again,

Pag. 144. Celsus had alleged that the Christians took pains to Proselyte none but young People, Ignorants, Ideots, &c. And Origen Replys, it is not true: They call all men σοφοὶ καὶ ἄθωστοι, wise and foolish, to the acknowledgment of Christ: And what evil is there in instructing the Ignorant? Do not you Heathen Philosophers the same? η' ὑμῖν, μω, ἢ Ελληνες ἐξετε μεταίχε, οὐ δικότεθαι καὶ ἄθωστος ἀρθρώτας ὁδὴ φιλοσοφίαν καλέων, ἡμεῖς ὑ τοῦ σοιῶντες ἐφιλανθρώπως αὐτὸ πράττουσι; Or is it allowable in you O Heathens to call young men, and servants, and ignorant people to the Study of Philosophy? But
we Christians, when we do the like, must be Condemn'd of inhumanity? Once more

Pag. 146. Celsus had objected that the Christians taught privately, &c. And Origen Answers, they did not refuse to teach publickly, and if people would come to them, they would send them περιλογογία, to be taught Philosophy by the Prophets of God, and the Apostles of Jesus. Whoso pleases to peruse that Excellent Apology for Christianity, may find much more to the same purpose. Nay farther,

St. Chrysostom, one of G. R's good acquaintances, has this Heretical Phrase, ane hundred times over: e. g. In the page immediately preceding that in which the Testimony is, which his Learn'dness Gloss t fo singularly; the Holy Father, zealous against such as were Christians in profession, only, without a suitable practice, Argues thus, what can one say ὅσιν ἐν ὄργοις ἀλλ' ἐν λόγοις φιλοσοφίας ἦμας, &c. When he sees us, not in works, but in words only, pretending to be Philosophers? Or (for all is one with Chrysostom) to be Christians?
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In his sixth Hom. on St. Matt. He says, God permitted the Jews, for a time to offer Corporal Sacrifices, &c. ἵνα αὐτὸς τῷ μικρὲν ἑκατέρες ἡμεῖς ἡμᾶς ἔδωκεν τῷ ἑαυτῷ ἀμαρτίαν φιλοσοφίαν, i.e. That by degrees he might lead them to the Elevated (i.e. the Christian) Philosophy. And doth not the same Father in the same Homilies on Matt. call our Saviours Sermon on the Mount ἄνευ τῆς φιλοσοφίας, The Top of all Philosophy?

And in his 4th Hom. on 1 Cor. He discourses elegantly how Christ by the Doctrines of the Cross, and Evangelical Polity, and true Godliness and the future judgment, &c. πάντας ἐκεῖνος φιλοσοφός, hath made all men, Rusticks, Ideots, &c. Philosophers.

Neither is this Phrase less frequent with the Latin Fathers: I shall only instance in two, but such two as most men use (at least ought) to Read, who have a mind to know any thing of Antiquity. St. Cyprian, I mean, and Vincentius Lirinensis.

St. Cyprian in ane Epistle to Corne-lin us, the 57 in number, (if I remember right, according to Rigaltius; Char-
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Characterizes Novatianus to this purpose, Magis Durus Secularis Philosophiae pravitate, quam Philosophiae Dominicae lenitate Pacificus: And in his Excellent Sermon De Patientia, Nos autem, Fratres Charissimi, qui Philosophi non verbis, sed factis sumus, &c. We Christians who are Philosophers; not in words but in deeds, &c. And

Vincentius in the 30th Chapter of his Commonitorium admires the Celestis Philosophiae Dogmata, the Doctrines of the Heavenly (i.e. the Christian) Philosophy. Indeed,

Some of these primitive Glory's of the Church, give us a Solid Reason for both the Orthodoxy and the Propriety of the Phrase. I cannot tell what notion G. R. has of Philosophy; But I am pretty sure, according to S. Justin's and St. Augustine's notion of it, it is a most proper name for our Holy Religion.

Justin (ut sup. p. 33.) tells Trypho, thus, ἐσὶ γὰρ τῷ ὑπὲρ τῆς φιλοσοφίας νομίσαν κυρίου· ἢ τιμιώτατον θεόν ἔστε περάσαν καὶ συνίστασθε ἡμᾶς μόνος, ὅσιος τοις ἀληθινοῖς ἕστοι εἰς τὴν φιλοσοφίαν τῆς περασάκησες. True Philosophy is the Richest.
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Richest and most Honorable possession in the sight of God. 'Tis that which brings us near, and commends us to him: And they are all truly holy, who apply themselves seriously and heartily to the practice of true Philosophy. And (pag. 34. he defines Philosophy thus, ὡς τὸν γὰρ θεὸν, καὶ τὴν αἰσθήσειν, ἡγομένους, ἑυσεξουσίας τοὺς τούτους ἐν ἑξήμων, καὶ ἰδίᾳ σοφίᾳ γένεσιν. Philosophy is the Knowledge of God and the acknowledgment of the Truth (i.e. of Christ, as I take it) and happiness is the reward of this wisdom and knowledge. And,

St. Austin, (with whose works G. R. should have been well acquainted, when he adventured to give him the Commendation of being the great Light of the Latin Church, as he doth in that same 24. Sect.) in the first cap. of his 8th Book De Civitate Dei, Discourses thus. Cum Philosophis est habenda Collatio quorum ipsum Nomen; si Latine interpretemur, amorem Sapienciae profitetur: Porro, si Sapientia Deus est, per quem facta sunt omnia, scit Divina Authoritas, veritasque monstravit, verus Philosophus est Amator Dei. The word Philosophy (says he) signifies the
The Love of Wisdom: But God is Wisdom, as Himself hath said in His Word; and therefore a true Philosopher is a lover of God. And,

In the ninth Chapter of that same Book Philosophari est amare Deum—Unde Colligitur tunc fore beatum Studiosum Sapientiae (id enim est Philosopher) cum frui Deo Caeperit. i.e. To Philosophize is to love God: One is then a true Philosopher when he begins to enjoy God, &c. Nay,

Tho G. R. should reject the Authority of these and twenty other Fathers, who have used and justified the Phrase, it were no difficult task to find enough of Modern Writers, who have used it, tho' they were neither Stoicks, Platonists nor Socinians; But I shall only recommend to him two who were his Predecessors in that same Chair, which he, now, so worthily possesseth. Doctor Leighton I mean, in his Valedictory Oration, lately published, and Mr Colvillet in his Treatise about Christian Philosophy. And now,

Let our Authors Ignorance and his Ill-nature debate it between them,
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to whither he was most obliged when he so fiercely scourged the poor Epistler, for talking so Heretically of Christian Philosophy. By this time, I think, the Reader may have got a sufficient Taste of our Renowned Vindicators singular Learning. Proceed we now

II. To his next Cardinal Virtue. Profound Learning, such as our Authors, is a teeming Mother, and commonly produces Congenial Brood, plentifully. Indeed, never was Author's more Prolifick. His Learning has produced crowds of Mysteries; but such Mysteries as plain speaking people, commonly, call Non-sense.

It were Non-sense, indeed, to insist on all instances of this nature, which beautify his writings: Such as his pretty position, That all Ceremonies of Gods worship are worship themselves (Animadv. on D. Still. Iren. p. 30.) His pleasant Fetch about Ceremonies that stand in the place of the Competentes or Catechumeni, (Rational Defence, &c. p. 72.) His Judicious Conclusion, That the Affirmative part of the Second Commandment, is, that we ought to worship God
in the way prescribed in his Word, (ibid. i 25.) His sublime notion about
the Unity of the Church in the Case
of the Lutherans (ibid. i 48.) We shut
not out the Lutheran Churches (says he)
from all possibility of Union with them;
We can have Union with them, as
Sister Churches; But we cannot partake
in their instituted parts of worship. His
surprising proposition, viz. That the
two Governments (Presbytery and
Monarchy) of Church and State, have
suted one another, many ages, since
the Nation was Protestant. 2 Vind. §.

It were to Vie with him for his
own Talent, I say, to insist on all
these, and many more, such, which
are to be found in his Matchless wri-
tings. I shall, therefore, mention
only three or four of his most Elabo-
rate Mysteries. And

1. Our Judicious Author wrote
Advadversions on Doctor Stillingfleet's
Irenicum, and you may judge of the
Metal of the whole by this one Speci-
men, which you have not far from the
beginning.

D. Still. (p. 2.) had laid down this
Foun-
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Foundation, "that difference of opinion about a point, and probable Arguments brought on both sides, by wise and able men, if it be not a matter of necessity to salvation, gives men ground to think that a final decision of the matter in Controversie was never intended as a necessary means for the Peace and Unity of the Church.

Against this position G. R. Reasons thus (p. 5.) If any things not necessary to Salvation, be so Necessary to be clearly revealed, that we are to look upon them as not Chrifts Truth, if there remain a Controversie about them, managed with specious Arguments, on both sides, among wise and able men, much more, things necessary to Salvation must be thus clearly revealed, so that there is no truth in them, if they be so Controverted, but the consequent is most false and absurd. Ergo, &c. Let the Reader try his skill on this Mystery, and fathom the depth of it, if he can.

2. The next Mystery I thought to have insisted on, is that grand one about the Decrees of God, (2 Vind. e 2 p. 6.)
p. 66.) viz. That God has a Decree that's Präteritum as an Act of Sovereignty, and a Decree that's Prædynamatum, as an Act of Justice. But I am told, this has been sufficiently represented already: And therefore I shall say no more about it, but this, that there is no Reason to think, it was a Typographical Error: For, after it was thus printed in Scotland, it was Reprinted in England without Alteration or Correction; So that there's all the Reason in the world to impute it to the Author: But, if so, was he not, at best, a Mysterious Theologue? But

3. The next I shall produce, tho' not sounding so directly towards blasphemy, is every whit, as good Mystery. The Story is this.

Doctor Stillingfleet, in his Unreasonableness of the Separation from the Church of England, forbore to sustain the Lawfulness of Liturgies; &c. Because Doctor Falkner had done it so well before: But our Author had made some Collections on the Subject (Ration. Defen. &c. p. 222.) And it was pity they should be stifled; And there
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therefore they behoved to be publish-
ed. I am not to insist on every thing that is Mysterious in that Learn-
ed Disquisition on the subject of Lit-
turgies, with which he has blest the Island. One thing shall suffice.

In his burning zeal against Liturgies or Set forms, he advances this proposition (among many others) That it is Unlawful to worship God by a frame of service, that is not warrant-ed in the word, both as to its Matter and Manner. (pag. 226. Sect. 8.)

This I prove (says he) 1. From Christ's Condemning the Traditions of men, as vain worship, Matt. 15. 9. They taught these Traditions, i.e. (faith Lucas Brugenfis in Locum) they followed them, and taught others to follow them. The same Author calleth these Mens Traditions, that are so, of men, that they are not of God, or are deivi-

ed by man; ibid. So also, Vatablus, Erasmus, Maldonate, Tirinus, Pil-
cator, Calvin and Chemnitus, say, Here is meant whatever is brought into Religion without the word: Now it is Manifest that a frame of Divine ser-
vice not warranted in the word falleth
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under this General Head. Thus you have all these Gentlemen, Lucas Burgensis, Vatablus, Erasmus, &c. (tho' some of them were Papists, some of them Lutheran, and not one of them but own'd and used Liturgies) strong against Liturgies, it not directly, at least by plain consequence. But our Author proceeds.

Secondly, The Lord condemneth all worship offered up to him, that he hath not Commanded, Jer. 7. 31. (turn to the Text and try if it is not pertinently adduced) Where not being commanded, but devised by men, is made the ground on which that practice (tho' otherwise evil also) is Condemned: And Jeroboam's Frame and way of service is Condemned because Devised (Heb. Created) of his own heart, 1 Kings 12. 33.

Thirdly, Even Reason teacheth that God ought to chuse how he will be honoured, or worshiped by his Creatures. He best knoweth what will please him: And his Soveraignty in all things must especially appear in this that himself is so nearly concerned in. This is a principle so rooted in nature, that among the
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the Heathens, they that contrived their Liturgies, or ways of worship, behoved to pretend Revelation from their Gods, to guide them in this. It was never heard of among the more Religious Heathens, that Religion, or the manner of worshipping their Gods was enjoined only by Mans Authority, and disposed only by him. Yea, in the so much magnified Rosary of the Virgin Mary, It is alleged that Saint Dominicus had it revealed by the Virgin her self, that this Form of service was most acceptable to her; And it is added, That she was fittest to chuse what way she would be worshipped. I hope they (the Papists) and such as symbolize with them, (those of the Church of England) in ordering of the worship of God, will give us leave to say the same of her Blessed Son.

Fourthly, For the Matter of worship, I think, it will not be Questioned, whether that must be appointed by God, or not; — But even the FRAME, COMPOSIURE and MODE of Divine worship should have Divine warrant, otherwise, it is not acceptable to God, &c. Now,
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Not to make much needless work;
Consider 1. our Authors great business was to prove the Unlawfulness of Liturgies, or Set-forms of Prayers, &c. in the publick worship. Consider 2. that he (as his Sect, generally,) is against using the Lords Prayer, the only Prayer I can find of Divine Institution, in the New Testament, as to the MATTER, FRAME, COMPOSURE and MODE of it. Consider 3. that our Author would be very angry, and complain of horrid injustice done him, if you should charge him with Quakerism, or praying by immediate inspiration: For who so great enemies to Quakers, as Scottish Presbyterians? Consider 4. if his Arguments can consist any better with Extemporary Prayers, which are not immediately inspired, and, by consequence, cannot be of Divine Institution, as to MATTER, FRAME, COMPOSURE, and MODE, than with Set-forms which are not of Divine Institution as to MATTER, FRAME, COMPOSURE, and MODE. Consider 5. in consequence of these, if
we can have any publick Prayers at all: And then consider 6. and lastly, if our Author, when he wrote this Section, had his zeal tempered with common sense; and if he was not knuckle-deep in right Mysteries Theology. But as good follows: For

4. Never man spoke more profound Mysteries, than he hath done, on all occasions, in his surprizing accounts of the Church of Scotland. He tells us of a Popish Church of Scotland, since the Reformation, and a Protestant Church of Scotland.

He tells us, (1 Vind. Answ. to Quest. i. 5. 10.) Presbyterians do not say that the Law made by the Reforming Parliament, Anno 1576, took from them (the Popish Bishops) the Authority they had over the Popish Church — but it is Manifest, that after this Law, they had no Legal Title to Rule the Protestant Church.

This same, for once is pleasant enough: The Reforming Parliament, while it defined the Church of Scotland (and it defined it so as to make it but one, as is evident from Act. 6. which I have transcribed word for word
word in my Book, allowed of two Churches of Scotland, two National Churches in one Nation. But this is not all:

He hath also subdivided the Protestant Church of Scotland, into two Churches of Scotland: The Presbyterian Church of Scotland, and the Episcopal Church of Scotland.

He insists very frequently on the Presbyterian Church of Scotland. Thus, in his Preface to his First Vind. of his Church of Scotland, in great seriousness, he tells the world that, that which is determined concerning all them that will live Godly in Christ Jesus, that they must suffer persecution, is, (and has long been) the lot of the PRESBYTERIAN Church of Scotland. And in his Preface to his 2 Vind. §. 7. I have, in a former paper pleaded for the PRESBYTERIAN Church of Scotland, against ane Adversary, &c. And in Answer to the Hist. Relat. of the Gen. Ass. §. 12. his Adversary had said, that General Assembly was as insufficient to represent the Church of Scotland, as that of Trent was to represent the Catholick Church. And G. R. readily
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readily replys, but he cannot deny that it represented the PRESBYTERIAN Church, and was all that could be had of a PRESBYTERIAN Assembly.

He is as frank at allowing ane Episcopal Church of Scotland: Thus, (in True Represent. of Presb. Governm. in Answ. to OB. 10.) The Ministers that entered by and under Prelacy, neither had, nor have any Right to be Rulers in the PRESBYTERIAN Church — Whatever they might have in ANOTHER Governing Church (i. e. the Episcopal Church) that the State set up in the Nation, &c. And more expressly, in Answ. to the Hist. Relat. of the Gen. Ass. 1690. § 3. Again (says he) tho' we own them (the Prelatick Presbyters as Lawful Ministers, yet we cannot own them as Ministers of the PRESBYTERIAN Church: They may have a Right to Govern the EPISCOPAL Church, to which they had been taken themselves, and left the PRESBYTERIAN: yet that they have a Right to Rule the PRESBYTERIAN Church, we deny.

By this time, I think, the Reader has got enough of Scottish National Churches
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Churches, and their distinct Governors and Governments. The Popish Clergy (even since the Reformation was established by Law) have Right to Rule the Popish National Church of Scotland: The Protestant Episcopal Clergy have Right to Rule the Protestant Episcopal National Church of Scotland: The Protestant Presbyterian Ministers have only Right to Rule the Protestant Presbyterian National Church of Scotland. By the way,

May not one wish, that he and his party had stood here? For if the Episcopal Clergy have Right to Rule the Episcopal Church, and if it was only Right to Rule the Presbyterian Church, which they had not, why was their own Right to Rule themselves taken from them? Are not the Presbyterians unrighteous in taking from them all Right to Rule, when they have Right to Rule the Episcopal Church of Scotland? But this (as I said) only by the way: That which I am mainly concern'd for at present, is, that the Reader may consider if there is not a goodly parcel of goodly sense in these profound Meditations. Yet better follows. After
After all this laborious clearing of marches between Scottish National Churches, particularly, the Episcopal and Presbyterian National Churches of Scotland, He tells you, for all that, they are but one Church of Scotland: But in such Depth of Mystery, as, per-chance, can scarcely be parallell'd. Take the worthy speculation in his own words. (True Rep. ad OB. 10.) Let it be further Considered (says he) that tho' we are not willing so to widen the difference between us and the Prelat-tick party, as to look on them and our selves as two distinct Churches; Yet, it is evident, that their Clergy and we are two different Representatives, and two different Governing Bodies of the Church of Scotland: And that they who are Members of the one, cannot, at their pleasure go over to the other, unless they be received by them. Well!

Has he now Retracted his making them two Churches? You may judge of that by what follows in the very next words. For thus he goes on. These things thus laid down, let us hear what is objected against this Course (the Course the Presbyterians were pur-
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Thusing with Might and Main, when he wrote this Book, viz. That the Government of the Church, might, primâ instantiâ, be put in the hands of the known sound Presbyterian Ministers, &c.) First, this is to set up Prelacy among Ministers, even while it is so much decried; That a few should have Rule of the Church, and the rest excluded: Answ. It is not Prelacy, but a making distinction between Ministers of one Society, and those of another. Tho' they be Ministers, they are not Ministers of the Presbyterian Church; They have departed from it, we have Continued in the good old way, that they and we professed (for who can doubt that all the Scottish Prelatists were once Presbyterians?) It is not then unreasonable, that, if they will return to that SOCIETY, they should be admitted by it, &c. Now,

What can be plainer, than it is, hence, that they must be still two Churches? He makes them in express terms, twice over, two distinct SOCIETIES: He makes one of these Societies, the Presbyterian Church: Of necessity, therefore, the other must
must be the *Episcopal Church*. And is not this, unavoidably, to make *two Churches*? Yet, neither is this the true *yolk* of the *Mystery*, as I take it: That lies here.

That the *Episcopal Clergy* and the *Presbyterian Clergy* are *two different Representatives*, *two different Governing Bodies of one Church of Scotland*. I remember, our Author in his *Rational Defence of Non-Conformity*, &c. Exercised Dr. Stillingfleet to purpose for talking of something, which, he thought, lookt like *two Convocations in England* (viz. the Upper and the Lower Houses) He seems above (says G. R.) to make such Convocations, and so there must be either *two Churches of England* (and why not, as well as *three of Scotland*?) *Or the one Church of England must be Biceps*, and so, a Monster.

Thus our Author, there, (p 195.) I say, and it seems he was mindful of it when he wrote his *True Representation of Presbyt. Governm.* For he was careful, indeed, to avoid the making of his *one Church of Scotland, Biceps*, and made it *something else*.

But
But what thing? Your pardon for that: I have neither Latin nor English name for it: I thought once, indeed, on [Bicorpor] But I found it could not do: For he makes not his one Church two Bodies: What then? I told you already, I can find no name for it: But, if I have any Idea of this his one Church, she is such a thing as this; A Body Govern'd by two different Governing Bodies, without ane Head.

That she is a Body, I think, cannot be Controverted, for all Churches are commonly own'd to be Bodies.

That she is Govern'd by two different Governing Bodies, is clear from the Text: For thus it runs: We will not so widen the difference between us and the Prelatical partie, as to look on our selves and them, as two distinct Churches; Yet it is evident, that their Clergy and we are two different Representatives, and two different Governing Bodies of the Church of Scotland.

That she is Govern'd by these two different Governing Bodies, without ane Head, is likewise evident, for there is
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is not so much as one syllable about ane Head in the Text: And there's all the Reason in the world for it; For, besides the difficulty of joyning one Head, conveniently; with two Bodies; to what purpose, ane Head for her, when she is so well stored of Governing Bodies? Are they not received maxims, that, Non sunt multiplicanda entia sine necessitate, and Deus & natura nihil faciunt frustra? The Definition, then, is unquestionable. Well!

Perhaps the Reader may be curious to know how G. R. came by this super-fine Idea of a Church. I have had my conjectures about it; And the most probable that offered was this.

No doubt he is wondrously well acquainted with Plato, otherwise, how could he have made the singular discovery, that Socinians and Stoicks were Platónists? Now Plato, (Conviv. p. 322. Edit. Lugd. 1590.) as I remember, has a pretty story about a certain Species of Rational Animals which were early in the world, and which he calls ἀγέγυντο, as if you would say
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Say Man-woman, or so: This Creature had two Faces, two Noses, four Hands, &c. in a word, it was a round Body, which contained both Sexes in it, Man and Woman, as it were, united by their backs: It was a vigourous, sturdy kind of Animal, and Jupiter turn’d afraid of it, and therefore, to weaken it, and make it more toward and subdueable, he took ane Ax or some such sharp instrument, and clave it from top to bottom, in the very middle, as if you should cleave an egg into two equal halves; And then, being (as you know) a nimble Mountebank, he drew together the skin, on each back, in a trice; and applyed some Sovereign Medecines; and both backs were made sound immediately; and the divided parts of the ἄνδρος ἡμών, being now ἄνδρας and γυναῖκας, Man and Woman, and having the felicity to look one another in the face, they fell in Love with one another: And this was the Original of Love, and Courting, and Marriage, and all that. Now, I say,

The most probable conjecture I can
can make of the way how G. R. came by his surprizing Idea of the one Church with the two different Governing Bodies, is, that when he Read this story in Plato, it made a deep impression on his imagination, and he labouring to outdo Plato at nimbleness of design and invention, fell upon this stranger and more surprizing Notion of a Church. But however this was,

I think our Author had Reason to say (Animad. on Iren. p. 51.) That a Church is a singular Society, and of another nature than other Societies, and therefore she ought to have a singular Government. For sure I am, he has given the one Church of Scotland a Government which is singular enough. One thing is certain.

At this rate, she wants not Government nor Governors; And, of all the Churches in the world, she is likeliest to have the best Canons and the justest Measures prescribed to her: For if the one Governing Body prescribes wrong, the other must readily prescribe right; For never were two Governing Bodies of one Society in greater likelihood.
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hood of contradicting one another. 'Tis true, the Governed Body may be sometimes puzzled about its obedience, and reduced to a state of Hesitation about the opposite prescriptions, whither of them it should follow: But that's but a small matter; Our Authors invention is not yet so far decayed but that I can promise for him, if he pleases, he shall as easily extricate it out of that difficulty, as he can give an intelligible account of this his one Church, with the two different Governing Bodies. Only one thing thing more I add.

Our Learned Author tells us in his Preface to this his Book, in which he has this Mystery, that, it was a work not undertaken at first, of his own private motion, and that (before it was published) it passed ane Examen Rigorosum of not a few Brethren. Now, if he spake truth, here, as I am apt to believe he did not) the world may judge of the accuracy of some mens Rigorosa Examina. And so much for a Taste of our Authors second Cardinal Virtue. Proceed we now to

III. The
III. The third, which (tho' it looks as like ill-nature as ever egg was like another) in complying with our Authors generous inclinations, I am content should pass under the name of his Excessive Civility: I allow it this name, I say, because our Author himself hath so Dubb'd it.

For thus he tells us (2 Vind. Pref. §. 6.) I have treated the Adversaries, I deal with, as Brethren; Desiring rather to EXCEED, than come short in CIVILITY and fair dealing with them.

Never was Author more plentifully furnished with this Ingenuous Quality, than G. R. Take a Specimen of it, from his Second Vindication, &c. Ed. Eden. Anno 1691; And consider with what Excess of Civility he treats his Adversaries.

The Author of the first of the four Letters, that Military Chaplain (p. 14.) that man of a vain mind (p. 19.) was Guilty of the Height of Disingenuiy: (p. 9) And it was the highest Impudence and Sarciness for a stranger (such as he was) thus to reproach the representative of a Nation, where he was so civilly treated. (p. 12.) And yet the whole
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whole Nation knows, the Gentlemen had asserted nothing but Truth, when he met with this Civility from our Author.

The Author of the second and third Letters, was blinded with Rage. (p. 22.) Was guilty of shameful Hypocrisy twisted with Malice. (p. 23.) His words were full of Monstrous Hyperbolies, if not plain forgeries. (p. ) He exposed his own folly, malice and silly credulity. (p. 42.) Was guilty of the highest efforts of Malice, blinding the mind, and depraving the apprehension of things. (p. 45) His ignorant malice not to be answered but despised. (p. 52.) Judas Iscariot was his Predecessor. (ibid) He was a Choleric Momus, whose Patron was Rabshakeh. (56) He Vindicated the Prelatists from being Persecutors, with a confidence in asserting Falshoods, and denying Known-truths, beyond any degree, that any sort of men, except Jesuits, have arrived at. (67.) He told things absurd above measure. (69) G. R. can convince the Reader (if the Author of this Letter was the Person whom he guessed) of his most absurd and habitual lying, known to most of the Na-
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Nation, even to a Proverb. (71.) But I am apt to think he guessed wrong; but whoever he was, he wrote in such a violent and insolent style as deserved an answer of another nature than a Paper-Refutation; i.e. the Gallows, as I take it.

The fourth Letter was not inferior to any of the rest in abominable lies and reproaches: (p. 81.) the most bitter invectives that could be invented, filled up this Author's few pages. (ibid.) What he wrote, was not to be refuted more than the words of a mad man, or of one raging in a Fever. (ibid.) In a word, this Letter was so unexaminable, so full of virulent reproaches, and so void of any thing that was Argumentative, that it was impossible for any man to Answer it, except his Talent for railing, and his conscience to say what he would, true or false, was equal to that of this Gentleman. (ibid.)

The Author of the Case of the afflicted Clergy, &c. spoke rage and fury, (84) was a malicious Calumniator, (89) a common liar, (101) most petulantly reproached the Government. (110) Twenty more such excessive Civilities he pay'd him. f 4 The
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The Author of the late Letter, I think, had done well, to have saved himself the labour of writing it; for, if he got not his share of G. R's excessive Civilities, G. R. himself was mistaken. This piece was behind none of the rest in effronted and bold lies, and to say this might be a just Refutation of of the whole Book; (117) This Author spoke broad-faced lies; (ibid.) Impudent and broad lies, gross and malicious lies; bold Calumnies; (118) shameless lies; slanderous forgeries. (119) He maliciously belied his Nation; (ibid.) Spate venome: (121) Lying and misrepresentation were familiar to him; (122) He most impudently obtruded upon peoples credulity; (125) was perfrictæ frontis; (126) Nothing, tho' never so certainly and manifestly false, could choke his conscience. (ibid.) He spued out the most spiteful venome that could lodge in an humane breast. (135) Forty more such Civilities he payed him: And it was reasonable to treat him so, for, The impudent accusations of this Scribbler, and the obligation that lay on Persons and Churches to necessary self defence, constrain'd G. R. to treat him thus Civilly. (137) The
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The Author of the Memorial (tho' I am apt to think G. R. knew he was dead before his Second Vindication was published) got Civilities payed him, of the same stamp, and out of the same repository: for, the Memorial was a print full of bitter and unreasonable invectives, (137) full of malicious insinuations. (ibid.) 'Twas nothing short of the rest for most gross falsehoods, in matters of Fact, and most injurious representations of the Presbyterian way and principles. (ibid.) The Moral Qualities of the Author might be seen, by his Book, to be none of the best. (ibid.) It was a parcel of false and malicious History as ever was written in so few lines. (ibid.) It began and ended with lies and railing. (ibid.) A man who took Liberty to slander, at that rate of impudence, deserved rather chastisement than ane Answer. (138) The writer was but a Scribbler. (139) He wrote neither like a Christian, nor like ane Historian. (140) He wrote perfect railing. (ibid.) He accused the Presbyterians, with a bloody mouth, of what hath been a thousand times refuted as ane horrid lie, viz. That the Scottish Pres-
Presbyterians did perfidiously give up their King to the English, who murdered him. (ibid.) Now, if there was reason for being at the expence of such ane excessive civility, on this occasion, let the world judge: And, indeed, it is a most surprizing Defence G. R. made for his Scottish Presbyterians in that matter, why? He was the King of the English (forsooth) as well as theirs, and they could not withhold him from them. So that the whole matter was no more than if ane English Ox had strayed or been stolen, and falling into the hands of Scottish Presbyterians, they had restored him, and got so much for reward; At most, it was not the Oxes price; it was only black meal as we call it. But to proceed, this Author of the Memorial advanced assertions beyond what Jesuitical Impudence it self hath ever arrived at. (142) And, which is worst of all, worse than any thing that ever proceeded from the mouth of Platonist, Stoick, Socinian or Jesuit, He most wickedly reproached the Covenant. (146)

The Author of the Annotations on the
The Presbyterian Address, &c. Quibbled more like a Buffoon than a Disputant, (147) and wrote so pure railing, as admitted of no other Answer, but to brand the whole of it with this Motto, that it was void of Truth and Honesty. (150)

But God a Mercy on the miserable Author of the Historical Relation of the Gen. Ass. &c. What ane Heterogeneous piece of the Creation was he!

The most fit Refutation of this Pamphlet, were, to write on the margin of every page, LIES and CALUMNIES. (150) This Author spake broad lies; (151) Was a delicious Scribbler; (156) His fancy was tintur’d with malice and prejudice; (161) He advanced whole Far-dels of lies and malicious representations; (162) He gave no proof of either sense or learning in his Book, but many Demonstrations of spite and railing; (165) His tongue was set on fire of Hell — and his kind respects to any man, were indeed a reproach to him. (166) He had abandoned all Reason and good nature. (ibid.) Had a brazen forehead. (ibid.) Nothing could escape the lash of his virulent Pen. (ibid.) His tongue was no slander.
The Preface.

Slander. (168) He was nothing but a Sciolist; (169) A Cholerick Scribbler. (170) His Paper was laden with lies. (ibid.) He was not ashamed to tell lies in the face of the Sun. (171) He had so inured himself to the foulest lies and calumnies, that he could hardly speak or write truth. (175) He was a Reviler; (182) A railing Scribbler who Censur'd and Condemned all Presbyterians without wit or discretion. (114) In short, He was a snarling curr, (191) and a spirit of lying had possess'd him. (192)

Thus, I think, I have given a Taste of our Authors excessive Civilities to the Adversaries, he Answered in his Second Vindication: What a formidable Author had he been if he had suffered himself to have Treated his Antagonists with such just, (not to say excessive) severities as they deserved! What Authors have these been, to whom such Treatment was nothing else than excessive Civility? So strangers might think who were not acquainted with G. R.'s nature. His nature, I say, for, indeed, it seems to be natural to him, to exceed thus in Civility towards all the Authors he ever
ever dealt with; at least, so far as I can learn by such of his Books as I have had the luck to be Edified withal. Thus,

In his Preface to his first Vindication, he discharges thus against the Author of the Ten Questions, &c. Now when their (the Prelatists') hands are tyed that they can no more afflict her (his Presbyterian Church of Scotland) their Tongues and Pens are let loose to tear her without mercy, by the most virulent invectives, and the most horrid lies and calumnies that their wit can invent. And in Answ. to Quest. 4. §. 2. He adorns him with the honourable Title of Controversial Scribbler. And the first words of his Answer to the 6th Quest. are singularly complemental. It may be observed from this Authors conduct (says he') in his Pamphlet, what it is to be fleshed in bold averring of what all the world knoweth to be manifest untruths: some by boldness and frequency in telling lies have come at last to believe them as truths, &c.

I have also seen two Books written by him, against D. Stillingfleet; One against his Irenicum, another against his
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his Unreasonableness of the Separation, &c. In both G. R. is excessively Civil to the Dr. after his wonted manner.

In his Preface to Animad. on Iren. he says the Dr. exposed himself between principle and preferment. In the Book, he calls him ane Abettor of Scepticism. (p. 5) For the most part he doth nothing but magno conatu nihil agere. (18) He evidently Contradicts himself, and G. R. wonders to meet with Contradictions, so often, in so Learn'd ane Author. (22) Contradictions are no Rarities in him. (27) It was impudently said by the Doctor that our Saviour kept the Feast of the Dedication. (124) His propositions are such Reflections on Scrip. that any but a Papist may be ashamed of. (132) These and twenty more such Regular Civilities he pays him.

He is more Civil to him, yet, in his Learned Answer to the Doctors Unreasonableness of the Separation, &c. The Doctor wrote unexpected incoherencies: (p. 4) Used wonderful confidence. (9) Jeer'd the zeal and warmth of Devotion, (16) was blinded with passion. (20) a Taunter. (21) Advanced falla-
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fallacious, if not false History. (41) Would have things so, and so, in despight of Hi-
story. (50) Woe to the world if such false and partial History carries the Day!
(52) (Just the same upon the matter with his woe to posterity if the lying sto-
ries which some have printed, and, with bold impudence, avouched, pass with them for Authentick Histories. Pref. to
2 Vind. §. 1. So that the Readers of that Vindication need not be much amused with such Cant: It follows of
Course with our Author.) But to go on with his Civilities to Dr. Still, the Doctor used Ratiocinations that would
better become Pharisees. (68) Asserted things so rashly and falsely, that G. R. had no name for such Assertions. (69)
His prejudices darkned his understanding. (85) He made a mad exposition of the Second Commandment. (125) Stretched
and forced Scripture. (126) Spake things beyond comprehension. (148) Made unbecoming Reflections on the
word of God. (189) Used sorry shifts. &c. (204) Outfaced plain Light. (206) Wearied not of writing beside the pur-
pose. (210) Advanced Conceits unwor-
thy of a Divine, and only fit for Simon Ma-
He did not Act the part of a Disputant, or a Casuist, but of somewhat else, our Author thought shame to name. These and God knows how many more such wonderful Civilities he payed the Doctor: Particularly two, for which, no doubt, G. R. stretched his invention. D. Still. had said something concerning the English Ceremonies (tis no great matter what it was) and G. R. Replys, wittily, (p. 55) This is so indigested a notion that it doth not well become the Learning of Doctor Stillingfleet, tho it be good enough for some to rant with, over a pot of Ale. How many good glasses of Forty-nine (alias good Sack) has our Author got for this! Again, the Doctor had said that the Cross in Baptism was a Ceremony of admitting one into the Church of England. But I doubt (says G. R.) it will prove but a Mouse brought forth by the long labour and hard throes of a Mountain. Was not this a pure Flight! a lofty Paraphrase on Parturiunt Montes!

Thus we have seen a sample of his excessive Civilities to such single persons as had the Honour to be his Adversaries.
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versaries. What a pity had it been, if such Civilities had been only dispenced to half a dozen of Individuals! Our Author, no doubt, was sensible of this, and therefore, he has even thought fit, when he had occasion to extend them to whole Churches, particularly, the Episcopal Church of Scotland, and the Church of England. Indeed,

The whole Body of the Episcopal Clergy of Scotland have got a large share of his Civilities: Take this Specimen, only from his Second Vindication, &c:

Presbyterians are all Jacob's, and Prelatifs, Esau's. (Pref. §. 1.) Presbyterians, the seed of the Woman, Prelatifs, the seed of the Serpent. (ibid.)
The Prelatifs are a spiteful and clamorous sort of men: (§. 5.) Men enraged by being deprived of the opportunity they had to persecute their Neighbours. (Book p. 1) Their course is diametrically opposite to Moderation. (p. 2) They are men of mean spirits and mercenary souls: (4) Unfaithful men: (17) Men who use Unmanly as well as Un-Christian shifts. (25) Most of them were
The Preface.

were put out (i.e. thrust from their habitations and the exercise of their Ministry, since the beginning of the late Revolution) were put out by their own Consciences. (36) Arminians. (60) Socinians. (61) The contempt of the Ministry came from the Atheism and debauches of the Clergy. (64) Their immoral men may be counted by hundreds. (65) They are generally liars. (70) Men who exposed the Nation to the reproach of Barbarity. (24) Men of a restless temper, embittered in their spirits by what inconvenience they are fallen into, from the ease and dominion over their Brethren, which they lately had. (84) Men, justly loathsome and a burden to the People. (99) Instead of feeding their Flocks, they worried them. (103) Inciters to and Abettors of Persecution. (126) A Faction that indulged debauched men in their immoralities. (166) Hundreds of their party guilty of gross immoralities, for one Presbyterian. (166) Their debauchery tempts people to count all Religion a sham. (173) Generally favourers of Popery. (paslim) Men who are wiser than to comply with the present Establishment of the Church, from which 'tis like,
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like, they would have been excluded for their immoralties or errors. (5) And God knows how frequently he makes them, generally, Ignorant, or Erroneous, or Scandalous, or Supinely Negligent. This I think may serve for a Tryal of his excessive Civilities to the Scottish Clergy. Well!

But is he as Civil to the Church of England? Take a Proof from his Rational Defence; &c. Those of the Church of England, seem wiser than Christ and his Apostles, from whom they do manifestly and confessedly differ, in the things Controversied, between them and the Nonconformists. (p. 71) They are either strangers to England, or strangely byass'd, who see not cause to complain of the Ignorance, Idleness, and Vicious Conversation of the English Clergy. (40) 'Tis the spirit of the party still to Create trouble to the Church. (63) They are ane imperious Superstitious Clergy, that will be Lords over God's inheritance, in despight of the Apostle. (80) And how often doth he call them, Liars, Misrepresenter, Calumniators, &c. (vid p. 66, 274, 275, 276, &c.

I shall only mention one instance

of
of the English Episcopal Knavery which G.R. resents very highly. You may see it pag. 276. I have met with another instance (says he) of Episcopal ingenuity, for exposing the Presbyterians among the Foreign Churches. It is in a Letter of the famous Bochart, dated Nov. 2. 1686. in Answer to a Letter from Doctor Morley, wherein the Doctor representeth the Presbyterian principles in three positions, whereof the third is a GROSS CALUMNY—

The position is, Reges posse vi & armis a subditis cogi in ordinem, & si propeant immorigeros, De Solis Deturbari, in Carcerem Conjici, S. in jus, per Carnificem denique capite pleti. i.e. That Presbyterians maintain, that Subjects may call their Sovereigns to an account by Force of Arms, and if they are stubborn, incorrigible Sovereigns, they may cast them in Prison, Judge them Sentence them, and order the Hangman to give them a cast of his craft. And now, kind Reader, judge impartially, was not this a Gross Calumny? What impudent lying Rogues must these English Prelates and Prelates have been, who so Grossly Calum
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Eminent Subjects, such True Friends to Monarchy, such unquestionable Passive-obedience, and Non-resistance-men? But, return we to our Author.

One thing may be pleaded in his behalf: It is, that this his Rational Defence, &c. (as he says himself) was written about the time that K. J. came to the Throne, i.e. some four years before the late Revolution; and at that time it was excusable in him to tell his mind freely about the English Clergy; Because, he was, then, a Non-conformist in England, and suffering under their Yoke: But now that Presbytery is Established in Scotland, and he has got a Post there, in which he can live to purpose, his temper is become a little sweetned, and he will not any more be an Enemy to the English Clergy. Nay, has he not published so much, lately, in his Second Vindication?

True! He has: More, he seems to have promised, at least, professed so much, not only for himself, but for his whole party. He has told the world in his Answer to the first of the
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the Four Letters, §. 12. That Scottish Presbyterians are far from interposing in the Church of England's affairs: that they are not bound by the Covenant to Reform England, but to concur, when Lawfully called, to advance Reformation. That 'tis far from their Thoughts to go beyond that Boundary: That they wish their Reformation; but leave the management of it to themselves. And in his Answer to the Case of the Afflicted Clergy, &c. §. 1. he goes a farther length. The Author had said That the Church of England should be think themselves how to quench the flames in Scotland, &c. And G. R.'s Answers, Thus, they saw discord among Brethren, and animate England to concern themselves in the affairs of our Church, when we do not meddle in their Matters. Here, you see, he owns the English Clergy, for no less than his Brethren: Are they not Cock-sure, now, that they shall never have more of his excessive Civilities? Well! I cannot tell what may be, but I can tell something of what hath already been.

This same Loving Brother to the Church
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Church of England published his Rational Defence, &c. Anno 1689, i. e. since the beginning of the late Revolution: And it is evident, his Preface was written since; likewise; For therein he Discourses Rhetorically, How God, by the late Revolution, hath made us like them that dream, and done exceeding abundantly for us, above what we could think, out-done our Faith, as was foretold Luk. 18.8. Now,

In that same Preface, he owns, he published his Book, then, because he thought it a fit Season, and it seem'd allowable, if not necessary, that each party should put in their Claim, and give the best Reasons they could for their pretensions. Which, how it consisted with designs for the peace of the Church of England, let herself consider. This I am sure of, if his excessive Civilities could be helpful for unhinging her, she got them in that Preface, with a witness. Take this for a Taste.

He not only exhorts his Readers to purge the Church of England, of bad Men, and Ignorant, Scandalous, and unsober Ministry. But he
Discourses thus, God will not be at peace with the Church, while such are countenanced; and good men cannot, with any satisfaction, behold such scandals to Religion, and such effectual Instruments of the ruin of Souls continued in the Church: — while some effectual course is not taken to remove them; The Church is like to have little peace, either with God or in her self: Let all then contribute their endeavours to have the unsavoury salt cast out — if this piece of Reformation be endeavoured, all ranks must put hand to it: The People, by discovering such, where they are; And not calling nor countenancing them when they want a guide to their Souls: And Magistrates, by endeavouring the Regulating of such Laws, as do, in any wise, open the door to such men to enter. And again, Church Reformation must also truly be endeavoured by us, if we would have Church peace. It is no taken for good when sinful evils, images of jealousy which provoke the Lord to jealousy (such as Episcopacy, the Liturgy, Ceremonies, Holy-days, &c.) are in the Church; and yet all agree in these ways, none lament them, nor re-
prove them, nor take care to keep their Garments clean from the Corruptions of the time, &c. Now, that all this is directly intended against the Church of England, is evident from the whole Contexture of that Preface.

By this time, the Reader, I think, has got enough of G. R.'s excessive civilities to all Persons and Churches he has been pleased to take notice of. Proceed we now to the last of his Cardinal Virtues, viz.

IV. His singular Modesty: And here a vast field opens; for, except the aforesaid three, there is scarcely another of his Qualities, good or bad, that makes any considerable appearance. But so it is, that generally, the greater lights obscure the lesser. Nay such ane Awkward Quality is this in our Author, that one would think, It has been at fend with it self, and had designs for obscuring its own Lu- fire; For you no sooner have found ane instance which you may be apt to apprehend, is the very brightest Impudence; than instantly another casts up, twenty times more splendid, and before you have got through them all,
all, you are at a loss again, and you cannot tell which was the most surprising. But I shall only give a Specimen of this Virtue as I have done of the rest.

1. Then, the blot of impudence might have been charged upon him, tho' he had said no more than what he has said concerning the Prelatical Scribblers, (Pref. to 1 Vind.) viz. "That "they used a piece of cunning, in "spreading their Books in England, "only, where the things contained "in them could not be known nor "examined, but there was never "one of them to be found in a Book-"sellers shop in Scotland, where most "Readers could have discovered the "falseness of their Allegations. And his Brother Mr. Meldrum in his Let-"ter subjoyn'd to G. R.'s Second Vindi-
cation, insists on the same ingenious Speculation. And yet both of them could not but know very well, that these Prelaticick Scribblers might have attempted to have pull'd a Star from the firmament, as plausibly, as to have got any thing that made against the Presbyterians printed in Scotland: One
One thing I can assure G. R. of; his True Representation of Presbyterian Government had not seen the light, many days, when a License was sought for publishing an Answer to it; But it could not be obtain'd: And how many innocent Pamphlets have been seized by the Government, since the beginning of the late Revolution? Did not both these Gentlemen know this sufficiently? And was it not Impudence in them, especially in G. R. considering the Post he had, to publish such a Calumny, as that it was the Conscience of the falsehoods were in them, that made his Adversaries publish their Books in England?

2. Another instance of his Impudence might be, his so frequent insisting on the Loyalty of his party: Believe him, and no men can be more Loyal than Scottish Presbyterians. Nothing but malice can make any think that Presbytery is an enemy to Monarchy. (True Rep. ad Quest. 2. §. 2.) Our Obedience to Magistrates in all their Lawful Commands, and our peaceful sufferings of unjust violence are notour to all that can behold us with an unprejudiced eye. (True Rep. ad
None maintain more Loyal principles towards Kings than Presbyterians do. (ibid. ad Ob. 2.) They always abhorred Rebellion. (2 Vind. p. 63) Yea, it is manifest, it is not their principle to bargain with their Kings about Allegiance. (ibid. p. 99) Our principles are known, that we owe Loyalty, and have paid it, even to ane Idolatrous King. (i.e. K. J. ibid. p. 115) Who can deny now that Presbyterians are true Passive-obedience and Non-resistance men? Or rather who knows not that this is Bantering the Common sense of all Britain?

3. There's no less Impudence in the large Encomiums he makes on the Harmlesness and Innocence of his party: 'Tis true, and 'tis much, he acknowledges sometimes, They are men; They have infirmities; They have been guilty of Excesses, &c. But try him to the bottom, and you shall never find him descending below these Generals: You shall not find him acknowledging that any particular instance, wherein they exceeded, was not very excusable. Thus, he cannot endure to hear that they were, ever, Persecutors or Rebels.
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Not Persecutors, for if they had been Persecutors, 'tis not to be doubted that the Prelatists had felt it. But what have they ever felt? Hear him in his Pref. to i Vind. It may be thought strange that the men with whom we have to do, should make such Tragical out-cries about their sufferings, when it may be made appear, that, in the late times, when Presbyterians suffered from their hands, any one of many, who may be instanced, suffered more hardships and Barbarous Cruelty, than all of them have endured. I must confess, these men who suffered so, have suffered to purpose; For, I think, it was pretty severe for one man to suffer the deprivation of 5 or 600 livelihoods and have 5 or 600 families, perchance 4 or 500 persons to maintain on nothing. I know not how far our Authors skill in Algebra may reach, but, I think, in this, he was hard enough for Common sense. But this is not all;

Hear him again, in that same Vind. (ad Quest. 3. v. i.) All unbyass'd men who know and have observed the way of the one, and the other, while they Alterna-
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alternatively had the Ascendant, will say, that the little finger of the meanest Prelate and his underlings was heavier than the loyns of the greatest Assembly of the Presbyterian Church. What Sir, no not the Afl. 1645, nor 1648, nor 1649 excepted? And 2 Vind. p. 23. The sufferings of the Prelatists are but flea-bites in comparison of the bloody lashes that others suffered. And p. 45. Their sufferings are but scratches of pins, &c. And you know, even the tenderest nurses (such as our Presbyterians are to Prelatists) cannot constantly preserve their dearest nursetings from such accidents. Who can say, now, that ever Presbyterians were Persecutors?

Believe him, and they were as little Rebels. Episcopacy (indeed) raised a Tumult in K. C. Its time which ended in its own ruine. (1 Vind. ad Quest. 2. §. 3.) And yet in Answer to that same Question §. 5. 'Tis true they (the Prelatists) raised no Tumults: For if there is a difference between raising Tumults, and raising no Tumults, yet it is certain, that they are only Abstractions which raise them, and Concrets do
do not raise them. Well! were the Concrets, the Episcopalians innocent of Tumultuating? Consider what follows, They did what they could to raise a war for continuing on the necks of the People, that Yoke that they had wreathed on them, and did effectually draw on a bloody war, &c. But what did the Presbyterians on that occasion? Why? How far were they from being Rebels! For, thus faith our Author (2 Vind. p. 140) These things (whatever the Presbyterians did) were done by the Body of the Nation, met in the most orderly representative that the time and case could permit; And I deny not that they were EXTRAORDINARY ACTINGS. Nothing, in these times like Perjury, or Treachery, or Treason, or Rebellion committed by Presbyterians, you see; All were EXTRAORDINARY ACTINGS. In short, Presbyterians are beyond reproaches in the Consciences of all that know them, and do not hate them. (2. Vind. p. 37)

Now,

'Twas none of my designs to render the Presbyterians peculiarly odious, by adducing these instances: I

know
know these Crimes are not peculiar to them, I doubt not, many of them are not violently inclined to Persecution or Rebellion: I doubt as little many of them will be ready to acknowledge they are peccable as other men; and things have been done by many of their party, which, such as are Ingenious will not offer to Apologize for: That which I was mainly concern'd for, was our Authors Impudence: For who ever saw greater Impudence than there is in these Ridiculous Defences he has been pleased to publish in Vindication of his party?

4. Another instance might be his making his party, so frequently, the only Protestants in the Nation; The only men that resisted, or could resist, or were willing to resist Popery. Thus, the Author of the Ten Questions had said (and said truly) That the Presbyterians accepted and gave thanks for any Indulgence, notwithstanding that they knew that all the Designs of the Court were for advancing Popery. How our Author Justifies their Thankful Addressing to K. J. for such a favour, shall
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shall be considered by and by. That which I take notice of at present, is, his Apology for their accepting of that Indulgence. *It had been a strange thing* (says he, 1 Vind. ad Quest. 8. §. 2.) *if they should have been backward to Preach and hear the Gospel when a door was opened for it*, because *some men had a design against the Gospel in their opening of it.* (The Gospel, you know, was neither Preached nor heard in Scotland before a door was opened for it, by that Indulgence: But this by the way.) *Surely their silence and peevish refusing on that occasion, had been much to the hurt of the Gospel; For, then, Papists (who would not fail to use the Liberty, for their part) should have had the fairest occasion imaginable to mislead People without ANY TO OPPOSE THEM: On the contrary, their using that Liberty was the great mean by which (with the blessing of the Lord) so very few, during that time of Liberty, were perverted to Popery, in the Nation. Now who should doubt, after this, that all the Prelatifs were silent Encouragers of Popery? And that the Presbyterians
were the only People who Preached against it zealously, and opposed it boldly? Here is such a Master-piece of our Authors main talent, as I am confident no other Presbyterian in the nation will offer to extenuate, far less, justify.

He insists on the same Theme, in his 2 Vind: p. 91, where he tells, That wise men thought that the best way to keep out Popery was to make use of the Liberty for setting the People in the right way, &c. As if there had been no possibility of keeping them from turning Papists, but by making them Presbyterians.

5. Near of kin to this, is that other Common Head, he sometimes insists on, viz. That all are Papists or Popishly affected, who were not for the late Revolution. Thus, in his 1 Vind. ad Quest. 9. 5. 4. in Answer to that Allegation, that the Presbyterians denied the Kings prerogative of making Peace and War, &c. He tells the world, If this his Argument can cast any blame on Presbyterians, 'tis this, that there are Cases in which they allow the States and Body of the Nation to
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to resist the King so far, as to hinder him to root out the Religion, that is by Law Established among them: And one should think that he might have been, by this time, convinced that this is not peculiar to Presbyterians; But that all the Protestants in Britain are engaged in the same thing. And in his True Represent. (ad Ob. 2) He has these plain words, what was done (in removing K. J. from his Throne) was not by us alone, but by all the TRUE PROTESTANTS in the Nation, who were indeed concerned for the safety of that Holy Religion. Now,

' Tis none of my present business to justify or Apologize for such as were, or are, against the late Revolution. Let Jacobitism be as great ane Heresy as our Author pleases to call it: Let him rank it with Platonism or Socinianism, if he will. Only, I dare be bold to say that it was ane odd stretch of Impudence to make it Popery.

I mentioned, a little above, his Apologizing for his party’s Addressing so thankfully to K. J. for his Toleration. And truly his performances that way may pass,
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6. For another instance of his having a good Dose of Brow, as himself commonly calls his own prime Accomplishment. For it was such ane Arrant mixture of Flattery and Hypocrify, especially when enlightened by their subsequent practice, that no Sophistry can palliate it, so, as to make it seem innocent. But it has been so frequently tossed already that I need not to insist upon it: Far less, am I at leisure to examine all the ridiculous stuff our Author has vented about it. Only one thing I shall propose to the world to be farther considered.

Who so has Read any of our Authors Vindications of his Church of Scotland, cannot but have observed that, even to loathsomeness, he was precise in pursuing his Adversaries, foot for foot, on all occasions, when Impudence it self could afford him any thing to say: Yet one thing of very great consequence, was alleged by the Author of the Second Letter, to which he has Answered nothing. What else could move our Author to this sinful and unseasonable silence, but the
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the conscience, that it was not fit to meddle with it?

The Matter is this: "The Author of that Letter, having Discoursed how amazed the Presbyterians themselves were at the Dispensing Power, upon the publication of K. J.'s first Proclamation for the Toleration; How little forward they were, at first, to accept of it; And how they complied not with its designs, till they got a Second Edition of it, &c. Offered at conjecturing about the Reasons which might have induced them, afterwards, to embrace it so thankfully and unanimously as they did. Amongst the rest I find he insisted on this as one, viz. That they had got secret instructions from Holland, to comply with the Dispensing Power in subserviency to the ensuing Revolution. And he added, that for this, he knew there were very strong Presumptions. Now, G. R. I say, passed this over, in a profound silence; which, to me, seems a considerable presumption that there was some truth in the matter, and the Epifler had guessed right. But if it was so; I think the Presbyte-
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rian Address to K. J. for the Toleration, may now appear in blacker colours than ever.

I am earnest not to be mistaken: I do not Condemn their keeping a Correspondence with the Court at the Hague, on that occasion: Let that have been done dutifully or undutifully, as it might: All I am concern'd for is this, that, If they kept a Correspondence there, at that time; if they got encouragement or Advice, thence, to comply with the Toleration; If they were instructed to comply with it in subserviency to the ensuing Revolution; If these things were, I say, then, what a villany was it in them to Address to K. J. in such a manner?

If they had known nothing of any Designs for setting him beside his Throne; If they had been privy to no intrigues against him; If it had been nothing but a surprize occasioned by such an unexpected Liberty, that prevailed with them to Address to him in such Terms, as they did on that occasion; something might have been pleaded to extenuate their guilt,
at least, tho' they had complied with the Designs of the Revolution, afterwards, when they saw it prevailing: Their Ignorance of Intrigues, and the Politick Designs were then on foot; and the possibility of their having been sincere when they Addressed so to him, might have been pleaded in Alleviation of the Dishonesty of their not performing what they promised in their Address; And it might have passed on with the common crowd of infirmities which usually surprize men of weak resolution in such Critical junctures. But to be on Plots and Intrigues against him; To snatch at his Concessions that they might be in a condition to ruin him; and in the mean time, to make such protestations to him; to flatter and cajole him at such a rate, meerly, of Design to wheedle him into a deep security, that they might the more expeditely and effectually supplant and ruin him, was such an instance of iniquity, of Antichristian craft, of rank and vile cheatry, as can scarcely be parallell'd in History. And so I leave it.
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Thus I have given half a dozen of instances, which might be sufficient, in all reason for expos'ing our Authors goodly Impudence: And yet they may be reckoned amongst the most innocent of many scores that might be collected in his writings. But 'tis not my present purpose to pursue him in all his wild careers: I shall therefore, insist only on three or four things more, which, as I take it, may be sufficient to give the world a surfeit of him. The things I am to take notice of, are some Impudent shifts he has betaken himself to, for extricating himself, when, at any time, his Cause was put to it, by any present difficulty. In such Cases, no Rule obliges him; no Law binds him; no Equity bounds him, no Shame bridles him, no sense of Reputation over-aws him. Thus, e.g.

7. Before he shall be forced to yield in his Argument, or seem to be non-plus't he shall not fail to furnish his Talent, and make it keen enough for combating the Common sense of the whole Nation: It were an endless work to trace him thro' all
all instances he has of this Nature.

What possessions have any of the Episcopal Clergy been deprived of, unless for Crimes against the State? (2 Vind. p. 6.) now, who knows not that more than 300 who were outed by the Rabble, were deprived of their Possessions, and that by an Act of Parliament, without so much as being Charged with any Crime or tried by any Court? Again,

The Author of the Second Letter had called it K. f.'s Retirement, when he left England, and went to France: So he Termeth (says G. R. 2 Vind. p. 23) that which the Parliament called King James's abdicating the Government. Now his Author was a Scottish man, and writing upon Scottish Hypotheses, and about Scottish affairs, so that, if G. R. spake sense, he spake of the Scottish Parliament: But I am satisfied, that the world reckon me as Impudent as G. R. is really, if there is so much as one syllable, or any thing that looks like an intimation of King f.'s either Abdicating or Deserting the Government, in any Scottish Declaration, or Law, or Claim of Right;
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Right; In any publick Deed done by the Nation. Again

2 Vind. p. 36. He says, That most of them who were thrust out by the Rabble, were put out by their own Consciences: But after this, what might he not have said? To trace him thro' all such instances, I say, would be an endless work: I shall therefore confine myself to two; One a Matter of Fact: Another, a Matter of Right; or rather a mixt matter, in which both Right and Fact are concerned.

The Matter of Fact, shall be that story, he so frequently insists on, about my Lord Dundee's 2000 men, &c. in his Second Vindication. About the time the Convention of Estates was to sit down, a Design was discovered (framed by the Viscount of Dundee and others) to surprize and seize the Convention, and for this end had secretly got together of K. J.'s disbanded Soldiers and others about 2000 strangers in Edinburgh. (p. 11) This Plot did our Author a great many services: It occasioned those of the West to gather as many into Edinburgh to oppose them and secure the Convention. (ibid.) Mark here,
here, they were those of the West who Gathered the Rabble into Edinburgh, and this Gathering was only occasional, and of their own proper motion; Mark these things, I say, and compare them with what follows. Again,

That there was a Design to fall on the Ministers of Edinburgh, is affirmed on no ground, and without any Truth; Or that the Colledge of Justice Arm'd in their Defence: It was rather on the same Design on which the Viscount of Dundee had gathered forces into the Town, and it was for opposing of them, and not for Assaulting the Ministers of Edinburgh. (ibid. 39) And (p. 40) The thanks the Rabble got was for their zeal in Defending the Convention from that opposite Rabble, viz. the 2000 men Dundee and others had gathered into Edinburgh, to have seized the Convention. Again, (p. 96) That the Western Rabble which came to Edinburgh in the time of the Convention were in Arms against Law, (says he) is false, for they were called by the Authority of the Estates as their Guard, when their Enemies had gathered a formidable party into
into Edenburgh. And tho' they were together before the Earl of Levin got the command, yet not before they were called together by the Estates. (ibid.) And (p. 110) He (Dundee) had gathered a formidable party to destroy the Convention of Estates, and they gathered a force for their own security. Now,

One who is a meer stranger to Scottish affairs, finding this Plot of Dundee's, so confidently asserted, so frequently insisted on, made use of to serve so many turns, would seem to have Reason to believe that there was really such a Plot, and that all this was uncontrovertible Matter of Fact. For how is it to be imagined that one who undertook to be the Vindicator of the Kingdom of Scotland, should talk so boldly of such a Recent Matter of Fact, if there was no such thing really? And yet,

The whole Nation knows, this whole Matter is as Notorious Figment, as Arrant Poehe, as is in all Homer or Ovid's Metamorphosis: For my part, I never so much as once heard of it, (and I was at Edenburgh for the most part, the whole year 1689) till I found
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found it asserted by G. R. in his Second Vindication, i. e. toward the end of the year 1691. And let the world judge of its Credibility.

Poets themselves should be careful to feign things Plausibly: But it seems our Author has never Read so much as the first ten lines of Horace, De Arte Poetica.

That Convocation of the Rabble from the West, which was at Edinburgh when the Convention of Estates met, would not have amounted to above 6 or 700 men. I saw them actually drawn up between the Tolbooth and the Weigh-house of Edinburgh, upon the 18th day of March 1689. I am confident they were not 800, yet, tho' they were but a Rabble, raw and untrain'd men, they chased Dundee out of Edinburgh, tho' he had 2000 Train'd and Disciplin'd men under his command; and yet the same Dundee with scarce 2000 Untrain'd, Undisciplin'd Highlanders routed near to 4000 Train'd and Disciplin'd men at Gillicranky: But this is not all.

You may observe, he says, it was not to Defend the Ministers of Edinburgh,
burgh, that the Colledge of Justice Arm'd, but in pursuance of that same Design with Dundee, viz. the surprizing and seizing of the Convention. Now, be it known to all men, that the Convocation of the Rabble which occasioned the Arming of the Colledge of Justice was quite different from that Convocation which was made when the Estates met. The Western Rabble met first at Edenburgh, with a Design to have insulted the Ministers of that City, about the 24th of January, and their numbers were daily increasing. The Colledge of Justice Arm'd and kept Guard about the 25 or 26th of that month. About the middle of February, there was a Proclamation over the Cross of Edinburgh, Commanding all in Arms except the Garrisons, &c. to Disband. Upon this, the Colledge of Justice Disarmed immediately. All this while, Dundee was so far from having got together 2000 to surprize the Convention, that neither was the Convention so much as indicted for the Letters by which it was indicted bear date no sooner than Feb. 5. at St. James's, and
and some six or eight or ten days, I think, were gone, before they were delivered to all persons concern'd in Scotland.) Nor was Dundee as yet come from England to Scotland. Well! Was not the Western Rabble, which was in Edinburgh in the time of the Convention, called by the Meeting of Estates for Counterplotting Dundee's Plot? Pure Poesie still! For did not our Author himself say (p. 11) That Dundee's having got together 2000 men, &c. occasioned those in the West to gather as many into Edinburgh to oppose him? Now if they were only occasionally Gathered by those in the West, how could they be called by the Authority of the Estates? Were those in the West, who Gathered them, the Estates? Besides, I would only ask G. R. if he can as readily produce the Order of the Estates for leaving these men for Defending the Convention against Dundee, as I can produce their Act for returning thanks to them? Let him search all the Records and try if he can find such ane Order. In short, Who knows not that that Rabble was
The Preface.

Was in Edinburgh as early as the Estates themselves? The Estates (as all Britain knows) met on the 14th day of March: The Rabble threatened Dundee on the 15th or 16th: He represented it to the Estates on Monday's morning, being the 18th: He could find no security for his person: He departed therefore from Edinburgh with some 28 or 30 persons in his retinue, that same day, and never saw it again. All this was done before Levin got his Commission from the Estates to Command the Rabble, or form them into Regular Troops. Besides,

Let the world consider if it required not even Poetick Expedition, to have got that Rabble levied by Order of the Meeting of Estates. There could not be an Order of the Estates for levying them, before the Estates met, as I take it: The Estates met on Thursday 14th afternoon: on Monday the 18th, These men were in Rank and File, on the street of Edinburgh: And many, most of them lived at 50, 60, 70, miles distance from the City. This, one would think, was no
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no ordinary Expedition. And now let any man judge if G. R. was not inspired with a goodly dose of Poetick (fie shall I call it? Or) Fury, when he laid this foundation of Dundee's Plot, and raised so many pretty structures upon it. And so much, of his modesty in narrating Matter of meer Fact. But is he as modest at mixt Matters where both Right and Fact are concerned? Consider him but in one instance, for brevity.

The Author of the Second Letter had given ane Account of Doctor Strachan's Defence, when he appeared before the Committee of Estates, and was Challenged for not praying for W. and M. as K. and Q. of Scotland, &c. This, for substance: That the Estates had found in their Claim of Right, that none could be K. and Q. of Scotland till they had sworn the Coronation Oath: For this Reason, they had Declared that James by Assuming the Regal Power, and Acting as King, without having taken the Oath required by Law—had forfeited the Right to the Crown: That all the Estates had yet done, was only the Nomination of W. and M. as the Per-
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sons to whom the Crown should be offered; But they had not yet actually made the offer: Far less had W. and M. accepted of it: It was possible they might refuse it: But tho' they should not, yet, they could not be K. and Q. of Scotland till they had solemnly sworn the Oath. This was not yet done: And therefore he could not see how he could Pray for them as K. and Q. of Scotland, nor how the Estates, in Reason, or in Consequence to their own principles could require it of him. One would think there was some force in this Defence. Yet,

Our Author had such a Force of Impudence as prompted him to offer at confuting it. But how? It is known (says he) that the Exercise of the Government had been, long before, tendered to the Prince, and that his Highness had Accepted and Exercised it. True; It was tendered to him on the tenth of January 1688, and he accepted of it upon the 14th. But what was this to M.? Was the Exercise of the Government Tendered to Her also? Or did this Tender made to W. and his Accepting of it make him King?
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King? Was he King ever after the 14th of January?

Observe here, by the way, when our Author had the Rabble to Defend, and the Estates to justify for not restoring the Rabbled Ministers (and the Nation knows, hundreds were Rabbled after that 14th of January) He could tell it twenty times over that that was an Interregnum, a State of Anarchy, &c. So that, if I mistake not, it may try his Reconciling Skill to make what he says here, and what he said on these occasions, piece well together. Proceed we now to what he has said more about Strachan’s Defence.

The Nations Representative (says he) had then own’d him (W.) as their King; and therefore it was a contempt of the Authority of the Nation for any man to refuse to own him, when called to do so. Now, what could move our Author to such a stretch of his main Talent, as thus to say that the Representative of the Nation had owned him as their King? I confess I am not able to fathom. For, how could they own him as King so long as he had not taken
ken the Oath, nor Agreed to the Claim of Right? If they own'd him as King before that, was he not King before that? But if he was King before that, where is the use of the Oath, or the Claim of Right?

The Estates, indeed, upon the 11th of April Declared W. and M. to be the Persons to whom they had resolved to Offer the Crown, upon such and such Conditions, as is evident from that day's Proclamation: But the Letter of the Estates by which they actually made the Offer of the Crown, on these Conditions, was not written till April 24. and the return, bearing that They had Accepted of the Crown, on these Conditions, is dated May 17. And was not Doctor Strachan Deprived, even before the Letter of the Estates was sent to London? Were not more than 24 Ministers Deprived before their Majesties return came to Edinburgh? Besides,

G. R.'s Impudence, as sturdy as it is, did not serve him, it seems, to give a faithful Account of D. Strachan's Defence, and grapple with all the force of it: For the Doctor (if the Author
of the Second Letter was right) made the supposition, that W. and M. might refuse to take the Crown with such Conditions: This was so far from being an impossible, that it was truly a very Reasonable, a very Equitable, a very Dutiful supposition: Now, suppose they had done so, would they have been K. and L. for all that, by virtue of the Declaration of the Estates of the 11th of April? If so, I ask again, what the Coronation Oath, or the Claim of Right signify'd? Or were the Estates to make them K. and L. whither they would or not? If, upon that supposition they had not been K. and L. (as, undoubtedly, they had not been) then, what can be more evident than that the Proclamation of the 11th of April, did no more than Nominate them to be K. and L. upon their Agreeing to such Conditions? So that G. R. was even himself, when he said that the Nations Representative had own'd them as K. and L. before the 13th of April. I add further,

What tho' they had own'd them as K. and L. by their Proclamation of
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the 11th of April? Did not the whole Drift, the whole Design, the whole Train, the whole Tendency, the whole Aspect, and the whole Circumstances of the Deliberations, Resolutions and Conclusions of the Estates evidently propose it to the dullest apprehension, that the Crown was not to be granted to them, but on such and such Conditions? This Question I propose, for vindicating D. Strachan from the guilt of Contempt of the Authority of the Estates, with which G. R. charges him: For if the affirmative in the Question be true, (and, I think, G. R. himself dares not to say, 'tis false) then, I ask how it could be called a Contempt of the Authority of the Nation to have refused, then, to own W. and M. as K. and Q.? How can he be said to Contemn the Authority of the Nation, who Reasons upon the Nations Authority? Who Reasons upon the Force of all the Deliberations, Resolutions and Conclusions of the Representative Body of the Nation? If doing so, he doth yet Contemn the Authority of the Nation, I am apt to think, it cannot be his Fault: He doth but
but what a man must needs do, when the Nation makes Repugnant and Contradictory Determinations. But after all this, is it not pleasant that G. R. forsooth, should so zealously exaggerate the Crime of Contemning the Authority of the Nation? Good Man! He paid it a wonderful Dutifulness all his life: Far was it still from him to treat it with such Contempt as Dr. Strachan's amounted to. But he has not yet done.

He Answers further, that it is a Material mistake of the words of the Claim of Right: (that was alleged in Strachan's Defence) which doth not say, none can be King or Queen, but that none can exercise the Regal Power till they have taken the Coronation Oath: It is certain that on the death of a King, his Rightful Successor is King; and may be prayed for as such; and such praying may be enjoined even before taking of the Oath: The same may be said of one Chosen, and Proclaim'd by the Supreme Authority of the Nation, which is the Case now in hand.

Here is a piece of as odd stuff as one would wish to see: For, if it was a
Material mistake to say, none can be King or Queen, when it should have been said, none can exercise the Regal Power, it seems to me to have been a mistake made of very Mathematical Matter, not of the solid sensible Matter, which can be felt and handled: For my part I cannot forbear thinking it must be compounded of Negative Quantities, till I shall learn how one can be a King, (i.e. a Person who has Right to Rule and Act as King) who has, yet, no Right to exercise the Regal Power, or Act as King I know, one may be Physically incapable of exercising the Regal Power, and Acting as King, by himself, in several Cases, such as that of Infancy, &c. yet even then, he has Right which is not a Physical but a Moral Quality. Now, I say, I would fain understand how one can be a King, without this Moral Quality; or how he can have this Moral Quality, called Right, and yet be Morally incapable of exercising it. I shall own G. R. is good at Metaphysics, if he can give an Intelligible Account of these things. Well!

But it is certain, that on the death
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of a King, his Rightful Successor is King, and may be Prayed for, as such, and such Praying may be injoyne'd even before taking of the Oath: All this is true; But then I affirm it is as true that that Rightful Successor who is King, may and can exercise the Regal Power and Act as King before he takes the Oath. So, I am sure, our Scottish Monarchs have done: So the Law allows them to do, so, of necessity they must do. For instance, they are not bound, by Law to take the Oath but at their Coronation: And (not to speak of other things) I think it is truly an exercising of their Regal Power, and Acting as Kings to appoint the preparations for, the day, the place, the solemnities, &c. of their own Coronations: For, I think, none other can do it but the King, and, if so, he must do it as King, otherwise, another might do it. But then,

Tho' I have granted our Author this much, that the Rightful Successor is King before he takes the Oath, I think no Reason can oblige me to grant what followeth, viz. That the same may be said of ONE CHOSEN, and
and Proclaimed by the Supreme Authority of the Nation, which is the CASE NOW IN HAND. For, (not to insist on the Liberty our Author hath taken here, to call their Majesties Elective Soveraigns, in opposition to such as are Hereditary, tho', I think, it was pretty bold in him to talk so) I think this is one of the most notable differences, between ane Hereditary and ane Elective Monarchy, that in the Hereditary, the King never dies, i.e. In that same instant that the Regnant Kings breath goeth out, the Rightful Successor is King: Whereas in the Elective Monarchy the King dies with the Man, and there is no King till there is a New Creation. This, I think, makes the Cases pretty wide: And, I think, they are wider, yet, when he that is to be the Elected King, is not to be King at all, till he Agrees to such and such Conditions: Who sees not a vast difference between the Hereditary and the Elective King in this Case? But not to press our Author farther, and once for all to end this Controversie about Strach-an's Defence, take what follows for undoubted Truth.
Upon that same very eleventh of April 1689, on which the Estates gave out their Proclamation, importing that they had Resolved that W. and M. should be K. and Q. of Scotland, they enacted their Declaration containing the Claim of Right, and their Resolution to Offer the Crown only on the Terms of that Claim; and not only so, but they made this following Act, word for word.

Forasmuch as the Estates of this Kingdom, by their former Acts Declared that they would continue undissolved until the Government, Laws and Liberties of the Kingdom should be settled and secured; and they having now proceeded to Resolve that W. and M. K. and Q. of England, be, and be Declared K. and Q. of Scotland: And considering that the Nation cannot be without Government until the said K. and Q. of England accept the Offer of the Crown, according to the Instrument of Government, and take the Oath required before they enter to the Exercise of the Regal Power; Therefore the said Estates do hereby Declare and Enact, that they will con-
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continue in the Government, as formerly; until their Majesties acceptance of the Crown, and their taking of the said Oath be made known to them. If this Act doth not make it evident that there was no Material Mistake of the words of the Claim of Right, in Dr. Strachan's Defence; But that the Doctor pleaded and Reason'd upon the Mani fest Principles of the Meeting of Estates: If it doth not Demonstrate that the Doctors Plea was Solid and Irrefragable; and if it follows not by necessary consequence, that it was ane unaccountable proceeding of the Committee of Estates to deprive the Doctor, and near to thirty more, for not praying for W. and M. as K. and Q. of Scotland, before they were, or could be K. and Q. of Scotland, let the intelligent Reader judge. But if these inferences are notoriously just, then let him judge again, if G. R. by offering to invalidate the Dr.'s Defence, was not guilty of a palpable indiscretion, in refreshing the memory of such an unaccountable proceeding of the Meeting of the Committee of Estates, which had been far better buried in perpetual
tual oblivion, and lastly let him judge, if it argued not more than one ordinary Impudence in G. R. to have attempted the Defence of that Procedure; And if such an attempt was not, with a Fetch of his Talent, peculiar to himself, to offer violence to Reason and Law, to Justice and Equity, to the Light of Nature, and the common sense of Mankind.

One would think, 'twas Impudence enough in all Conscience, to have made so bold with common Humanity, and particularly, with the Universal Convictions of ones Native Country, as to a plain Matter of Fact: But such is our Author's share of that Daring Talent, that assisted by it, he could even flee in the face of his Learer Relations, and leave them in the Lurch, rather than appear to have been worsted in his Argument: Thus, e. g.

8. When he was put to it, and could not, otherwise, make his escape, he never made scruple to flee in the face of the present Civil Government.

He tells you, indeed, in his Preface to 2 Vind. §. 6: That one of his Des-
signs in writing his Book was to Vindicate and Justify the Actings of the Civil Government. Believe him, on many occasions, and he is a most dutiful Subject; there cannot be a greater Reverencer of Authority; He tells you, 'Tis a saucy boldness for private persons to meddle with the Designs of Legislators. (2 Vind. p. 112) And God knows how frequently he exposes his Adversaries to the Resentments of the Civil Government: How zealous is he for stretching necks, &c.? And yet, for all this, as much as he is obliged to it, as great a veneration as he pretends for it, it must not only shift for it self, but he must run through its sides, if he has not another hole to escape by. I shall only take notice of two instances of his behaviour this way.

The first is in his 2 Vind. (p. 22) His Adversary had laugh’d at the Presbyterian Address, and their protestation of Loyalty to K J. But I would fain know (says G. R.) by what Topick either of these can be Condemned. I think, I have hinted, at least, at Topick enough about that: Go we on, now,
The Preface.

now, with our Author: They gave thanks for restoring them to their just Right: Neither is this the Matter: They Professed and practised Loyalty towards their LAWFUL Soveraign, tho' of a different Religion from them. Here it is. For don't you hear him plainly affirming, that K. J. was a LAW-FUL SOVERAIGN? Now what was this less than striking at the very root of the present Establishment? Is it not a direct Contradicting of the Claim of Right, which Declares that K. J. had forfeited the Right to the Crown by assuming the Regal Power, and Acting as King, without ever taking the Oath required by Law? i.e. Manifeemy, for not being a LAWFUL SOVERAIGN. If thus to Contradict its very foundation, strikes not at the root of the present Constitution, let the world judge. But so it was, that our Author could not otherwise justify the Presbyterian Address, &c. Again, "One of his Adversaries had Ar-gued, that Episcopacy was abolis-hed by the Parliament as being con-trary to the Inclinations of the Peo-ple, and therefore, if the People should
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"should alter their Inclinations, it "might be restored by another Par-
"liament.

One would think there was Reason here; and it seems G. R. was sen-
fible of it: And therefore finding no other way to avoid its Dint, he straight impugns the Power of King and Parliament. Take his own words (2 Vind. p. 90) But he should have con-
sidered (says he) that whatever Motive the Estates went upon, it is Declared against in the Claim of Right as a Griev
cance, and therefore, cannot be restored without overturning the Foundation of our present Civil settlement. He is at this, again, in other places, upon the like occasions, particularly p. 152. Now,

Not to insist on the Irreligion and Godlessness of that wild fetch, viz. That whatsoever the Motives were which induced men to Establish any thing, yet being once Establish't it cannot be altered;

Not to insist on the notorious unreasonableness of separating the Con-
cclusion of the Estates from their Premisses, and saying the Conclusion must stand tho' the Premisses be rejected,
The Preface.

They established the conclusion on the strength they apprehended was in the premises.

Not to insist on the ridiculousness of saying, that Episcopacy cannot be restored without overturning the foundation of the present civil settlement: Tho' nothing can be more ridiculous than to say that the foundations of the present civil settlement are subverted, if all ecclesiastical grievances are not redressed.

Not to insist that our author spake very much at random when he called the abolition of episcopacy, one of the fundamentals of the present civil settlement, considering that the present civil settlement was not only founded, but finished, a good time before the abolition of episcopacy: Not to insist on these things, I say, however momentous.

Consider, only, how directly and plainly he impugns the power of King and parliament, by saying, they cannot restore episcopacy without subverting the foundations of the present civil settlement. What is this less than that, if King and parliament should

k  Restore
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Restore Episcopacy, they should break their Original contracts? Than that both should forfeit their Titles? Than that the King should be no more King, and the Parliament should be no more Parliament?

Is it not clear that, with our Author, the Articles of our present Claim of Right are unalterable? Unchangeable Rules both to King and Parliament? Now if this is not to impugn their power, I know not what can be. In effect it is to Evacuate the usefulness of all Soveraign power: For whereby its usefulness, if it is not able to rectify what is amiss, even in the Constitution? But how can it rectify what is amiss, in the Constitution, if the Constitution, Right or Wrong, is unalterable.

For my part, I cannot see but there is still that Supreme power in the Nation, which was, when the present civil Settlement was made: And as it might, while it was a making Settlements, have made either another, or the same, with twenty little varieties, so, it may still alter that which is made. I cannot think that it either Disabled or Exhausted itself, so, as to
The Preface.

to be no more capable of providing farther, or otherwise, for the Good of the Nation, when it shall find it necessary.

In short, Is not that same power still in the Nation which established the Claim of Right? if it is not, what is become of it? How can the Nation subsist without a Supra-Legal, Supra-Original-Contract, Supra-claim of Right Power? It had it once, otherwise how could it ever have had Laws, or Claims of Right, or Original Contracts? And must it not have it still? Has it lost it? Or thrown it away? Or has any body taken it from it? But if it is still to the fore; If the Nation is still possessed of it; where is it? Lodged, if it is not Lodged in King and Parliament?

Was there more power in the meeting of Estates than there is, now, in King and Parliament? How came the meeting of Estates by it, then? Or whether is it vanished now? What is become of it? Especially,

I think, 'Twas pretty bold to say that the same power is not in the present King and the present Parliament;
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Considering that the present Parliament is that same very individual thing with the meeting of Estates by which the claim of Right was Created. Cannot the same, the very same Creators pretend to a power of Altering their own ill-made Creature, and make it Better? Had they more power under One name than under Another? Or have they weakened or lost their power by communicating it to their King, so that there is not so much power, Now, in him, and them both together, as there was once in them Singly?

And now let the Reader Judge if G. R. for avoiding a difficulty, has not impudently run himself into the Guilt of the most Atrocious, the most Criminal, the most Treasonable Treason; The Treason of impugning the power of King and Parliament. This was odd enough, for one in his circumstances: But yet the next step seems to me a little more Surprizing: For.

9 On several occasions, he has not stood on disgracing his own dear party, the Presbyterians themselves, and
and most undutifully, as well as impudently, discovering their Nakedness. I shall not insist on all instances that might be adduced to this purpose, particularly his Loading the Cameronians with so much Guilt and so many hard Names, upon every turn: The Cameronians, I say, these Men of plain principles, these avowed Covenanters, these most Orthodox and Honest Presbyterians in the Nation; even them tho they are the true Champions of the Cause, and were the principal promoters of the Presbyterian interest in the beginning of the late Revolution, he has Lait to purpose, when his Argument requir'd it; as may be seen in every page almost of his Second vindication. But this I shall not insist on, I say, leaving him and them to reckon for it, if they shall think it fit.

I shall take notice only of one very tender Secret of his own Anomalous Species of pretended Presbyterians which he has even needlessly, and by consequence, very foolishly and undutifully exposed. He has, in his Books, made many more inexcusable offices.
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ous Lies, than if he had made One for covering such a Mighty Shame of theirs: But 'tis hard for one of his prudence to avoid such escapes, when pressed with a pungent Argument, The matter is this.

The Author of the Case of the afflicted Clergy had said, that the Presbyterian Ministers, never preached against the disorders of the Rabble: Now hear G. R. (2 vind. p. 97.) This is False, tho we thought not fit to make that our constant Theme. Now, that Rabbling work was such a Barbarous and Unchristian work, that one would think, it had not misbecome the Presbyterian Ministers themselves to have made it, at least, very much their Theme on that occasion. But the Secret is not here.

He adds, And if but few did it; It was because they, who were the Actors in that Scene, little Regarded the preaching of the Sober Presbyterians: A great many things may be observed here: For besides that he owns they were but few who preached against the Rabbling, It might be of use to enquire at our Author, what kind of Scene he took
took it to be? Whither was it Tragical or Comical? or Both? Tragical to the Prelatists, and Comical to the Presbyterians? It were worth enquiring likewise, whom he meant, by Sober Presbyterian Preachers? If there are any such in the Nation? How many? Where do they preach, &c. But I insist not on these things, because the Secret is not amongst them.

Yet

The next thing he produces is worth the Noticing. And they (The Sober Presbyterian Preachers, if they had preached against Rabbling the Clergy) Should have lost their SWEET WORDS. Now, here is subject afforded for several weighty Controversies: For it may be made a Question, Whither it be the duty of Sober Presbyterian Preachers to preach Righteousness to a Rebellious people, whither they will Hear, or whither they will Forbear? It may be made another, Whither our Author, here, gave up all the Rabblers to a reprobate Sense? 'Tis possible he meant so. For the Sweetest words, the Soberest Presbyterians can utter in their preachings are
not too precious to be spent on such as are in a state of Reclaimableness. But that which I take to be the most proper Question, the Question that arises most naturally from the Text, is, Whither Presbyterian Words are not sweeteer than that they should be spent on such needless purposes, as the Recommendation and Assertion of Righteousness, and the Condemnation of Iniquity? Whither it had not been ane unaccountable prodigality in them to have lost their Sweet words, about such Trifling concerns as these? But neither is the Secret here: But it follows now.

These practices of the Rabble were publickly spoken against by Ministers, both before they were Acted, for preventing them, and after, for Reproving them, and preventing the like. Here it is, I say: Has he not, here, discovered ane important Secret of his party? Has he not discovered that the Rabbling of the Clergy was not the product of Chance or Accident, but a Deliberated, a Consulted, ane Advised politick? Has he not discovered that even the sober Presbyterian Ministers
Ministers were privy to the plot of it? Has he not told, that *they spake against it, before it was Acted*, for preventing it? And doth it not follow clearly that they *knew of it before it was Acted*: for if they had *known nothing* of it, how could they have *spoken against it for preventing it*?

But tho they knew of it, that it was to be done, yet, it seems, *They consented not that it should be Done*; *For they spake against it for preventing of it*. But I am afraid our Author, here, turn'd weary of his *Sincerity*: *For who spake publickly against these practices of the Rabble? Or where, or when were they spoken against, before they were acted?* I dare challenge him to name one of his most sober Presbyterian Ministers who preached *publickly against them for preventing of them*. When I am put to it I can name more than One or Two, who pretend to be of the *First Rank* of the *Sober Presbyterian Ministers*, who knew of them indeed, and Consulted *privately* about them; and said, *It was the surest way, to have the Curates once dispossessed*: *Because, Once dispossessed*, *they*
they might find difficulties in being Repossessed: But I never heard of so much as One who preached against them before they were Done. I am very confident G. R. cannot name One. Indeed,

Seeing, as our Author Grants, they knew of the Rabbling before it was Acted; If they had been so serious against it, as they should have been, and as our Author would have us believe they were; how natural and easy, as well as Christian and Dutiful had it been, to have given Advertisements to the poor men who were to suffer it, about it? Was ever any such thing done? But it seems Presbyterian words were Sweeter to Presbyterian palates than Common humanity or Christian Charity: They were too Sweet to be Lost in such Advertisements. By this time, the Reader, I think, has got a proof of G. R.'s tenderness, even, to his own Herd, when the Argument of ane Adversary pinched him. But this is not the Highest Stept. For

10. If ane Argument straitens him, He never stands to baffle, and expose, and
and contradict and make a Lier of his own Learned, Sensible, Civil Modest Self. And, here, again, One might write a large volume, but I shall confine my self to a Competent number of instances.

First, then, you never saw a Prelatist and a Presbyterian Contradicting one Another, in more plain, opposite and peremptory Terms, than he has done himself on several occasions. Take this Taste.

In his Answer to D. Stillingfleets Irenicum (p. 64) He is at great pains to prove that where Episcopacy is, Presbyters have no power: Particularly, he has these two profound Arguments for it. 1. If Bishops be set over Presbyters they must either be only Præsides, which is not contrary to P arist; or they must have Authority above, and over their Brethren: And if so, They may rule without their Brethren; Seeing they may command them, &c. 2. If Presbyters under a Bishop have ruling power, either they may Determine without, or against his consent, or not: if so, The Bishop is but a President: If not, The Presbyters are but Cyphers.

Now
Now who would think that one of
G. R.'s Courage would ever have par
ted with such ane important propo-
sition, especially, having such im-
pregnable Arguments for it? Yet.

Consider if he has not done it,
most notoriously in his Answer to
the Doctor's Unreasonableness of the se-
paration, &c. pag. 182. where he has
these express words. He (The Do-
ctor) Undertaketh to prove that the
English Episcopacy doth not take away
the whole power of Presbyters — we
do not allege that it taketh away the
whole power of Presbyters, for that were
to reduce them into the same order with
the rest of the people; but we say
it usurpeth ane undue power over them,
&c. Again,

In his First Vind. of his Church of
Scotland, His cause led him, in Answ.
to Quest. 10. to say That K. J’s. Tol-
leration was against Law: He was
pressed with this Argument about
the Inclinations of the people, “That
not fifty Gentlemen, in all Scotland
(out of the West.) did, upon the In-
dulgence, forfake the Churches to
frequent Meeting houses: And his An-
swer
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Answer was. They clave to the former way (i.e. Continued in the Episcopal Communion) Because the Law stood for it. Is it not plain, here, that the Meeting houses were contrary to Law? Hear him, now, in his 2 vind. (p. 43, 44. passim) when he was press with the Scandal of his party's Complying with the dispensing power, and erecting Meeting houses contrary to Law. He affirmed boldly, that the dispensing power was according to Law, And K. J. was enabled by Law, to Grant his Toleration. Again,

In his 2. vind. in Answ. to Letter 1. § 9. p. 12. when he had the Meeting of Estates to Apologize for, for suffering and allowing persons to sit as Members, who were not Qualified according to Law. He Granted some such Members late there, but they had been most unjustly Forfeited in the Late Reign. Even Parliamentary Forfeitures, you see were most Unjust Forfeitures, and there was no Reason that they should exclude these Gentlemen from their Just and Antient Rights and Priviledges. But when he was pressed by the Author of the Case
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Case of the Afflicted Clergy, &c. with this " That many Ministers' Benefices were unjustly and illegally kept from them; he got his cloak on the other shoulder, as we say, if the Authority of the Nation in the convention or Parliament have Determined otherwise, I know not where their Legal Right can be founded. (p. 96. § 6.) It was not so much as Knowable, to our Author; in that Case, that there might be most Unjust Parliamentary Determinations.

It were an endless work to adduce all such little Squabbles as these, between himself and himself: I shall Insist, therefore, only on two more, which are a little more Considerable. And

First, Our Author was not at more pains about any one thing in his Answer to D. Still's Irenicum, than the Inseparableness that is between the Teaching and Ruling power of Presbyters: He spent no less than 8 or 9 pages about it, Stretching his Invention to find Arguments for it. Whoso pleases to turn to page 79 may see the whole Deduction.
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He is asearnest about it in his True Representation, &c. These are his words (prop. 13) There being no Disparity of power amongst Ministers by Christ's Grant of power to them: No man can make this Disparity by setting one over the rest: Neither can they Devolve their power on one of themselves: For Christ hath given no such warrant to men to dispose of his Ordinances, as they see fit: And power being Delegated to them by him, They cannot so commit it to Another to Exercise it for them, as to deprive themselves of it. Also, it being not a Licence only, But a Trust, of which they must give ane account. They must perform the work by themselves as they will be Answerable. Now, it is not possible for one to contradict himself more than he hath done both Indirectly and Directly in this matter.

He hath Contradicted himself Indirectly, and by unavoidable Consequence, in so far as he hath owned, or owns himself a Presbyterian, and for the Lawfulness (not to say the Necessity) of Scottish Presbyterian General Assemblies of the present Constitution.
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For, are all the Ruling Officers of Christ's appointment, Both Preaching and Governing Elders allowed to be Members of General Assemblies? Do they all discharge their Trust, and perform their work by themselves, there, as they will be Answerable to him, from whom they got their Trust? Doth not every Presbytery (consisting of 12, 16, or 20 preaching, and as many Ruling Elders) Send only some Three or Four Preaching Elders, and only One Ruling Elder to the General Assembly? Do they not Delegate these, and Devolve their power upon them, and Constitute them their Representatives for the Assembly? Let their Commissions be Inspected, and let it be Tryed, if it is not so: Now, How is such a Delegation Consistent with our Authors position about the Indevolubility or Indelegability of such a power? It were easy to pursue this farther in its Consequences. Now what an ill thing is it, for a man, thus, to sap and subvert all his own Foundations? To Contradict the fundamental Maximes of his own Scheme by such unadvised propositions?
tions? But this is not the worst of it.

He hath contradicted himself most directly in that same Individual True Representation, &c. in Anfw. to the 10th Objection; and in his 2 Vind. p. 154, 155. For in both places he endeavors to justify the Taking of all Ruling power out of the hands of the Episcopal Ministers, and the putting it, only, in the hands of the Known sound Presbyterians; Reserving to the Episcopal Ministers, their Teaching power, only. 'Tis true, 'Tis evident that he found himself sadly puzzled in the Matter, and was forced to bring in his Good Friend Necessity, and the Old Covenant-Distinction of Status Ecclesiæ turbatus and paratus, to Lend him a Lift. I have considered his Friend Necessity, sufficiently in my Book, and thither I refer the Reader for satisfaction about it. But what to do with his Præsens Ecclesiæ Status, I do not so well know: Only this I dare say, granting it to be so nimble as to break Scot-free through Divine Institutions, Yet it can, neither by itself, nor with Necessity to help it, reconcile notorious Contradictions.
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The other Instance I shall adduce is in a very important matter; no less than the Presbyterian Separation from the Episcopal Church of Scotland. He was put to it, to defend it in both his Vindications of his Church of Scotland. First Vind. in Answ. to Quest. 4. 2 Vind. in Answer to Letter 2. § 3. All the Reasons he has for that Separation may be reduced to these Three; 1. Episcopacy. 2. The Episcopal Ministers were Usurpers or Intruders: For 3. They had not the Call of the People; and so the People were not bound to own them as their Ministers. These are his Grounds, I say, on which he justifies their Separation from us. Now, hear him in his Rational Defence, &c. published, as I have told, since the beginning of the Late Revolution, by Consequence, after the Scottish Schism was in its full Maturity: Hear him there, I say, and you never heard Man reject any thing, more fairly, more fully, or more directly, than he hath done these his own Grounds. Let us try them one by one.

1. For Episcopacy, turn first to pag. 95.
The Preface.

95. And you shall find these very words, Whatever fault we find with the Ministers of the Church and the Hierarchy, we do not separate because of these; we would join with you (the English Church) for all these Grievances, if you would but suffer us to do it, without sinning against God in that which is our personal Action.

Turn next to pag. 150. There he offers at enumerating the Causes that cannot justify a Separation, and he talks particularly about Episcopacy, thus; We are grieved with Prelatical Government, and taking away that Parity of Power that Christ hath given to the Ordinary Ministers of his Church. This we cannot approve, and therefore Ministers ought rather to suffer Depri-vation of the publick Exercise of their Ministry than own it. And People also ought not to own that, their Lordly Authority that they Exercise; Yet, because this is not Required to be acknowledged as a Lawful Power in the Church, by the People, I see not that we should withdraw from the Publick Assemblies, meerly because there are Diocesan Bishops set over the Church; Except our owning
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... by submitting to their jurisdiction is Required as one of the Terms of Communion with the Church. Who so pleases may find more to the same purpose, pag. 157, 275, &c. Nay,

So condescending is he in that Book (p. 159.) that he can allow Bishops their Temporal Honours and Dignities. We meddle not with their Titles and Revenues (says he) These are the Magistrates Gifts, and do not cross Christ's institution, whatever inconvenience may be in them.

2. As to the Plea of the Usurpation or Intrusion of the Prelatists, D. Still. had alleged that the Dissenters pleaded, "That most of the present "Ministers of the Church of England "were Usurpers, and that from such "the People might lawfully separate. We deny both parts of the Assertion, (saves G. R. p. 115, 116.) Whatever Usurpation some of them may be guilty of, we know most of them have the (Ta- cite, at least) consent of the People, a post facto; and therefore however they may be guilty of Intrusion in their Entry, in their continuing in their places they are no Usurpers: Neither do we own...
own it to be lawful to separate from Every Minister that is ane Usurper, Meerly on the Account of his Usurpation. And he discourses the point copiously; as the curious Reader may find, ibid. Neither is he less positive about the

3. Thing, which, in his Scottish Management of the Plea, he insists on as the Great Reason of the former, viz. The Popular Call. "For I Still, " had adduced D. Owen as asserting, " that the depriving of the People of " the Right to choose their own Pa- "ftors was a just Ground of Separation. And G. R. answers, 'If Do- 
ctor Owen hath done so, let it pass for a part of the Independent Judgment, which was a mistake of that Eminent Servant of God; Others are not of that Mind. And a little after: The Peo- ple by the Laws of the Gospel have the Right of Election of their own Pastors; But it doth not follow that they ought not to bear with being hindered the Ex- ercise of this Right for the sake of Peace and Unity. And p. 151. Depriving the People of their Right of chusing their own Church Officers, is also Matter of Complaint, but we must bear it rather
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than separate for that, from a Church. And pag. 197. when he came to assert, that Right of the People. He told he did Not make the Depriving of the People of that Power, a Cause of Separation. Nay, Not once, but very frequently, he lays the whole stress of the English Separation, Upon the sinful terms of Communion (as he calls them) imposed by the Church of England. Let the Church purge her Offices of humane Inventions, Let her lay aside the the Liturgy, the Cross in Baptism, Kneeling at the Receiving of the Eucharist, and Holy days, &c. and he, and all his Party shall join with her cheerfully, Vide p. 24, 81, 106, 107, 109, 120, 133, 144, 151, &c. Now Let any Man, even of his own Sect, reconcile these things: Let him shew why Episcopacy, Usurpation, and Depriving the People of their Right to choose their own Pastors, should be so every way sufficient Grounds for Separating from the Church of Scotland, and so no ways sufficient grounds for separating from the Church of England. What could move the Man to venture upon such lumpish, bulkish Contradictions? For my part, I cannot guess
guefs at another Motive than that which I have frequently mentioned, viz. The present Argument.

In England he had some other things to bear the Burden, but no other thing in Scotland; and it was necessary for his Vindicatorship to justify the Separation: And therefore what could not do it in England, behoved to do it in Scotland.

But perhaps he may endeavour to extricate himself by running for shelter to the Old Scottish Plea of the Covenant. For, Is not Prelacy abjur'd in Scotland? Is not the Oath of God upon Presbyterians, nay on all the Nation, not to own Prelacy? Are not all the Prelatists perjur'd, &c.? And now may not the Presbyterians separate lawfully?

He seems indeed to betake himself to this Plea, in his Answer to the Historical Relation of the General Assembly, § 20. p. 189. The setting up of Episcopacy (says he) was more sinful in this Nation (Scotland) than it could be elsewhere, because of the Oath of God that the Nation is under, against it; Not in latter times only, but in the times
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of King James the Sixth, who caused the whole Nation swear the Shorter Confession of Faith, called the National Covenant, where it is abjured. Now

Not to insist on shewing that, upon the supposition, all this were true, it militates only against Episcopacy; it could conclude it only, but neither the Usurpation, nor the Depriving the People of their Right, &c. to be a sufficient Ground for the Separation. Nor yet to insist on the notorious fallacy of the supposition, viz. That Episcopacy was abjured in King James the Sixths time. Not to insist on these things, I say,

If he himself is strong enough for himself, himself will not suffer himself to make the Abjuration of Episcopacy in Scotland, a sufficient Ground for separating from the Episcopal Church of Scotland. For in the 40th page of his Rational Defence, &c. Attempting to shew a Difference between complying with the Church of England at the Reformation, and complying with her Now, he opens thus: I might here alledge the Obligation of the National Covenant that we are under, as they were not.
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not to whom the Doctor would make our case parallel (i.e. those who lived at the Reformation) Tho I never thought that that Bond made any Sins or Duties that were not such Antecedently. Now

(Not to insist on the Pleasantness of pretending that he might insist on a Topick, in which he instantly acknowledges there is no Force;) If Oaths and Covenants make no Duties nor Sins, which were not such Antecedently, I would fain understand, how the National Covenant, or whatever Covenant has been in Scotland, could make Episcopacy a sufficient Ground for Separating from the Church of Scotland; if it was not a sufficient Ground for such Separation Antecedently to these Covenants? Thus he himself hath cut off himself from all hopes of escaping by the Covenant. Indeed there is no possibility of Escape left him: It is not in the power of Nature to rescue one who is so plunged over Head and Ears in such a Sink of Contradictions.

What hath been said might be sufficient, in all Conscience, for representing his own Unnatural Unmercifulness
fulness towards himself: For what can be more Unmercifully done to one, than to demonstrate him to all the world to be a Manifest Lier? And who can be a more manifest Lier than he, who, upon every turn, vomits Contradictions? Yet this is not all, perhaps it is not the worst.

There is such an Intimate Relation between himself and his Books written by himself, That, I think, 'tis reasonable to say, that whosoever treats his Books with any Degrees of Impudence, is every whit as Impudent towards himself. Now, it is not possible that Ranker, more Merciless, or more Impudent injury can be done to any thing, than himself hath done to his Second Vindication of his Church of Scotland. At least, to near three parts of four of it: To it, so far as it Answers The Four Letters, The Case of the Afflicted Clergy, and the Late Letter. For he hath engraven on it such indelible Characters of Distinguinity, Partiality, Injustice, Unfair Dealing, Effrontery, Ridiculousness, &c. as perhaps never Book was injur'd or bespattered with, since writing of Books
Books was in fashion. The Reader may think this is a very strange Charge: But I can make it good, to a Demonstration, by a very plain and obvious Deduction. Thus,

Some of the Episcopal Clergy, thought themselves obliged for their own Vindication, to give some short Representations of their Circumstances, and the Unkindly Treatment they had met with from the Presbyterian Party, An. 1688, 1689, &c. The whole Nation knows, they were so far from feigning instances, or aggravating the circumstances of their Sufferings, that they told not the twentieth part of what they suffered; nor represented what they told in all its proper Blacknesses: However, so much was told, as was enough to represent the Presbyterian Temper in no very Lovely Colours. The Party were sensible of this; And therefore, it was necessary to try if there was a possibility of Collecting and Connecting some Rags to cover their Shame and Nakedness. The Expedient they agreed to was, that the Accounts given by the Episcopal Clergy should be An-
Answered and Refuted: But then the Difficulty was to find an Author, who had Talents proper for such a Task.

It was committed, first to Mr. Alexander Pitcairn: But after he had thought some time about it, it seems, it stood with his Stomach: He had not so far abandoned all Principles of Truth, and Honesty, and Ingenuity, as was necessary for such an Undertaking; he resign'd the employment, therefore into the hands of another General Meeting of the Party, and told them, He would have nothing to do with it.

This, no doubt, was a Discouragement to all others of any Wit or Probability, to undertake it: For if it was to be done, to any good purpose at all, Pitcairn was as fit for doing of it as any of the Sect: And if he gave it over, after so much Deliberation about it, it was to be presumed, there was Frost in it; it was not safe to meddle with it. Thus it fell to the share of G. R. as he tells himself both in his Preface, and in the Beginning of his Book.

Such
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Such an Odd Undertaking did, indeed, require a suitable Undertaker; and now it had one as oddly qualified for it as the world has heard of. For if we may believe himself in his Preface to his Anim. on D. Stillingfleet's Irenicum (for who but himself would have been at pains to write Prefaces to his Books?) He died a worthy and much lamented Author, Anno 1662. And, so far as I can learn, he continued thus in the state of the dead, till towards the end of the year 1688. i.e. about 26 years. Then, indeed he return'd to Life. Now, it is not to be imagin'd, his Soul, all this while, was either in the Regions of Eternal Rewards, or Eternal Punishments; for, then, how should it have returned? Doubtless, therefore, it was in some Purgatory: But what Purgatory is not easy to determine. I am confident, it was not the Ordinary Purgatory, in which People are purg'd from the Dregs of Corruption they carry out of this world with them; for he came alive again more corrupted and vicious than ever. Possibly, he has been in some New Purgatory,
gatory, which the Pope built lately for keeping a Seminary of such as he lets out upon Occasion, for Plagues to the Protestant Churches. Whatever Purgatory it was, Our Author came out of it, purged pretty clean of all principles of Sense, or Shame, or Honesty. And now, who fitter than he to be the Vindicator of the Kirk of Scotland? Before his Death he wrote only such Books as were little in their own Eyes (Pref. to Anim. on Irenicum) but he ventured on writing such Books as his Second Vindication, after his Resurrection.

I have given this Account of our Author, and the Occasion of his writing the Book, for fixing the Readers attention, that he may consider it with the greater Application.

Now, in this Book, (His Second Vindication, I mean) he rejected, by the Bulk, all the Matters of Fact, which were contain'd in the Four Letters, because they were not Attested; as if, forsooth, the Writers of the Letters had had opportunity to have had all the particular Cases, Tried in formal Courts, before Indifferent Judges, and
and with all the Usual Solemnities of Process. As if it had been their Intention, by their Letters, to have made formal Pursuits for the Injuries had been done the Clergy. As if the World could not have easily Discerned, That all their purpose in writing these Letters, was not to sue Legally for Redress, but to represent to their Friends, Matter of Fact, in the common way of History. Well!

To mend this, however, The Case of the Afflicted Clergy gave him Attestations, enough, in all Conscience: But did that satisfy him? No more than if he had got none at all, for they were not worth a Button, they were not probative, they were but partial; he had reason to reject every one of them. Thus,

When the Author of the Case, &c. cited D. Burnet, G. R. reply'd in these words; He farther proveth our Persecution by citing some passages out of Doctor Burnet, whom, being a party, we are not to admit as a Witness against us. (85) What? No not D. Burnet? No not the Son of such a Mother? No not the Nephew of such ane Uncle? No not
not the Brother of such a Brother? No not the Cousin German of such a Cousin German? No not the Man who has all alongst advised the Scottish Prelatists (particularly Mr. Malcome, one of the Ministers of Edinburgh) to return to their Native Country, and submit to the Ecclesiastical Government Now Established; Do you reject even him as a party? But to proceed.

If the person who was barbarously used by the Rabble, gave an Account of his own Usage, (and who could do it better?) and subscribed his name to it; This was such ane Attestation, as G. R. thought fit to reject with a Fie upon it. It was Teste Meipso, (p. 88.) and so, not worth ane half-penny: As if it had been possible for a Minister, when the Rabble surprized him, and came upon him unawares, still to have had witnesses at hand for Attesting all their Rudenesse; as if it had not been enough for all the design of such Accounts, that a Man of known Probity and Reputation, subscribed his own Narration of a Matter of Fact which so nearly concerned himself,
himself, and thereby declared his Readiness to make the Matter appear, as far as he was capable.

If the Rabbled Minister adduced Witnesses (as was done in the Case, &c. in several Instances) And they subscribed the Account, was he then satisfied? Never ane Ace more than before. All of his Witnesses are the sworn Enemies of Presbyterians, and in a Combination to defame them, (p. 88.) And again (p. 100.) His first Collection is of Accounts that he hath had from his Complices, a company of Men avowed and malicious Enemies of all Presbyterians—— and all this attested by themselves. Nay,

Tho they were not Episcopal Ministers, but Laicks who attested, if it was done in favour of Episcopal Ministers, that was enough to prove them Friends to Episcopacy, and so they were no more Boni & Legales Hominés, as he calls his Unexceptionable Witnesses, (p. 111.) Thus,

The Account which was sent to London immediately after the Second Tumult at Glasgow, which happened on the 17th of Feb. Anno 1685, was
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subscribed by James Gibson, then One of the Magistrates of the City; John Gillbagie, who had been a Magistrate the year before; and Patrick Bell, Son to Sir John Bell, a discreet young Gentleman, and Merchant in the City.

These three subscribed it, that it might make Faith; it was directed to Doctor Fall, Principal of the College of Glasgow, that he might shew it to the then P. of O. and crave, that now, that he had taken upon him the Government of the Kingdom of Scotland, he would interpose his Authority for discharging such Tumults for the future, &c. Doctor Fall actually addressed to his Highness, and shewed the Account. All this was done before the Scottish Estates met in March. Now consider G. R.'s Discussion of this Account. (p. 94.)

John (he should have called him James) Gibson was a Party, and made a Bailie by the Archbishop, and all know the Prelates Inclinations towards the present Civil Government. Have ye not here a goodly Specimen of both our Authors Law and his Logick.

John
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John Gillhagie is lookt on by all as a Foolish and Rash Man, who little considereth what he doth. Now what was his Testimony worth after our Author had given him such a Character?

Patrick Bell and his Brother were soon after seised for Treasonable Practices, were long in Prison, and are now under Bail. And is not G. R. now a potent Author? How easily and readily he can reject Testimonies! And these three once thus rejected, There was never such a thing as that Presbyterian Tumult at Glasgow: No not tho there are Hundreds in Glasgow who can attest, that every syllable of the Account was true. Again,

Pag. 109. in Mr. Gellies Case, How easily could he reject all the Testimonies that were adduced? Why? They that testify for him are of his own party: And then let them testify that they saw a Nose on G. R.'s own Face, and for any thing I know, he should cut off his own Nose to have them Liars. And now,

Let the World judge of this way of disproving Historical Relations and Attestations of Matters of Fact: Is it m 2 not
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not plain that according to this Standard, it is impossible to Attest any thing? For as I take it, the whole Nation is so divided between Prelatists and Presbyterians, or those who favour one of the sides, that you shall not find many Neutrals. Now, who is obliged to take the Testimonies of Presbyterians, in Matters of Fact, more than the Testimonies of Prelatists? Have they any Divine, Natural or Municipal Law for the Validity of their Testimonies beyond other Men? If they have not, as I shall still be apt to believe, till G R. produces the Law, then I would fain know how G: R. by his own Standard can allow, That Presbyterian Witnesses should appear before any Court Ecclesiastical or Civil against Episcopal Ministers. Nay, may not the Presbyterians themselves reject even G. R.'s Testimony? Nay! say they ought to do it: Why? He stands nearly related to Episcopacy. How? Let it be enquired into and I'll hold him two to one, if he was Baptized at all, he was Baptized either by a Bishop, or by a Presbyterian that
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that submitted to Bishops. But if so, then good morrow to his Testimony: For thus the Argument runs, G. R. was Baptized by a Prelate or a Prelatist, and all know the Prelates inclinations, &c.

Why this Reasoning should not hold in G. R.'s Case, as well as in James Gibson's Case, I desire to learn of G. R. when he is at Leisure. But this is not all.

As he rejected all the Attestations in that Book, without any shew of Reason, so he did some in Despight of the Common Sense of Mankind. For setting this in its due Light, it is to be Remembred, that, in that Book, there are Accounts of the Infolencies committed by the Rabble upon such and such Ministers in the Presbyteries of Glasgow, Hamilton, Irving, Air, Paisley, Dumbarton, &c. Now these Accounts were occasioned thus, When the Rabble was in its fury, and making Havock of all the Clergy in the Western Diocess of Glasgow, some of them met at Glasgow upon the 22 of January, 1625, to consider what might be proper for them to do for m 3 their
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their own Preservation, and Protection against the Rage of their Persecutors: And the best Expedient they could then fall upon, was to send Doctor Scot Dean of Glasgow to London, to represent their Condition to his Highness the P. of O. who had then assumed the Government of the Nation; and crave protection according to Law. And that the Doctor might be the better instructed, it was resolved, that particular Accounts of the Violences had been done to the Clergy within the abovenamed Presbyteries should be digested by such Ministers as lived within these Presbyteries, respectively: This was done. The Account of the Violences done to those who lived within the Presbytery of Air, was digested and signed by Mr. Alexander Gregory, Mr. William Irvine, and Mr. Francis Fordyce; that for Paisley, by Mr. Fullerton, and Mr. Taylour, Ministers at Paisley; that for Glasgow, by Mr. George, and Mr. Sage, &c. And that the Truth of these Accounts might be the more unquestionable, the Subscribers (in some of them, at least) undertook to make all
all the particulars appear to be true, upon the greatest peril, if they should get a fair Hearing. What greater Evidence of Truth and Ingenuity could have been expected or required of People in such Circumstances? Yet,

Even these accounts G. R. rejected, as readily and confidently as he did any other; he rejected them I say, indiscriminately, and without taking notice of any difference between them, and such as were not written upon any such Occasion, such as were only vouched Teste Meipso. Was this like either the Sense or the Discretion that were proper for the Vindicator of a Church? I do not incline, so much as in the least, to insinuate, that any of the Accounts contained in The Case of the afflicted Clergy, were false; I am satisfied they were all very true: All I intend, is to represent G. R.'s impudent Rashness in rejecting all Accounts with the same facility: And certainly, whosoever considers this seriously, cannot but reckon of his Book as written with as little Wit or Discretion, as Truth or Ingenuity.
And all this will appear more evident still, if it be considered, that,

All this did not content him; but he was such a Fool, as to stumble upon the same Methods, himself condemn'd most, in his Adversaries, when he had any Matter of Fact to Attest.

He was very careful, as he tells frequently, to have his particular informations from all Corners, concerning all the Instances of Rabbling which were represented in the Prelatrick Pamphlets? But from whom had he these Informations, mostly? From the very Rabblers themselves. It were both tedious and unprofitable to trace him through all instances: One may be sufficient for one example. And I shall choose the very first that is to be found in his Book, viz. That of Master Gabriel Ruffel Minister at Govean.

The Author of the Second Letter had given a brief and a just Account of the Treatment, that poor Gentleman had met with. And G. R. conveys it thus, To this, I oppose, says he, The Truth of the Story, as it is attested by the Subscriptions of Nine Persons who
who were present, i.e. Nine of the Rabblers; for so Mr. Russel himself assured me, repeating over these very names which G. R. has in his Book. And is not this a pleasant Attestation? Is it not pleasant, I say, to rely upon the Testimony of such barbarous Villains, and take their own word for their own Vindication? Yet there's one thing, a great deal more pleasant yet, in the Story.

The Author of the Second Letter had affirmed, that Mr. Russel was beaten by the Rabble; But they (the nine whom he adduces) utterly deny, That any of them did beat him. And 'tis true indeed, none of these nine did beat him; but 'tis as true that he was beaten: And one James Colphoun was the person who did it; and therefore his Name was concealed, and not set down with the other nine. And now I refer it to the Reader, if it is not probable, that he has got a parcel of sweet History from G. R. in his Second Vindication. But I go on.

As he thus adduced the Rabble witnessing for themselves; so when he was put to it, he never stood on adducing
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adducing the Testimonies of single Presbyterian Ministers, witnessing for the Honesty and Integrity of the Rabblers, or in opposition to the Prelatical Relations. Thus,

In White's Case (p. 32.) he adduces five Men, testifying that the Accounts of White's Sufferings were false, &c. And for the Honesty of these five he tells us, *They have all their Testimony from their Minister that they are credible and famous Witnesses.* And

P. 105. He rejects Bullo's account, who was Episcopal Minister at Stobo, in one word, thus, *In this Narrative are many Lies, which is attested by Mr. William Russel (Presbyterian) Minister at Stobo.* But the best is,

After he had run down all the Prelatical Accounts by this Upright Dealing of his, and concluded them almost horrid Liars and Calumniators, and all their Relations most horrid Lies and Calumnies: He tells you gravely in his Preface, § 6. That the Truth of Matters of Fact, asserted in his Book is not to be taken from him, but from his Informers. That he pretends to personal Knowledge of few of them: That
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That therefore, not his Veracity, but theirs, is pledged for the Truth of the Accounts he has published; That if they have deceived him, or been deceived themselves, he is not to Answer for it.

Let the World judge if this was not a sure foot for supporting such Superstructures as he rais'd upon it; and if his Second Vindication is not a pleasant Book. Was it possible for him to have Farced it with more bare-faced Iniquities? What picqu'd the Man, so, at his own Book, as to publish it with so many fair Evidences of Disingenuity, Partiality, Effrontery, and Downright Ridiculousness, about it? What could move him to treat his own Brat with so little compassion? Was not this, even in a Literal sense Male Naturm exponere factum? Or rather what meant he by treating himself so unmercifully? For who fees not that all the Infamy terminates on the Author, in the Rebound?

But, perchance, now that he is a profound Philosophick Head of a Colledge, he may fall on a way to distinguish between his own and his Books
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Books Credit: Perchance he may think his own Credit secure enough, whatever hazard his Books may run. Well! He may try it if he will; but I would advise him not to be rash in falling out so with the Book; For, as sorry a Book as it is, yet, I perceive that with the assistance of a Neighbour Book, it can serve him a Trick, that may be sufficient to put even his impudent self a little out of Countenance. I'll be so kind to him as to let him see where the Danger lies.

He may remember, That the Author of the Second Letter (which, by the most probable Calculation I can make, was written in December 1689, or January 1690.) endeavoured to make it appear as probable, That the Leading Men in Government were, then, very much inclined to justify the Expulsion of the Clergy by the Rabble, and sustain their Churches vacated by that Expulsion; and thereby cut off these poor Men from all hopes of being restored to their Churches or Livings, tho they had neither been Convicted of any Crime,
Crime, nor Deprived by any Sentence. Now

There's another Book, called *Ane Account of the Late Establishment of Presbyterian Government by the Parliament, Anno 1690,* which gives a full and fair Account, how the thing was actually Done, how the Expulsion of the Clergy by the Rabble was actually Justified by that same Act of Parliament which established Presbyterian Government.

If G. R. has not seen that Book, or is resolved to reject its Testimony because probably written by a Party: I can refer him to the Universal Conviction of the whole Nation, that such a thing was Done, by that Act of Parliament: Nay I can refer him to the Act of Parliament itself.

That Book tells also a shrewd story concerning a Presbyterian Minister, called Mr. Gilbert Rule, who preached a Sermon before the Parliament on the 25 of May, being the Sunday before the Act was Voted in the House; And, before he published it, wrote a Preface to it, after the Act was Voted, in which he thanked the House very heartily.
heartyly for **Voting** such ane Act: And if G. R. distrusts that Book, I refer him to Mr. Rule's printed Preface to his Sermon, where I am confident he may find satisfaction. Nay, I dare appeal to G. R. himself, if he knew not all these things to be true, before he wrote one Syllable of his **Second Vindication**: For these things were transacted, every one of them, before the middle of June 1690, and his **Second Vindication** came not abroad till more than a year after. Well!

But what of all this? how can this assist G. R.'s Book against himself, if it should be irritated to serve him a Trick? Why? turn over to p. 43, 44, &c. and consider how it discovers in him such a Brawny Impudence, as never Ghost appearing in humane shape was guilty of, before him. For Tho the Letter-man was fully justified by the Event; tho what he said seemed to be intended by the Government, appeared undeniably to have been intended by them in the Execution; tho they justified the Expulsion of the Clergy by the Rabble, as plainly and positively as ane Act of Parlia-
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Parliament could do it; So plainly and positively, that the whole Nation was sensible of it, and cried shame upon it; That some Members, in the very time, resented it highly, calling it ane indelible Reproach upon the Justice of the Nation; That many Members to this very minute will frankly acknowledge, there was never greater or more notorious iniquity established by a Law. Tho G.R. knew it so well, and was so much pleased with it, that he thanked the Parliament with all his Soul for it, telling them, *He and his Party were filled with Joy, while they beheld the Religious Regard which the High and Honourable Court of Parliament had shewed to the Mountain of the Lords House, above other Mountains; in the Great Step towards the Establishing thereof that they had made by their Vote. (Whereof that Justification of the Rabble was a great part) Tho he prayed, That the Lord would reward them for their good Deeds (whereof this was one) towards his House. Tho all these things were, and are, clear as the Light, and uncontroulable
as Matter of Fact can be; yet G. R. Iafht the Letter-man till he had almost flead him; made him a Railer, one who Understood no Logick, a Strainer at Silly Quibbles, one who had ane Extraordinary Dofe of Brow, and whose Wit was a Wool-gathering, &c. And all this for telling this plain Truth, That the Government had a design to Justify the Expulsion of the Clergy by the Rabble.

Thus I think, I have made it appear how little tender G. R. was, even of his own beloved self, when he was straitned in his Argument: I might have easily added more Instances; but the Truth is, I am now very weary of him; and he himself has done himself the Justice to represent himself to any Man's Satisfaction, who shall not be satisfied with the Representation I have given of him: For he hath fairly own'd, that he sets himself in opposition to those whom he acknowledges to be the Soberest and Wiftest of his party. I don't love to be unjust to him; I'll give it you in his own words, as I find them, Vind. Ans. to Quest. 5. 96.
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He was complaining of the Persecutions his Party had met with for keeping Conventicles, &c. And amongst other things, he discourses thus, There might have been some shadow for such severity against Meeting (at Field-Conventicles) with Arms, tho' even that was in some cases necessary; but that was always disallowed by the Sobrest and Wifest Presbyterians. Now tis plain, there are here these two Affirmatives. 1. That Meeting with Arms at Field Conventicles was in some cases necessary: This is our Authors sentiment. 2. That Meeting with Arms at Field Conventicles, was always disallowed by the Sobrest and Wifest Presbyterians: This, I say, he plainly affirms to have been always the sentiment of the Sobrest and Wifest. By Consequence; are not both these Affirmatives joyned together Equipollent to this Complexe Proposition; Tho' the Sobrest and Wifest Presbyterians did always disallow of Meeting with Arms, &c. Yet, in my Judgment, it was sometimes necessary? And now have you not, from his own Friendly self, a Fair Demonstration of his own n

Folly
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Folly and Futility? For who but a Futile Fool would have said, that he differed in his Sentiments from the Soberest and Wisest? And now, to bring all home to my Original purpose.

By this time, I think, I have given Reason enough for my refusing to accept of him for an Answerer of my Book. No Man on Earth, I think, would willingly enter the Lists with one who is so singular for four such Cardinal Talents. Tho Incurable Ignorance and Incorrigible Nonsense, may be something pitiable, as being the Vices of Nature rather than Choice; yet, 'tis no small Persecution for one to be obliged to grapple with them. What must it be then to be committed with the other two? Rank Ill-nature, I mean, and the most stubborn Impudence?

Some Ill Natures may be cured: Men may be either cajol'd or cudgel'd out of them; Agelastus himself laugh'd once; so did Duke D'Alva: But what hopes can there be of one whose Common Sense is so intrinsically vitiated, that he can avouch the coarsest, and
and most Scurrilous Scolding to be Excessive Civility? But this is not the worst of it:

If there had been any thing Venust or Lepid, any shadow of Concinnity or Festivity, of Jollity or Good Humor, any thing like Art, or Life, or Wit, or Salt, in any one of Fifty of his Excessive Civilities; if they had had the least Tincture of the Satyre, nay, if their Mein had resembled so much as the Murgeons of ane Ape, I could have pardon’d him, and let his Talent pass for Tolerable. There is something delightful in Marvelism, in well humor’d wantonness, in lively and judicious Drollery: There may be some Enormous Strokes of Beauty in a surprizing Banter; some irregular Sweetness in a well cook’t Bitterness: But who can think on drinking nothing but Corrupted Vinegar? What humane patience can be hardy enough for entering the Lifts with pure Barking and Whining? with Original Boulness? who can think on Arming himself against the Horns of a Snail? or setting a Match for Mewing with a Melancholy Cat? But

What
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What can be said of his Impudence? his Master-Talent? Why? to tell Truth of it, I am not able to define it, and so I must let it alone; I know nothing in Nature like it: 'Tis too hard for all the Idea's or words I am Master of. Were I to talk any more of it, I should design it his Undeфине-able Attribute. And now

I think our Author may be sensible, that it is not a good thing to cast a bad Copy to the world, lest some, for Curiosity, try if they can imitate it. For my part I do acknowledge, that I have crossed my temper to make an Experiment, if it was possible to be Even with him: To let him see, that others, as well as he, if they set themselves for it, may aim, at least, at Arguing the Case Cuttingly, as he phrases it (Pref. to Vind. § 6.)

One thing I am sure of, I have been faithful in my Citations from his Books: And I am not conscious that I have, so much as once forced ane Unnatural sense on his words: For this, I am satisfied, that what I have said, be tried with the greatest and most impartial Accuracy. But,
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if he is such ane Author as I have truly represented him to be I hope the world will allow that I had, and still have Reason to refuse to have any Dealing with him. Nay farther, I think 'tis nothing for the Honour or Reputation of his Party, that he was ever imploied to be the Vindicat or of their Kirk. If they can imployp any civil, discreet, ingenuous person to write for them, I shall be heartily satisfied; and for his Encou-ragement, I do promise, if he falls to my share, I shall treat him suitably. Nay

After all, if even G. R. himself will lay aside such Qualities, as I have de-monstrated adhere to him; if he will undertake to write, with that Gravity and Civility, that Charity and Modesty, that Honesty and Ingenuity, which may be thought to become One of his Age and Character; I can as yet admit of him for my Adversary, (for I think the Party cannot assign me a weaker one) And I do hereby promise him ane Equitable Meeting.

F I N I S.
ADVERTISEMENT.

This Book was designed for the Press December 1693.
The Article.

That Prelacy and the Superiority of any Office in the Church above Presbyters, is, and hath been, a great and insupportable Grievance and Trouble to this Nation, and contrary to the Inclinations of the Generality of the people, ever since the Reformation; (they having Reformed from Popery by Presbyters) And therefore ought to be Abolished.

His Article was Established in our Claim of Right, April 11. 1689. By virtue of this Article Prelacy was actually Abolished by Act of Parliament, July 22. 1689. Upon the foot of this
this Article Presbyterian Government was Established, June 7. Anno 1690. This Act Establishing Presbyterian Government was Ratified in the whole Heads, Articles and Clauses thereof, June 12. 1693. It is indisputable, then, That This Article is the Great Foundation of that Great Alteration which hath been made in the Government of the Church of Scotland, since the Beginning of the Late Revolution. Whether, therefore, This is a Solid or a Sandy Foundation? cannot but be deemed a Material Question: And, I think, I shall bid fair for the Determination of this Question, if I can give clear and distinct Satisfaction to these following Enquiries.

I. Whether the Church of Scotland was Reform'd solely, by persons clothed with the Character of Presbyters?

II. Whether our Scotch Reformers, whatever their Characters were, were of the present Presbyterian Principles? Whether they were for the Divine institution of Parity, and the unlawfulness of Prelacy, amongst the Pastors of the Church?

III. Whether Prelacy and the superiority of any Office in the Church, above Presbyters, was a great and insupportable Grievance and trouble to this Nation, and contrary to the inclinations of the generality of the people, ever since the Reformation?

IV. Whe-
IV. Whether it was *Such* when this Article was Established in the *Claim of Right*?

V. Whether, supposing the premises in the Article were *True*, they would be of sufficient Force to infer the Conclusion, *viz.* That *Prelacy*, and the Superiority of any Office in the Church, ought to be abolished?

The Determination of the main Question, I say, may competently result from a perspicuous discussion of these five Enquiries: And therefore I shall attempt it as fairly as I can, leaving to the world to judge, equitably, of my performance: And without further prefacing, I come to

**The First Enquiry.**

*Whether the Church of Scotland was Reformed, solely, by persons cloath'd with the Character of Presbyters?*

If the Framers of the Article meant that it was in these words, *They having Reformed from Popery by Presbyters*, I think, I am pretty sure they meant amiss: For there is nothing more obvious to one who reads and compares our Histories, than That persons standing in other stations, and cloath'd with other Characters, had a very great
great hand, and were very considerable Instruments in carrying on our Reformation. Particularly,

1. There were Prelates who concurred in that work as well as Presbyters. Knox says there were present in the Parliament helden in August, 1560. (which Parliament gave the first National Establishment to our Reformation) The Bishop of Galloway, the Abbots of Lundoris, Culross, St. Colmes-inib, Coldingham, Saint Mary-isle, and the Subprior of St. Andrews, with diverse others: And of all these, he says, That they had Renounced Papistry, and openly professed Jesus Christ. (a) Spotwood reckons up no fewer than Eight of the Spiritual Estate, all Protestants, chosen, at that time, to be Lords of the Articles: Namely, (b) the Bishops of Galloway and Argyle, the Prior of St. Andrews, the Abbots of Aberbrothoik, Kilwinning, Lundors, Newbottle and Culross. Lay these two Accounts together, and you shall have, at least a Round Dozen of Reforming Prelates. 'Tis True Spotwood says, The Popish Prelates formed mightily at such a Nomination for the Articles, alleging that some of them were meer Laicks. But what if it was so? I am apt to think, our Presbyterian Brethren will not be fond to make much advantage of this: I am apt to think, they will not say, That all those whom they allow to have been Reforming Presbyters, were Duey and Canonically Ordained: That they were Solemnly seperated for the Ministry, by such as had Commission and
and Power to Separate them, and in such Manner as had Universally obtained, from the Apostles times, in the Separation of Presbyters for their holy Function. The plain truth is,

2. Our Reformation was principally carried on by such as neither Did, nor Could pretend to be Canonically promoted to Holy Orders. Knox himself (c) tells us, (d) Kn that when the Reformation began to make its more publick Advances, which was in the Year 1558, there was a great Scarcity of Preachers: At that time (lays he) we had no publick Ministers of the word; Only did certain Zealous Men (among whom were the Laird of Dun, David Forres, Mr. Robert Lockhart, Mr. Robert Hamilton, William Harlaw, and others) Exhort their Brethren, according to the Gifts and Graces granted to them: But shortly after did God stir up his Servant Paul Methven, &c. Here, we have but a very Diminutive account of them, as to Number: And such an Account, as, in its very Air and Countenance, seems to own they were generally but Lay Brethren: They were but Zealous Men, not Canonically ordained Presbyters: And if we may believe Lesly, Paul Methven was, by Occupation, a Baker, and William Harlaw a Taylor. (d) (d) Lest: The Laird of Dun, that same very year, was Provost of Montrose, and, as such, sent to France, as one representing, not the First or the Spiritual, but the Third Estate of Parliament, the Burrows; to attend at the Cele-
bration of the Queens Marriage, with the
Dauphine of France: (e) He was indeed a
Gentleman of good Esteem and Quality,
and he was afterwards a Superintendent, but
it no where appears that he was ever Re-
ceived into Holy Orders. Nay,

3. After the pacification at Leith, which
was concluded in July 1560, when the
Ministers were distributed amongst the se-
veral Towns, we find but a very small
Number of them. John Knox was appointed
for Edinburgh, Christopher Goodman for St. An-
drews, Adam Herriot for Aberdeen, John Row
for Perth, William Chrystifon for Dundee, Da-
vid Ferguson for Dunfermline, Paul Methven
for Jedburgh, and Mr. David Lindesay for
Leith. Befide these, Five were nominated
to be Superintendents; Spotswod for Lothian
and Mers, Winram for Fife, the Laird of Dun
for Angus and Mers, Willock for Glasgow,
and Carsewell for Argyle and the Isles. These
are all who are reckoned up by Knox and

(f) And Spotswood adds, With
this small Number was the Plantation of the
Church, at first, undertaken. And can we
think, tho all these had been Presbyters duly
ordained, That they were the only men who
carried on the Scottish Reformation? Far-
ther yet,

4. Petrie (g) tells us, that the First Gene-
ral Assembly, which was holden in Dec. 1560,
consisted of 44 persons; and I find exactly
44 Names Recorded in my Ms. Extract of the Acts of the General Assembly's, as the
the Names of the Members of that Assembly: But of all these 44, there were not above Nine, at most, who were called Ministers; so that, at least, more than Thirty, were but Lay-Brethren according to the then way of Reckoning: probably, they were generally such, if you speak in the Dialect, and reckon by the Measures of the Catholic Church in all Ages. In short, 5. There is nothing more evident to any who considers the Histories of these times, than, that they were generally Laymen, who promoted our Violent and Disordered Reformation, as Spotswood justly calls it. (b) And 'tis Spotswood Reasonable to think, the Sense of this was so. One Argument, which prevailed with our Reformers to Declare against the Antient, Catholic, and Apostolick Ceremony of Imposition of Hands in Ordinations; as is to be seen in the 4th Head of the First Book of Discipline, (i) Spotswood (i) and as is generally acknowledged. 

Thus I think I have sufficiently deduced Matters, as to my First Enquiry: It had been easy to have insisted longer on it; but I had no inclination for it, considering that there is a kind of Piety in Dispatch, when, the longer one insists on a subject of this Nature, he must still the more Expose the Failures of our Reformation, and the Weaknesses of our Reformers. Proceed we now to

B 4 The
The Second Enquiry.

Whether our Scottish Reformers, whatever their Characters were, were of the present Presbyterian principles? Whether they were for the Divine Institution of Parity, and the Unlawfulness of Prelacy amongst the Pastors of the Church.

This Enquiry, if I mistake not, is pretty far, in the interests of the main Question: For, the Article, as I am apt to take it, aims at this, That our Reformation was carried on, with such a Dislike to Prelacy, or the Superiority of any Office in the Church, above Presbyters, as made Prelacy, or such a Superiority, ever since, a great and insupportable Grievance and Trouble to this Nation, &c. But if this is the Sense of the Article, what else is it, Than that our Reformers were Presbyterians? But whether or not, This was truly intended, (as 'tis truly very hard to know what was intended) in the Article, This is Certain, this Enquiry is material and pertinent; And if it faces not the Article Directly, Undoubtedly, it doth it, by fair Consequence. 'Tis as certain, our Presbyterian Brethren use, with confidence enough, to assert that our Reformers were of their Principles. This is One of the Main Arguments by which they
they endeavour, on all occasions, to influence the Populace, and Gain Proselytes to their Party: And therefore I shall endeavour to go as near to the bottom of this Matter as I can, and set it in its due Light; And I hope, It shall appear to be competently Done, to all who shall, attentively and impartially, weigh the following Deduction. And

I. Let it be considered, That while our Reformation was on the Wheel, and for some years after its publick Establishment, there was no such Controversy agitated, in Europe, as this, concerning The Divine Institution of Parity or Imparity amongst the Pastors of the Church.

The Popes pretended universal Headship was Called in Question, indeed; And, Called in Question, it was run down with all imaginable Reason, some years, before the Settlement of our Reformation. That Controversie was One of the First, which were accurately ventilated by the Patrons of Reformation. And it was very natural that it should have been so, considering what stress was laid upon it by the Pontificians.

’Tis likewise true, That the Corruptions of the Ecclesiastical Estate, were Enquired into, in most Provinces, every where, where the Truth began to Dawn, and the Reformation was Encouraged: And it was not to be imagined, but in such Scrutinies, Bishops would be taken notice of, for their general
general Defection from the Antient Rules and Measures of the Episcopal Office, and the vast Diflimilitude between them, and those of the fame Order in the primitive times, both as to the Discharge of their Trust, and their Way of Living: And who doubts, but in these things the Popish Bishops were too generally culpable? 'Tis farther true, that some Countries, when they reformed Religion, and separated from the Church of Rome, did set up New Models of Government in the Churches they erected, as they thought their civil Constitutions could best bear them: And having once set them up, what wonder if they did what they could to justify them, and maintain their Lawfulness? Thus, for instance, Mr. Calvin erected a Model of the Democratical Size at Geneva, because that State had then cast it self into a Democracy. And the Protestants in France, partly for Conveniency, partly in imitation of Calvin's Platform, fell upon a method of governing their Churches without Bishops; And so it fared with some other Churches, as in Switzerland, &c. while in the mean time other Churches thought it enough for them to Reform the Doctrine and Worship, without altering the Ancient form of Government. But then 'Tis as evident as any thing in History, that all this while, from the first Dawnings of the Reformation, I mean, till some years after the publick Establishment of our
our Reformation, That there was no such Controversie instited on, by Protestant, either in their Debates with the Papists, or with one another, as that, about the Divine and Unalterable Institution of parity or impari-ty, amongst the Pastors of the Church. And I dare confidently challenge my Presbyter-ian Brethren to produce any One Protestant Confession of Faith for their side of the Quest-ion: Nay more, I dare challenge them to instance in any One Protestant Divine, of Note, who, in these times, maintained their side of the Controversy; who main-tain'd the Unlawfulness of Imparity amongst Christian Pastors, before Theodore Beza did it, if he did it. Sure I am They cannot, without the greatest impudence, pretend that Mr. Calvin (the only Transmarine Divine, I can find, consulted by our Reformers about matters relating to our Reformation) was of their Principles, For whose shall be pleased to consult his Commentaries on the New Testament, particu-larly on 1 Cor. 11. 2, 5 Or some Chapters in the beginning of his 4th Book of Institutions; Or his Book about the Necessity of Reforming the Church; Or his Epistles, particularly his Epistle directed to the Protector of England, dated Octob. 22. 1548. Or to Cranmer Arch-bishop of Canterbury; (k) To the Bishop of London; (l) To Ithavius Bishop of Ulva-dilavia, dated Decem. 1. An. 1558; (m) Or (l) Col. his Resolution of that Case, if a Bishop or (m) Col. Curate join himself to the Church, &c. (n) Or (n) Col; lastly, 466.
(12)

Col. 190. Lastly, his Epistle to the King of Poland (o), wherein he tells him, That, "It was Nothing but pride and ambition that introduced the Popes Supremacy; That the Ancient Church, had, indeed her Patriarchs and Primates, for the Expedition of Discipline, and the Preservation of Unity: As if, in the Kingdom of Poland one Archbishop should have the precedency of the rest of the Bishops, not that he might Tyrannize over them, but for Orders sake, and for Cherishing Unity amongst his Colleagues and Brethren; And next to him there should be Provincial, or City Bishops for keeping all things orderly " in the Church. Nature teaching (says he) that from every Colledge, One should be chosen who should have the chief Management of affairs. But, 'Tis another thing for one Man, as the Pope doth, to arrogate that to himself which exceeds all humane abilities; namely, The Power of governing the whole Universe. Whoso shall perpend these writings of Mr. Calvins, I say, shall find that he was very far from maintaining the Unlawfulness of Prelacy. Nay, farther yet, I challenge my Presbyterian Brethren, upon their ingenuity to tell me, whether it was not a good many years after 1560, that Beza himself (the true founder of their Sect) condemned Prelacy, if he did condemn it.

I say,
I say, if he did maintain the Necessity of Parity, and condemn'd Prelacy; For however he may seem, upon several occasions, not only to give the preference to Presbyterian Government, and represent it as the most eligible, But to endeavour to found it on Scripture; And represent Episcopacy as an humane invention, yet I have not observed that, any where, he calls it absolutely or simply Unlawful. On the contrary, he says in express terms; That it is Tolerable when it is duly Bound; when the pure Canons of the Ancient Church are kept in vigour to keep it within its proper Limits.

Sure I am, he was not for separating from a Church (as our modern Presbyterians are) upon the account of its Governments being Episcopal, as might be made appear fully from his Letters; so that whatever greater Degrees of Dislike to Episcopacy he may have discovered, beyond his Predecessor Mr. Calvin, yet it is not unreasonable to think, that his great aim was no more, than to justify the Constitution of the Church, he lived in; and recommend it as a pattern to other Churches.

The Scope of this whole Consideration is this, That if what I have asserted is true; if there was no such Controversie agitated, all the time our Church was a Reforming, nor for a good many years after; Then we have one fair Presumption, that our Reformers were

were not Presbyterians: It is not likely that they were for the Indispensability of Parity, that being the side of a Question, which, in these times, was not begun to be tossed. And this Presumption will appear, yet, more ponderous, if

II. It be considered, that we have no reason to believe, that our Reformers had any peculiar Motives, or Occasions, for adverting to the pretended Evils of Prelacy; or any peculiar interests to determine them for Parity, beyond other Churches; or that they were more sharp-sighted to esp'y faults in Prelacy, or had opportunities or inclinations to search more diligently, or enquire more narrowly, into these matters than other Reformers. The truth is

The Controversies about Doctrine and Worship, were the great ones which took up the thoughts of our Reformers, and employed their most serious Applications. This is obvious to any who considers the accounts we have of them; so very obvious, that G. R. himself fairly confesses it in his First Vind. ad Quest. 1. where he tells us, That the Errors and Idolatry of that way (meaning Popery) were so gross, and of such immediate hazard to the Souls of People, That it is no wonder that our Reformers minded these First and Mainly, and thought it a great step to get these Removed; so that they took some more time to consult about the Reforming of the Government of the Church. From which, 'tis plain, he confesses,
confesses; the Reformation of the Churches Government was not the subject of their Main Thinking; which indeed is very true; and cannot but appear to be so, to any who considers what a Lame Scheme was then dressed up by them. But however this was, 'tis enough to my present purpose, That our Reformers were more employed in reforming the Doctrine and Worship, than in thinking about Church Governments. From which, together with the former presumption, which was, that our present Controversies were not begun to be agitated in these times, one of two things must follow unavoidably, viz. either 1. That if they were for the Divine and indispensable Right of Parity, 'tis no great matter; their Authority is not much to be valued in a Question about which they had thought so little; Or 2. That it is to be presumed, they were not for the Divine Right of Parity, That being the side of a Question, which was not then agitated in any Protestant Church, and as Little in Scotland, as any. To be ingenuous, I think both inferences good, tho' 'tis only the Last I am concerned for at present. But this is not all, For

III. So far as my opportunities would allow me, I have had a special eye on all our Reformers, as I found them in our Histories. I have noticed their sentiments about Church Government as carefully as I could; And I have not found so much as one
one amongst them, who hath either directly or indirectly, asserted the Divine and Unalterable Right of Parity.

By our Reformers, here, I mean such as were either 1. Martyrs; or 2. Confessors for the Reformed Religion, before it had the countenance of Civil Authority, or 3. Such as lived when it was publickly established, and had a hand in bringing it to that perfection. Such, I think, and such only, deserved the Name of our Reformers: And, here, again I dare be bold to challenge my Presbyterian Brethren, to adduce clear and plain proof that so much as any one man of the whole Number of our Reformers, was of the present principles of the party.

Some of them, indeed, seem to have laid no great Stress on Holy Orders, and to have been of opinion, That personal Gifts and Graces were a sufficient Call to any man to preach the Gospel; and undertake the pastoral Office. Thus that excellent person Mr. George Wishart, who, in most things, seems to have juster notions of the Gospel Spirit, than most of our other Reformers, when, at his Tryal, he was charged with this Article, That every man was a Priest, and that the Pope had no more power than another man, answered to this purpose, "That St. John faith of all Christians, He hath made us Kings and "Priests And St. Peter, He hath made us a "Kingly Priesthood. That, therefore, any "man, skill'd in the Word of God, and "true Faith of Christ, had power given "him
8* him of God; But he that was unlearned, and not exercised in the word of God, nor constant in the Faith, whatever his state or order was, had no power to bind, or to loose, seeing he wanted the word of God, which is the Instrument of binding (p) and loosing. (p) And

Tis probable, This was a prevailing opinion in those times, from the too common practice of it. But hath this any relation to the Divine Right of Parity? Doth it not strictly equally against both Orders, that of Presbyters, as well as that of Bishops? Is it not plainly to set up the fusc Laicorum Sacerdotes in opposition to both? And who can say but this Opinion might have been in a Breast, which entertain’d no scruples about the Lawfulness of Episcopacy? No doubt it might; and no doubt it was, actually, so with this same holy Martyr: For, he was not only willing that the then Bishops, tho Popish, should be his Judges; He not only gave them still their Titles, and payed them all the Respect that was Due to their Order and Character (homages infinitely scandalous with our modern Presbyterians) as is to be observed thro all the steps of his Tryal: But in his last Exhortation to the People, at the very Stake, he bespake them thus; (q) I beseech you Brethren and Sisters, to exhort your Prelates to the Learning of the Word of God; that they may be ashamed to do evil, and learn to do good; and if they will not convert themselves from their wicked Errors, there shall hastily come C

[p]
upon them, the wrath of God which they shall not eschew.

Here you see the Dying Martyr was earnest, that the Popish Prelates might quit their Errors, not their Prelations. What is there here that looks like a Divine-Right-of-Priest-man? Indeed he was none of that Principle: He had had his Principles from England, as we shall find hereafter. Only one thing more about him, here; He was not for Club-law Reformations: He was neither for violent Possessions of Churches, nor for propagating the Cause by Rabbles, if we may believe Knox's accounts of him.

Others, again, of our Reformers, Declaim'd loudly against the Bishops of these times, and condemn'd them severely, and perhaps too deservedly: But what is this to the Order? Doth every man condemn the Office, who condemns this or that Officer? If so, then, sure, the Order of Presbyters was as bad as the Order of Bishops, in the judgment of our Reformers; For instance, hear Walter Milne in his Exhortation to the People, at his Martyrdom: Therefore as ye would (r) escape Eternal Death, be no more seduced with the Lies of (whom? of Bishops only? No, but of the whole collection of) the Priests, Abbots, Monks, Friars, Priors, Bishops, and the rest of the Sect of Antichrist. But 'tis needless to adduce the Testimonies of private persons: we have the publick Deeds of the Protestants of these times, very clear to this purpose: Thus,

They
They directed a Declaration of their minds to the Popish Clergy, under this Title, To the Generation of Antichrist, the pestilent Prelates and their Shavelings within Scotland, &c. (f) And were not Presbyters of the number of 140. these Shavelings? And what can be more patt to this purpose than the Supplication which was presented by our Reformers to the Parliament, Anno 1560? There they tell the Estates, That they cannot cease to crave of their Honours, the Redress of such Enormities, as manifestly are, and of a long time have been committed by the Place-holders of the Ministry, and others of the Clergy—— They offer evidently to prove, that, in all the Rabble of the Clergy, there is not one Lawful Minister—— And therefore they crave, that they may be denounced unworthy of Honour, Authority, Charge, or Care, in the Church of God, &c. (t) Whofo ever pleases may see more of their publick Presentations, to this effect, in Knox's History. (w) Now, what can be more clear than that all this work was against Presby- ters, as much as against Bishops? and by consequence, against Both Offices, or against neither? as, indeed, it was against neither, as I shall afterwards demonstrate from this same Petition. In short, nothing can be more evident to an attentive Reader, than that in all these Efforts of the Zeal of our Reformers, against the Popish Bishops, it was only the Popery, and, not at all, the Prelacy, that was aim'd at. They never condemned Bishops as Bishops, but only as Popish Bishops.
I have insisted the more largely on these things, because, I know, People are apt to mistake in this matter, who do not sufficiently attend to the **Diætæ** of these times; Especially when they read the History which is commonly called John Knox's. I return now to my purpose, and repeat my assertion, viz. That our **Presbyterian Brethren** cannot aduce so much as one of our Martyrs, our Confessors, or those who had any remarkable hand in the Establishment of our Reformation, in the year 1560, who was of the **Modern Presbyterian Principles**.

Three Authors have indeed attempted it; The Author of the Pamphlet entituled, *The Course of Conformity*; Mr. Calderwood, and Mr. Petrie. The Author of the *Course of Conformity* in his 4th Chap. reckons up a full Dozen of such as (he says) gave Evident and full Testimony against Bishops, as he calls it. But he has not recorded the Testimony of any One, except Knox.

All the rest he proves to have been enemies to Prelacy, by this one Argument: *They preached zealously against Popery, And Bishops is one of the greatest Errors and Corruptions of that.* He neither offers at proving his Subsumption, nor at adducing any other Topic: And has he not proven the point demonstratively? Besides, some of his Dozen were not heard of till several years after the Reformation, and so, cannot be brought in **Barr** against my Challenge.

Further,
Further, He has had the ill Luck to name such for the half of his Dozen, as would have laughed heartily to have heard themselves cited as Patrons of the Divine Right of Parity. Particularly, Mr. Willock, who lived and died Superintendent of Glasgow; Mr. Pont, who died Bishop of Caithness; Mr. Row, who was one of the Three, who stood for the Lawfulness of Episcopacy, when it was first called in question, at the Assembly in August 1575; (v) Mr. Craig, whom Calderwood himself centsures severely for his forwardness to have making bitter invectives against the sincere fort, as he calls the Non Subscribers. (v) I may add Mr. Knox, as shall be made appear, 167. & by by by. But I have taken but too much notice of The Course of Conformity, which is, truly, one of the weakest Pamphlets was ever seen in print. And if that part of it, which is against Episcopacy, was written by Mr. James Melvil, as Calderwood affirms, (v) Calderwood It is a Demonstration, That whatever his Zeal was against Prelacy, it was not according to much Knowledge.

Mr. Petrie mentions only two of our Reformers, as Divine Right-of-Parity Men: The Earl of Murray, who was, Regent, and Mr. Knox: Calderwood insist on Knox, but doth not mention Murray.

Petrie's Evidence about Murray, is, That Pet. 366. he hath read of him, that by his Letter, he did inform Queen Elizabeth of the Honor and Hap-
hints that would attend her Crown and State, upon the Establishment of Christ's Government; And of the profitable Uses whereunto the Rich Benefices of Bishops might be applied. But He tells not in what Author he read this; And none who knows Mr. Petrie's Byass, will think it unreasonable to require some other thing to rely on, than his own Bare Authority. 2. If we should rest on his Authority, and allow that Murray wrote so, because Mr. Petrie said it, yet how will it follow, that his Lordship was for the Divine Right of Parity? Might not he have been against the Temporal Dignities, and the rich Benefices of the English Bishops, without being against Prelacy? How many have been so? Indeed 3. There is all the Reason in the world to believe, That if Murray did write so to the English Queen, this was all he aimed at: For, had he been for the Divine Right of Parity, would he ever have so much countenanced Imparity in the Church of Scotland? Was not he one of the Subscribers of the First Book of Discipline? (3) wherein Imparity was so formally established? Was not he Regent in December 1567? And did not he, then, give the Royal Assent to some Acts of Parliament, made clearly in favour of Imparity? Or did he extend the Royal Assent to these Acts in Despight of his Conscience?

'Tis true, indeed, Time has been, when some Men have had such Dutiful Consciences, that perhaps, the one year, for not having so much
much favour at Court, as they thought they deserved, they could boldly stand up in Parliaments against iniquous Laws, and tell their fellow Members, That such Laws reflected on the Justice of the Nation, and what not? And yet, the next year, when the Court smiled on them, and gave them Preferments and Penfions to satisfy their Ambition, or their Avarice, they could retract all their former Niceness, so much, that if they had got the management of the Royal Assent, they would have made no scruple to have Applied it for the Ratification, Ap- probation, and perpetual Confirmation of the same Laws, in their whole Heads, Articles and Clauses, which seemed, to themselves, so scandalous and wicked: But the Earl of Murray, while Regent, had no such tempta- tion. I believe he had no such yielding Con- science; if he had, I don't think his Author- ity was much to be valued. Once more, I think 'tis very strange that he should have been for the Divine Right of Parity, and yet should never have spoken so much out, considering his occasions, ex- cept in his private Letters to Queen Eliz.

The only person now to be considered is John Knox: He was certainly a prime instru- ment in the Advancement of our Reforma- tion: His Authority was great, and his Sentiments were very influential; And it is not to be denied, but it is of some weight in the present question, to know what was his judgment. I shall therefore endeavour
account for his principles a little more fully; and I shall do it by these steps. 1. I shall shew the insufficiency of the arguments that are adduced, by our Brethren, to prove him Presbyterian. 2. I shall adduce the Arguments which incline me to think he was not.

The great Argument insisted on by the Author of the *Course of Conformity*, and Mr. Petrie, (d) is taken from a Letter of Mr. Petrie's, directed to the General Assembly, held at Stirling, in August 1571: The words are these. Unfaithful and Traitors to the Flocks shall ye be, before the Lord Jesus, if that, with your consent, directly or indirectly, ye suffer unworthy men to be thrust in within the Ministry of the Kirk, under what pretence that ever it be: Remember the Judge before whom ye must make an Account, and resist that TYRANNY: as ye would avoid Hell fire. So the Author of the *Course of Conformity*, without the least attempt to let the world see where the Argument lay. Mr. Petrie is indeed a little more discreet: He tells us where it lies: John Knox in his Letter to the Assembly, by the word Tyranny meaneth Episcopacy: So he, but without any fuller deduction. And is not this a Demonstration, that Knox was Presbyterian? And yet, after all this, it is not possible to make more of the Letter, when it is narrowly considered than, "That Knox deemed it a pernicious "and Tyrannical thing, for any person or "persons whatsoever to thrust unworthy "men into the Ministry of the Church; "and
and Ministers who would make Consci-
ence of their Calling and Trust, must
resist such encroachments with all possible
concern and courage. No man, I say,
can make more of the Letter; And who
doubts but Mr. Knox was so far in the
right? But then, let any man who looks not
through Mr. Petrie's Spectacles, tell me
what this has to do with Parity or Imparity?
The next argument is insisted on both
by Petrie and Calderwood: (b) It is, that
Knox was at St. Andrews, in Feb. 1572, when
Douglas was advanced to that See; That
he refused to inaugurate him; Nay that
in the Audience of many then present,
he denounced Anathema to the Giver, and
Anathema to the Receiver. And if you ask
Calderwoods Evidence for this, he tells
you, He found it in a certain Manuscript,
 than which what can be more Apode-
stick? To be short, tho we had reason to
give credit to Calderwood, and his uncertain
Certain Manuscript, and to believe that the
Matter of Fact is true, and that Knox said
and did so; yet, by what consequences will
it follow, that he was for the Divine Right
of Parity? To deal frankly, 'tis like enough
that Knox said so, and 'tis very probable he
had reason to say so, in that instance: For at
that time dreadful Invasions were made
upon the Patrimony of the Church; None
more deep in that Iniquity than the Earl of
Morton, then Chancellor; by whose influence
Douglas was preferred to that Archbishopsrick:
And
And 'tis like enough that Knox, who all his life was singularly Zealous for the Rights of the Church, upon suspicion, if not certain knowledge, of some dirty Bargain between Morton and Douglas, expressed suitable Resentments. But that it was not from any persuasion he had of the Unlawfulness of Prelacy is clear, even from what Calderwood and Petrie themselves have recorded, within a pag. or two. For both tell us, that when the next Assembly continued Douglas in the Rectorate of the University of St. Andrews, a Station he had been in before he was raised to the Archbishoprick; John Knox Regretted that so many Offices were laid on one Old Man, which scarcely 20 of the best gifts were able to bear. For (as Petrie adds) he was now Archbishop, Rector of the University, and Provost of the New College of St. Andrews. From this, I say, it is plain, that Knox did not resent Douglas his advancement, from any opinion of the Unlawfulness of Episcopacy, for no such word, so much as once mutter'd by him; but from a persuasion he had, that no one man was fit for such a Multitude of Offices. And I shall readily grant, that Knox was not for Large Diocesses (such as St. Andrews was then), as we shall learn by and by, tho I am afraid, little to the comfort of my Presbyterian Brethren. But I have not yet dispatched the whole Argument; 'Tis said, He refused to inaugurare the Bishop: Be it so, but may not the grounds I have laid down already, make
make it reasonable for him to have done so, tho he had no quarrel with imparity? What one Argument is this, John Knox, a Presbyter, refused to consecrate a Bishop, Ergo he was a Presbyterian? This is upon the supposition, that Calderwood and Mr. Petrie have told us true Matter of Fact: And yet I must confess, I see not the probability of its being true, That Knox was desired to inaugurate him: For how is it imaginable, that he would be desired to perform that Office, when there was a Bishop and a Superintendent at hand to do it, and who actually did it; as both Authors acknowledge? But that is not all.

There is another Argument insisted on by both Authors, (d) viz. That Mr. John (d) Calderfoord, Provost of the Old College alleged, that Mr. Knox's repining proceeded from Male-contentment, And Knox purged himself, next Sunday, saying I have refused a greater Bishoprick, than ever it was, which I might have had with the favour of greater men than he hath his; I did and do Repine for Discharge of my Conscience. Now, what more is there in all this than, That Knox his Conscience would not have allowed him to take a Bishoprick, with so much prejudice to the Rights of the Church, for any mans feud or favour, as he suspected Douglas had done in compliance with the Earl of Morton? Can the world see any thing here that lookt like the Divine Right of Parity? But.

Calderwood
Calderwood has yet a more wonderful argument (e) to prove Mr. Knox one of his party: Mr. Beza, forsooth, being informed by Mr. Knox, as appeareth, of the Intention of the Court to introduce Bishops, wrote a Letter to him, wherein he told him, That as Bishops brought in the Papacy, so false Bishops, the Relicks of Popery, would bring in Epicurism to the world, and therefore prayed him, that Episcopacy might never be re-admitted into Scotland. &c. Petrie indeed mentions the same Letter, but he had not the courage, it seems, to say, that it appeared to have been occasioned by a Letter of Knox's to Beza, concerning the intentions of the Court to introduce Episcopacy. Indeed no such thing appeareth from any sentence, phrase, or syllable, in all Mr. Beza's Letter. How it came to appear to Mr. Calderwood, whether by some certain or uncertain Manuscript I know not; but however it was, make the supposition. That Knox did write so to Beza, where is the consequence of the Argument? And if he wrote not (and 'tis impossible to make it appear from Mr. Beza's Letter that he did) Why was Calderwood at such pains to give the world a citation out of Beza's Letter against Episcopacy? was that a good proof that Knox was Presbyterian, that Beza sent him such a Letter? The truth is, if any thing can be collected from that Letter, concerning Knox's sentiments, it seems rather, that he was for Prelacy. For Beza seems clearly to import, that Knox needed to be caution'd
Caution'd against it: For thus he writes; One thing I would have you, my dear Knox, and your Brethren to advert to, as being very obvious, it is, That as Bishops brought forth the Papacy, &c. But if Knox needed this Commonitory, I think 'tis no great Argument that he was Presbyterian, so much, at least, as Beza would have had him. But to do Mr. Calderwood justice, he seems to have laid no great stress on this Argument, and so I leave it. So much for the Arguments insisted on to prove, that Mr. Knox was for Parity. I come now to the Arguments which incline me to think he was not.

When we are enquiring after one's sentiments about a point in controversy, It is not reasonable to build much on far fetched consequences; or refine upon incidental sayings, which may be, very frequently, the Results of Negligence or Inadvertency: It is not proper to fasten on indirect propositions, or snatch at this or that indeliberated phrase or expression, which might have dropped unwarily from his tongue or pen. Following such measures, we may easily strain men's words, beyond their meaning; and make them speak Nonsense, or innumerable Contradictions when we have a mind for it. The solid measure is to weigh a man's deliberate and serious thoughts, if, any where, he has express'd them; To consider his Reasonings, when he treated directly on the controverted Subjects, or any thing
thing that stands so nearly related to it, that one cannot readily discourse the one, without reflecting on the other; To trace him through his life, if the controverted point is Relative to Practice, and try what was his Behaviour, when he had occasion to declare his mind concerning the matter in question. This, as I take it, is the true Rule. Now allowing this Rule to take place, I am very much mistaken if Knox shall be found to have been for the Divine Institution of Parity, and the Unlawfulness of Prelacy.

Had he been so persuaded, how reasonable had it been for him to have spoken out so much, when he was brought before King Edwards Council? (f) The question was then put to him, Whether he thought that no Christian might serve in the Ecclesiastical Ministeration, according to the Rites and Laws of the Realm of England? Here was a proper opportunity for him to have declared himself against Prelacy, if he had been really against it. How natural had it been for a sincere Parity man, on that occasion, to have told that Council, That no Christian could, then, serve with a safe Conscience, as a Pastor of the Church of England, because according to the Laws of that Realm, he behoved to serve as a Member of ane Unlawful Hierarchy? yet he answered nothing, but that No Minister in England had Authority to separate the Lepers from the whole, which was a Chief Part of his Office: Plainly founding all the

(f) Life of Knox. Cald. p. 3.
the Unlawfulness of being a Pastor of the Church of England, not on the Unlawfulness of the Hierarchy, which he spoke not one word about, but on the Kings Retaining, in his own hands, the Chief Power of Ecclesiastical Discipline, as, it is known, he did. (g) Knows

When was it more opportune for him to have expressed these sentiments, if he had had them, than when he was at Frankfort? Yet not one word of the Divine Right of Parity, or the Unlawfulness of Prelacy in all these controversies (g) He was warm enough then, and eager enough, to have found faults in the English Constitution; yet he never charged her with the horrid guilt of Prelacy: Not so much as one word of that in any Account I have seen of these Troubles.

How suitable had it been for him to have declared himself in this matter, in his Appellation from the cruel, and most unjust sentence, pronounced against him, by the false Bishops and Clergy of Scotland; as he calls them, published by himself Anno 1558? yet, in all that Appellation, not one syllable to this purpose: On the contrary, he plainly supposes the Lawfulness of the Episcopal Office, all alongst, throughout it: He appeals to a Lawful General Council; (h) Such a Council, as (h) pag. 22 the most Ancient Laws and Canons do approve: And who knows not that the most Ancient Laws and Canons made Bishops the Chief, if not the only Members of such Councils? He says (i) if the Popish Clergy, his Advertisers,
Three things being granted him, whereof these are two, 1. That the most Ancient Councils, nearest to the Primitive Church, in which the Learned and Godly Fathers examined all matters by God's word, may be helden of most Authority. 2. That no Determinations of Councils, nor Men, be admitted against the plain verity of God's word, nor against the Determinations of the four chief Councils. Would he, if he had been Presbyterian, have agreed so frankly to have stood by the Determination of these 4 Chief Councils? Could he have expected, they would have favoured the Divine Right of Presbyterian Parity? Will any Scottish Presbyterian, now adays, stand to the Decision of these 4 Councils? Farther, In that same Appellation, (k) he requires of the Nobility, that the Bishops be compelled to make answer for the neglecting their Office; which plainly supposes the Lawfulness of the Office, and charges Guilt only on the Officers.

When had it been more seasonable, than in his Admonition to the Commonalty of Scotland, published also Anno 1558? His great design, in it, was to excite them to a Reformation, by loading the Papistical Clergy with every thing that was abominable: Yet not a Syllable of it here, neither; nothing but a farther and a clearer Supposition of the (k) p.40, Lawfulness of Prelacy. You may (says he (k)
in a peaceable manner, without Sedition, withhold the fruits and profits, which your false Bishops and Clergy, most unjustly receive of you, until such time, as they shall faithfully do their Charge and Duties, which is, To preach unto you Christ Jesus truly; Rightly to minister the Sacraments, according to his Institution; And so to watch for your Souls as is commanded by Christ, &c. If this supposes not the Innocency of the Episcopal Office in itself, I know not what can.

Had he been for the Divine Right of Pariety, how unfaithful had he been in his Faithful Admonition to the true Professors of the Gospel of Christ within the Kingdom of England, written Anno 1554? His great work there, was to enumerate the Causes, which, in God's righteous judgment, brought Queen Mary's Persecution on them. But he quite forgot to name the Sin of Prelacy, as one. Affuredly he had not done so, had he been of the same sentiments with our Famous General Assembly 1690. (l) How unfaithfully was it done of him, I say, thus to conceal one of the most Crimson Guits of the Nation? But this is not the worst of it: In that same Admonition he has a most scandalous Expression; sure he was not then sufficiently purged of Popish Corruption. God gave (says he) such Strength to that REVEREND FATHER IN GOD, Thomas Cranmer, to cut the Knots of Devilish Sophistry, &c. (m) To call (m) p. 53 an Archbishop a Reverend Father in God, what was it else, but the plain Language of the Beast?
Beast? How Rankly did it smell of the
Where?

How reasonable had it been, in his Let-
ter to the Queen Regent of Scotland, written,
Anno 1556, and published by himself, with
additions, Anno 1558? He talked very freely
about the Popish Bihions in it; but never
a Tittle of the Unlawfulness of the Office. It
is plain from that Letter he never dream'd
of the Doughty Argument, so much insist'd
on, since, against Prelacy, viz. That it is a
Branch of Popery, and Bishops are Limbs of An-
tichrift. For having state'd it as one of the
Popish Arguments, (n) That their Religion was
ancient, and it was not possible, that that Reli-
gion could be false, which so long time, so many
Councils, and so great a Multitude of Men had
authorized and confirmed; He gives his answer
thus: If Antiquity of time shall be considered
in such Cases, Then shall not only the Idolatry of
the Gentiles, but also the False Religion of
Mahomet be preferred to the Papistry; For both
the one, and the other, is more ancient than is
the Papistical Religion; Yea Mahomet had
Established his Acoran before any Pope of
Rome was crowned with a Triple Crown, &c.
Can any man think, John Knox was so very
unlearned as to imagine, that Episcopacy was
not much older than Mahomet? or knowing
it to be older, that yet he could have been
so Ridiculous, as to have thought it a Relic of
Popery, which he himself affirm'd to be
younger than Mahometism? whose pleas's may
see more of his sentiment about the Novely of
of Popery in his conference with Queen Mary, recorded in his History. One other (o) Kn. Testimony to this purpose I cannot forbear 318. to transcribe; All that know any thing of the History of our Reformation, must be presum'd to know, That Superintendency was Erected by Mr. Knox's his special advice and counsel. That it was in its very height, Anno 1566, is as indubitable: Now, we are told that Knox wrote the 4th Book of his History, that year. Hear him, therefore, in his Introduction to it. (p) We can speak the Truth, whomsoever we offend; There is no Realm that hath the Sacraments in like Purity: For all others, how sincere that ever the Doctrine be, that by some is taught, Retain in their Churches, and in the Ministers thereof, some Footsteps of Antichrist and Dregs of Popery. But we (all Praise to God alone) have Nothing within our Churches that ever flowed from that Man of Sin. Let any man judge, now if Mr. Knox lookt upon Imparity as a Dreg of Popery.

Thus we have found Knox, when he had the fairest occasions, the strongest temptations, the most awakening calls, when it was most reasonable for him, to have declared for the Divine Right of Parity, and the Unlawfulness of Prelacy, still silent in the matter; or rather, on all occasions, proceeding on suppositions, and reasoning from principles fairly allowing the Lawfulness of Prelacy. But is there no more to be said? Yes. More with a witness.
In his Exhortation to England for the speedy Embracing of Christ’s Gospel, dated from Geneva, January 12, Ann. 1559. Amongst many other Reformations, He is for Reforming their Bishopricks indeed: But how? By abolishing them? Nothing like it: How then? Take it in his own words, (q) Let no man be charged in preaching of Christ Jesus above that a man may do: I mean, That your Bishopricks be so Divided, that of every one (as they are now for the most part) may be made ten: And so in every City and Great Town there may be placed, a Godly Learned Man, with so many joined with him, for preaching and instruction, as shall be thought sufficient for the Bounds committed to their Charge. So he: And let our Parity-men, if they can, give this Testimony a Glose favourable to their side of the Question, without destroying the text: The Truth is, this Testimony is so very nicking, that I am apt to apprehend, it might have been for its sake, That this whole Tractate was left out of the Folio-Edition of Knox’s Works, printed at London, Anno 1641. However, the Inquisition, it seems, has not been so strict at Edinburgh; for, there it escap’d the Index Expurgatorium. And yet tho it had not, the Good Cause had not been one whit the Securer. For Knox’s practice would have sufficiently determined the matter: For,

Did not he compile the First Book of Discipline? (r) And is not Imparity fairly Established there? Did not he write and bear the Letter sent by the Superintendents, Ministers and
and Commissioners of the Church within the
Realm of Scotland, to their Brethren, the Bi-


Did not he, in that same Title of that same
Letter acknowledge, that these Brethren, Kn. 445.

Bishops and Pastors of England had renounced
the Roman Antichrist, and professed the Lord
Jesus in sincerity? And doth not the Letter
all alongst allow of the Episcopal Power and
Authority of these English Bishops? Did not
he publickly and solemnly admit Mr. John
Spotswode to the Superintendency of Lothian,
Anno 1561? (t) Did not he Concur, at the
Coronation of King James the Sixth, with a Old Li-
Bishop and two Superintendents, Anno 1567? turgy.

(w) Was not he, some time, a Commissioner (w) Spot.
for Visitation, as they were then called, i. e. a
Temporary Bishop? And did not he, then,
Act in a Degree of Superiority above the
Rest of his Brethren, within the bounds of
his Commission? Did not he sit, and vote,
and concur in many General Assemblies,
where Acts were made for performing
Canonical Obedience to Superintendents? In
fine, doth not Spotswode tell us (w) That be (v) Spot.
was far from the Dotages, wherein some, that 266.
would have been thought his followers, did after-
wards fall? That never man was more obedient
to Church Authority than he? That he was al-
ways urging the Obedience of Ministers to their
Superintendents; for which he caused diverse
Acts to be made in the Assemblies of the Church?
And, That he shewd himself severe to the
Transgressors?
I have insisted the longer on this instance of Knox, because he made a Singular Figure amongst our Reformers. Besides, having so fully evinced that he (whom our Brethren value so much) was no Divine Right of Parity Man; I think it may readily pass for credible, that neither were any of the rest of our Reformers of that opinion. And now, to bring home all this to my main purpose, if not so much as one of our Reformers, no not Knox himself, was for the Divine Right of Parity, I think it may amount to an undeniable evidence, at least, to a strong Presumption, That they were not of the present Presbyterian Principles, and all this will appear still farther unquestionable, when it is considered in the place, How much reason there is to believe, That our Reformers proceeded generally on the same principles with the Reformers of England, where the Government of the Church, by imparity, was continued, without the least opposition.

This is a Consideration, which, I am afraid, may not relish well with the Inclinations of my Presbyterian Brethren; yet, withal, may be of considerable weight with unprejudiced people; and bring light to several things about our Reformation, which, even those who have read our Histories and Monuments, may have passed over, inadvertently; And therefore I shall take leave to insist upon it somewhat fully: And I shall proceed by these steps.
r. I shall endeavour to represent how, our Reformation, under God, was principally Cherished and Encouraged by English influences.

2. I shall endeavour to represent how, in Correspondence to these Influences, our Reformers were generally of the same mind, with the Church of England, in several momentous instances relating to Constitution and Communion, the Government and Polity of the Church, wherein our present Presbyterian Principles stand in direct opposition and contradiction to her. If I can make these two things appear, I think, I shall make a Considerable Advance towards the Determination of the Second Enquiry.

f. I say, our Reformation, under God, was Cherished and Encouraged, principally, by English influences. That Scotland, barring foreign influences, is Naturally dispos'd for receiving English impressions, cannot but be obvious to common sense. We not only live in the same Island, separated from all other Neighbourhood; we not only breathe the same air, and speak the same language, and observe the same customs, and have all the opportunities of Reciprocating all the Offices, which can result from daily Commerces, and familiar acquaintances, and easy Correspondences, and Matrimonial Conjunctions, and innumerable other such Endearing Relations, and Alliances to Mutual Kindness; but also,
Scotland is the lesser, England the larger; Scotland the more barren, England the more fertile; Scotland the poorer, England the richer; Scotland the more penurious of people, England the more populous; Scotland every way the weaker, England every way the stronger Kingdom; and, by consequence, Scotland every way the more apt to receive, and England every way the more apt to give impressions. And Nature, in this, is fully justified by Experience: For what Scottish man knows not, that, when the late Revolution was a carrying on, as England cast the Copy to Scotland, so it was used and prest, as one of the most popular and influential Topicks to persuade the Scots to follow the Copy, That England had done it; and why should Scotland follow a separate Course? Was not England a powerful and a wise Nation? what Defence could Scotland make for itself, if England should invade it? And how was it to be imagined, that England would not invade Scotland, if Scotland did not follow England’s Measures? So that, to stand by K.?, when England had rejected him, what was it else, than to expel the Nation to unavoidable Ruine? Who knows not, I say, that this was one of the most prest, because one of the most plausible Arguments, in the beginning of the late Revolution? And who sees not that the Force of the Argument lay in Scotland’s obnoxiousness to England’s impressions? Let no true hearted Scottish man imagine.
imagine, 'Tis in my thought, to dishonour my Native Country: I have said no more than all the world knowsto be true, and what cannot be denied. If we could contend with them for Virtue, and Integrity; for Honour and Gallantry; for Civility and Loyalty; for Glories that are truly manly; 'Twere for the Credit of our Nation; And it were our own fault if we were inferior to them, in such Competitions: But 'tis Arrant Vanity to contend with them for Wealth, or Strength, or Multitude. Now, to bring this home to my purpose.

God had so ordered, in his wife Providence, that, for many Ages before, Scotland had not been so free of foreign influence, as a little before, and all the time, our Church was a reforming: The French were the only foreign Influences which were wont to find Entertainment in Scotland: And, in those times, the French had treated us very basely and dishonourably. I shall deduce the matter with all convenient brevity.

King Henry the Eighth of England had resolved upon a War with France, Anno 1512. The French King perceiving this, applied to James the Fourth of Scotland, his old Confederaie, to engage him in an Alliance against Henry. His Application was successful: a private League was made betwixt them in November that year. (a) Two of the Articles were, That if England should invade Scotland, France should wage War with all its might, against England; Scotland should
should do the like, if England invaded France.
And neither of the two should take Truce with
England, without the other gave his Consent,
and were comprehended therein, if he pleased.

In pursuance of this League, James raised
a potent Army, invaded England, incurred
the Popes Displeasure, to the very Sentence
of Excommunication, (b) fought the fatal
Battle of Flodden, Sept. 9. 1513, (c) Lost his
Life, and the Flower of all the Scottish No-
bility and Gentry, and left behind him,
James the Fifth, an Infant, exposed, with
his whole State, to the not very tender
Mercies of King Henry. Here was serving
the French interests with a witness. Well!

How did Lewis require this? The next
year, he patcht up a Peace
with Henry, without compre-
hending Scotland, without
Respect to his Faith and Pro-
mise, without Pity to those
who were reduced to such
Extremities on his account:
If this was not, what can be
called, Disobliging? But this
was not all.

The Scots, reduced to these difficulties,
and sensible, that it was not possible for the
Nation to subsist, under an infant King,
without a Regent, became humble Suppli-
ants to the French King, that he would send
them John Duke of Albany, then in the French
Service; a Man of great Abilities, and
next by Blood to the Scottish Crown, that
he
he might be their Governour, during their Kings Minority; But Henry's Threats, for a long time, prevailed more with the French King (d) than Scotland's Necessities, or his Obligations to it; For Albany came not to Scotland, till May 1515. (e) So that, for near two years, thro' the French Coldness and Indifference towards Scottish affairs, the Kingdom had no settled Government.

The War brake out again betwixt France and England, Anno... and a new Peace was concluded Anno 1518. And Albany our Scottish Regent was present, in person, when it was concluded; but the English Obstination, not to comprehend Scotland, was more effectual with Francis the First (who had then got upon the Throne) than all the Intercessions of Albany, or the Merits of our Nation. (f) Nay, if we may believe Herbert, (f) It was one of the main Articles of that Treaty, that Albany should not return to Scotland; (g) Nor did he return, till Octob. 1521. (b) And returning then, Henry reckoned it a Main Breach of Treaty, nay and plain Perjury in Francis, that he gave way to it. (i) Thus were we treated, then, by France.

Let us now consider, if Henry was at any pains, all this while, to make an Interest in Scotland. And if we may believe the unanimous voice of our own Historians, or my Lord Herbert in the History of his Life, (k) never was man more earnest for any thing, than he, in that pursuit, and he had brave occasions for it: For not only were

(d) Herb. 50.
(e) Buch. 488.
(f) Leff. 372.
(g) Herb. 122.
(b) Buch. 496.
(i) Herb. ibid.
(k) Herb. 49, 59, 60, 65, 99.
were the Scots highly (and justly) irritated by the degenerous and undervaluing flights France had put upon them, (as I have just now made appear) But Henry had surprized them with ane Unexpected and Unaccustomed Generosity, after the Battle of Flawdon. He had not pursued his Victory, but had listened gently to their Addresses for Peace; and told them that tho' he might, yet he would not, take advantage of their circumstances: He would treat them frankly; if they were for Peace, so was he, if for War, they should have it. A Response so full of true Honour and Gallantry, as could not but work on their affections. Besides,

His Sister Margaret, the Queen of Scots, a Lady of rare Endowments, was all alongst working to his hand, and making a Party for him. James the 4th by his Testament, before he went to Flawdon, had nominated her, Governess of the Realm, during her Widowhood. This gave her once the principal hand in affairs. 'Tis true, she was young and lively, and married within a year after the King's Death, and so lost her Title to the Regency. But then she married the Earl of Angus, the choice of all the Scottish Nobility, and one who was in great

Repute with all Ranks of People,(l) so that, however her Marriage annulled her Title, it did not so much weaken her Interest, but that

Henricus, animo magno & vere Regio, respondit, sibi cum Scotis pacaris, pacem, cum bellantibus, bellum fore. Buch. 485.
that she had still a great Party in the Nation; so great, that tho Albany was advanced to the Regency, she was for the most part able to over-balance him in point of power and following. In short such was Henry's and his Sisters influence, that all the time Albany was Regent, the Nation was divided into two Factions; the one French, headed by Albany; the other English headed by the Queen Dowager; and hers was generally the more prevalent; so much, that tho Albany was perhaps one of the bravest Gentlemen that ever was honoured with the Scottish Regency, he was never able to prosecute, to purpose, any project, he undertook, for the French Service. Thus, Anno 1522, He raised ane Army to invade England; But with what success? Why? The Scottish Nobility waited upon him to the Border indeed, but they would go no further. They told him plainly, they would hazard lives and fortunes in defence of their Country; but it was another thing to Leit. 386. Invade England. (m) And Letly plainly attributes all this Refractoriness in these Nobles to the Queens influence. Nay, 'tis evident from the same Letly, that the Baseness and Ingratitude of the French in the forementioned Treaties, was one of the principal Arguments that moved them to Regina esti absens, hujius saniem consilii Nobilibus auctor fuit. Leit. 386. Albanius cum intellexerat Scotos Nobiles a bello gerendo abhorrire, quod non Reip. suo utilitate fed Regis Franci voluntate, tanquam fucepum illud putaverint, in Franciam tranimitit, &c. Leit. 387. such
such Backwardness: And Albany was sensible of it, and therefore went to France; and told the French King so much, and asked a swinging Army of Frenchmen, five thousand Horse, and ten thousand Foot: with such a force, he promised to do something against England; but from the Scots, by themselves, nothing was to be expected.

And this his absence was a new opportunity to Henry to play his Game in Scotland. Indeed he neglected it not; he used all arts imaginable, further, to advance his own, and weaken the French interest; he harassed the Borders, without intermission; that, in the Miseries and Desolations of War, the Scots might see the Beauties and Felicities of Peace, on the one hand; resolving, as it were, to cudgel them into an accord, if no other thing could do it: And on the other hand, he had his Emissaries and Instruments busie at work; in the Heart of the Kingdom, and about the Helm of Affairs, employing all their Skill and Interest, all their Wit and Rhetorick, all their Eloquence and Diligence, to persuade the Nation to a perpetual Amity with England, the Queen being the Chief Actrix. Neither did this seem sufficient; He sent Ambassadors, and wrote Letters, and represented things in their fairest
faires Colours, and made most charming Overtures, &c.
If they would break the League with France, and enter into one with England, the world should see, and they should find by Experience, that it was not Humour, or Ambition, or Love of Greatness, that had moved him to treat them so, but Love of Concord, and Concern for the Prosperity and Happiness of the Nation; That he had but one only Child, a Daughter, Mary; Her he would give to James in Marriage; hereby the English would become subject to the Scottish, not the Scottish to the English Government; and a great deal more to this purpose. Whoso pleaseth may see this whole matter transcribed by Herbert (n) from Buchanan. (n) Herb. 148, 149.
I go on.

The French King was not at leisure, it seems, to afford Albany such assistances as he required; so he was obliged to return without them. And returning, found the French interest still weaker and weaker, and the English stronger and stronger, as appears from his Success. For,

Having return'd to Scotland in September 1523, (o) He instantly gave out his Orders, (o) Buch: That the whole force of the Kingdom should meet in Douglas-dale, against the middle of October. He found Obedience so far, indeed, that they met; but when he had marched them to Tweed, and they found, he design'd to invade England, they would
would not move one foot further, but
founded, aloud, their old Carol. " They
" knew by experience what was to be gain'd
" by invading England: It was enough for
" for them that they were willing to defend
" their own Country, &c. (p)

Here they stood, I mean, as to their Reso-
lutions, not, their Ground; for they left
that, and instantly return'd within their
own Borders; so hastily, and with such
strong inclinations, it seems, to be at home,
That, with great difficulty, he got them
kept together, some days, till he should
fall on some pretext, which might give a
fair colour to his Retreat, and cover it from
appearing, downright, dishonourable: 'Tis
true his luck was so good that he found it:
But how? By the Art and Interest of the
English Faction. (q) Thus,

Queen Margaret, to wait her opportuni-
ties, had come to the Border, and lodged
not far from the Scottish Camp. The Earl
of Surrey commanded the English Army, with
whom she kept secret Correspondence; and
it was concerted betwixt them, it
seems, that the English should by all means
avoid Fighting, and she should be imployed
as a Mediator to bring matters to some
honest accommodation. The Plot succeeded;
a Truce was readily patch'd up, to the satis-
faction, no doubt, of both Parties. Albany
had reason to be glad of it, for, he could
make no better of the Bargain; and 'twas
with much difficulty he brought his Expe-
dition
dition to so honourable an issue. And 'tis plain, the English Faction had reason to be as glad, for they had gained two points: They had got Albany to understand the temper of the Nation, and the weakness of the French interest: And they had treated the Scots, who were so averse from Fighting, so discreetly, by thunning all occasions of Engaging, and thereby persuading that they were no Enemies to the Scots, unless it was on the French account, that they could not have fallen on a more successful politick for gaining King Henry's great purpose, which was, To disengage the Scots of the French, as much as he could: And the Success was agreeable. For,

After that, Albany's Authority, and the French interests, decayed so sensibly; and the English Faction manag'd their designs, so successfully, that, within a few months, Albany was turn'd out of his Regency; and the young King (then but twelve years of age) was persuaded to take in his own hands, the Government. It was the English Faction, I say, that wrought this Revolution, as is evident from the whole thread of the History:

And Lefty (r) tells us plainly, that Albany was sensible of it, and was persuaded, it was in vain to endeavour any more, to gain them to the French side, and therefore he took his leave and departed the Country.
try. This was in the year 1524.

The King, so young, all know, was not able to manage the Government by himself; but stood in need of Counsellors; they were English who had got him thus Early to assume the Government in his own person: 'Tis obvious to collect, therefore, they were English enough, who were his Counsellors. And such they were indeed,

For, as Lefly has it, a Parliament was indicted to meet in February thereafter, wherein, a Council was nominated for assisting the King in the Administration of the Government, but so as that the Queen was to have the Sovereignty, so far as nothing was to be done without her special approbation and allowance.

Albany, the great Opposer of his interests in Scotland, thus dispatched, King Henry's whole Soul was divided betwixt Gladness and Kindness: He was Glad, almost to excess, that he had got rid of such an eye-sore.

- He was kind to the highest degree, to his Sister, and Nephew, and the Scottish Nobility: He dispatched two Ambassadors, with all Expedition, for Scotland, by whom he offered to establish a Lasting Peace; and in the interim, agreed to a Truce for a year, till a fond for a solid settlement might be maturely considered. (s) On the other hand

---

(50)

Ita tamen ne quid horum Consilio omninoSTATUERET
vel antiquaret Rex, quod Regina tanquam Regni
Principis, antea, sua aut-

oritate non fixeRIT Aut
reflexerit. _LeB. 397._

(a) IncrE-
dibili qua-
dam laxi-
tia elatus.

_LefL 394._

(5) _LeB._
_ibid._

(s) LefL
Our Queen (without doubt, with her Brothers fore-knowledge and allowance) having now the Reins in her hands, sends three Ambassadors to England; The Earl of Caffils, the Bishop of Dunkeld, and the Abbot of Cambuskeneth, to propose to Henry, in the name of the Scottish Nation, that there might be a firm and perpetual Amity establislh betwixt the two Crowns; and, to this great End, that a Match might be agreed to, betwixt James and Mary. Henry entertain'd the proposition with all imaginable shews of Satisfaction, but demanded two things, That the Scots might break the League with France, and make one of that same Nature with England; And, That James might be educated in England, till ripe for Marriage. But the Scottish Ambassadors were not Plenipotentiaries enough for adjusting these Matters: Caffils therefore comes home; a New Meeting of the States is called; and Caffils is return'd to England, with Commission to tell Henry, That the Scottish Lords are content to Relinquish the French, on Condition the Match with the Princess Mary were secured. (u) 'Tis true, (u) See nothing followed upon this Treaty but a Truce for three years; for what reason I know not. But from the Deduction I have briefly made, it may sufficiently appear how weak the French, and how strong the English interest was then in Scotland; so very strong, as, clearly, to overcome, and, almost, quite extirpate the other.

E 2

Well!
Well! did Francis nothing to recover the Scottish amity? Alas! at that time, he had greater matters to imploy his thoughts. He lost his Liberty at the Battel of Pavia, Anno 1525, and became the King of Spain’s Prisoner; and was not Restored to his Freedom, till Henry interposed with a powerful Mediation: For which, He entered into another League with Henry 1527, without minding the Scots, or being concern’d for their security. This was a third flight put up on the Scots by the French, in their Treaties with England. 'Tis true indeed, Francis did not enter into this League with Henry, over-awed by his Threats, but constrain’d by his Kindness and Good Offices, in his Liberation from his Spanish Captivity: But it was all one to the Scots, for what reason it was, if they were Deserted. 'Tis true indeed,

When James came to full age, he had strong inclinations for renewing the Old Amity with France; and no wonder, considering how much he was manag’d by the Clergy, who abhorred Henry, for shaking off the Popes Authority; and thought themselves concern’d, with all their Might, to guard against Henry’s contagious influences, as they deem’d them. But however the King and Clergy were inclined, 'tis evident, the Body of the Nation continued constant in their so frequently provoked Coldness to the

Gallus studiu, maxime & diligentia Angli, in liber-tatem, ex Hispamorum manibus restitutas, feedus adeo amplum cum iiis te-cit ut multum scoico fœ-deri derogaretur. Buch. 519.
the French interests; and in their good Affection towards England, so much, that they would never thereafter, (at least all the time our Reformation was a carrying on) follow either King or Regent to invade England. Thus,

When James the Fifth, Anno 1542. was very earnest for it, the Nobility generally declined it; and he was forced to dismiss them: And when, shortly after that, his Earnestness that way, it seems, increasing, he ordered an Army to meet at Carlaverock, intending therewith to enter England; so soon as Oliver Sinclair was declared Chief Commander, and the Kings intentions were made known, all threw away their Arms, and offered themselves to be taken Prisoners. (v) And

When the Earl of Arran Regent, Anno 1537. no ...... went with a goodly Army to besiege the Church of Coldingham, which the English, for the time had fortified, he was forced to run for it, abruptly; fearing (as Buchanan says (w) his friends pretended) Buch. 529. left his Army should betray him into the hands of the English. And

Anno 1557, when the Queen Regent (Mary of Lorraine) was most earnest to have had England invaded, thereby to have made a Diversion, and eased France of the English Force, which was assisting Philip the Second of Spain against Henry the Second of France,

---

Rex mirum in modum cupiditatem domus decernere, advera Nobilitate; a quibus id impetrare non poterat. Buch. 529. Lefl. 435.
the Nobility could by no means be gain'd to do it, as all our Historians tell us. I could have insisted on this Deduction far more largely, but I think, what I have said, may be sufficient for my purpose, which was to shew how much Scotland was disengaged of Foreign Influences, and by consequence, how much it was disposed to receive English impressions from the very Dawning of our Reformation, till its Legal Establishment 1560.

Let us next try, if according to these Dispositions, the English influences were Communicated; and made suitable impressions. And, I think, in the first place, No man can reasonably doubt but that 'tis fairly credible, they did: For no man can deny that the Reformation made a considerable figure in England, more early, than it did in Scotland: When Light was thus arising in the Isle, it was natural for it to overspread both Nations: And it was as Natural, that the more and sooner Enlightned Nation should be the fountain of Communication; that is, in plain terms, that Scotland should derive it, under God, from England; Especially considering, how, at that time, they were mutually disposed towards one another. Indeed

2. 'Tis certain, Books deserve to be reckoned amongst the prime Vehicles of such Light as we are now considering; and 'tis as certain, That the first Books which enlightened Scotland were brought from England.

Tindal
Tindal translated the New Testament into English, Anno 1531. And Copies of it were dispersed here in considerable plenty; and other useful Books were then written also in the Vulgar Language, which was common to both Nations; which coming from England, had great success in Scotland, as is evident even from Knox's History: (a) But (a) Kn.38, this is not all. The truth of all this will appear more fully, if,

3. We consider, That King Henry had no sooner begun his Reformation (such as it was) in England, than, he Endeavoured to transmit it into Scotland. He shook off the Popes Supremacy, Anno 1534. And he sent the Bishop of St. Davids to his Nephew James of Scotland, Anno 1535. (b) with (b) Books written in English, containing the Substant of Christian Religion; Earnestly desiring him to read them, and join with him in carrying on the Reformation. And Herbert says, (c) Henry was vastly sollicitous, (c) Herb. To draw James on his side, as knowing of what Consequence it was to keep his Kingdom safe on that part; And therefore Laboured still to induce him to abrogate the Papal Jurisdiction in his Dominions: And tho this Embassy of St. Davids had not success, yet Henry gave not over; but continued to write Letters to James, insistling still upon the same Requests. Petrie has transcribed one from Fox (d) wherein Henry "Premonishes; (d) Pet. requires, and most heartily prays James to consider the Supremacy granted by the Holy
Holy Scriptures, to Princes, in Church matters: To weigh what Gods word calleth a Church: To consider what Superstitions, Idolatries, and blind abuses, have crept into all Realms, to the high Displeasure of God: and what is to be understood by the Censures of the Church, and Excommunication, (for the Pope had then Excommunicated Henry)

and how no such Censure can be in the power of the Bishop of Rome, or of any other man, against him, or any other Prince, having so just ground to avoid from the Root, and to abolish, such an execrable Authority, as the Bishop of Rome hath usurped, and usurps upon all Princes, to their Great Damage: Requesting him for these Reasons, to ponder, of what hazard it might be, to James himself, if he agreed to such Censures, and, by such example, gave upper-hand, over himself, and other Princes, to that Usurper of Rome, to scourge all who will not Kiss and Adore the foot of that Corrupt Holiness, which desires nothing but Pride, and the universal Thrall of Christendom, &c.

Here was Earnestness, for Reformation in Scotland, with a witness. And can it be imagined that Henry, who was so serious with the King of Scots, was at no pains at all with his Subjects? with the Nobility and Gentry, with such as might had influence, either at the Court, or in the Country?
Country? No, certainly, as may be evident, if we consider.

4. That, when, in the year 1540 or 1541, Henry was earnest for a Congress with James, to try, no doubt, if meeting face to face, and personal and familiar Convers and Conference might prevail with him; All our Scottish Protestants were mighty zealous that the Interview might take effect, and both time and place (which was York) might be punctually observed. Is not this a Demonstration, that they understood Henry's project, and approved his designs? and that they were in the same Bottom with him, in pursuance of a Reformation? 'Tis true James followed other Councils, and disappointed the Interview; and therefore Henry turn'd angry, and raised War against him: But then, 'tis as true, that James found his Subjects so backward (as I shewed) and was so unsuccessful in the management of that War, that he contracted Melancholy, and soon after died. Add to this.

5. That after James's Death, Henry persisted, in his Concern to advance the Reformation in Scotland, as well as in England. To this end, He was careful, that those of the Scottish Nobility and Gentry who were taken Prisoners at Solway-mos's, might be lodged with such persons as could instruct them in the Reforming Principles. And so...
fo soon as he heard that James was dead, and had left a Daughter, some few days old, yet Heiress of the Crown, He dispatched them for Scotland, to promote his interests, in the Matter of the Match, he was zealous to have made, betwixt his Son Prince Edward, and our Infant Soveraign. Indeed they were as diligent as he could have desired: They got it carried in Parliament; and that they did it from a prospect of carrying on the Reformation of Religion, by that conjunction, cannot be doubted, if we may believe Dr. Burnet, in his Abridgment of the History of the Reformation of the Church of England: For there (e) he not only tells, “That Cassils had got these seeds of Knowledge at Lambeth, under Cranmer’s influences, which produced afterwards a Great Harvest in Scotland. But also, “That the other Prisoners were instructed to such a degree, that they came to have very different thoughts of the Changes that had been made in England, from what the Scottish Clergy had possessed them with; who had encouraged their King to engage in the War, by the assurance of Victory, since he fought against ane Heretical Prince, &c. And a little after, They were sent home, and went away much pleased both with the Splendor of the Kings Court, and with the way of Religion which they had seen in England. And that we have reason to believe this Author in this matter, is evident, because he
he is justified, herein, by all our Historians, especially Buchanan, as may appear by the sequel. Here was Success of the English influences: Seven of the Supreme Order, i.e. Noblemen, and 24 of inferior Quality, considerable Gentlemen, all enlightened in England, for fo Buchanan numbers them. (f) (f) Buch.] And here, by the way, it will not be amiss 5 3 2.
to consider the strength of the Protestant Party in Scotland, when in this Parliament, wherein the Match, by the influence of the English Converts, was agreed to,
They were so strong, that they carried the Regency for the Earl of Arran, prompted thereto, chiefly by the persuasion they had of his affection to the Reformation, as is evident from the consentient Accounts of Buchanan, Knox, and Spotiswood. (g) They (g) Buch: carried it for the Match with England in opposition to all the Popish Party, as I have just now represented. Nay, which is more, because more immediately concerning the Reformation of Religion, they procured ane Aet to be made, That it should be Lawful to every Man, to take the Benefit of the Translation, which they then had of the Bible, and other Treatises containing wholesome Doctrine, &c. (h) (b) Kn.38.
Indeed, at that time, the Reformation was so far advanced, That the Regent kept his two Protestant Chaplains, Guillam and Rough, both Church of England men, as we shall hear, who preached publickly to the Court (i) and declaim'd boldly against the Roman Corruptions. So far advanced, that it
flood fair, within a short space, to have got the publick establishment, if Arran, the Regent, to keep the Popes Cover on his Title to the Succession, wherein, without it, there were a Couple of sad Chasms, and for other worldly ends, had not play'd the Jade, by renouncing his Profession, and returning to the Popes Obedience.

Observe further, by the way, That this first Parliament of Queen Mary's, was holden, in her name, and by her Authority, upon the 13th of March 1543, as is clear, not only from our Historians, but, the printed Acts of Parliament; and she was not crowned till the 20th of August thereafter, if we may believe both Lesly and Buchanan. And yet there was not so much as the least objection made, then, against the Legality of the Parliament; no such thing was thought on: So that 'tis no new, nor illegal thing, for Scottish Monarchs to hold Parliaments before their Coronations. But this, as I said, by the way.

Such was the strength of the Reforming Party, then, and this strength, under God, advanced so far, principally, by English influences. And all this will appear more convincing still, when it is considered in the 6th place, That all alongst the Popish Clergy were very sensible of it, and very much offended with it, and were at all imaginable pains to disappoint it, and oppose it. Thus,
When Henry sent the Bishop of St. Davids (as we have heard) Anno 1535. to treat with James about Reforming, the Clergy were in a dreadful power, how to keep off the Interview; and used all imaginable Arguments with the King, to dissuade him from listening to it; Telling him, it would ruin Religion, and that would ruin his Soul, his State, his Kingdom, &c. Nay

The Pope himself was extremally solicitous, how to prevent so great a mischief, as he deem'd it; For, as Levly tells us (l) His (l) Left. Holiness finding that Henry had cast off his Yoke, and fearing left James should transcribe his Uncle's Copy, sent his Legates to Scotland to confirm him in the Faith, and fortify him against Henry's impressions. And Buchanan (m) says, He allowed him (m) Buch. the Tenths of all the Benefices within the Kingdom, for three years time, to keep him right. Again,

When Henry, Anno 1540. insisted the second time for ane Interview, the Clergy were in a whole Sea of troubles; They used all arts, and tried all Methods to impede it. At last they fell upon the true Knack, (and a true Demonstration of their Concern, seeing, it was a Knack that lookt so unkindly on their Pockets) which was, to promise him Money, largely, no less
less than 30000 Crowns yearly, says Buchanan; Knox calls them 50000, out of their Benefices, besides a vast sum which might arise out of the confiscated Estates of Hereticks. 50000 Crowns was a good round sum in those days in Scotland. Further,

How were they alarmed? what fears were they under? what shapes did they turn themselves in? what tricks did they play, when the Match betwixt Edward and Mary (spoken of before) was in Agitation? The Cardinal forged a Will in the King's Name, nominating himself, the principal, of four Conjunct Regents, for managing the Government during the Queen's Minority: intending, thereby, to secure the Popish interests, and prevent the coming of the Nobility from England, who, he knew, would lay out themselves with all their Might to oppose him, being his Enemies upon the account of Religion, and advance the Designs of England. This not succeeding, (for the forgery was manifest) His next Care was, that all the Popish Party should tumultuate, bawl and clamour, confound and disturb, the Parliament, all they could; which, indeed, was done so successfully, that nothing could be done to purpose, till he was committed to Custody:

(n) Neither did this put an end to these practices

Occasio item supremae pcestoratis invadendae, & celeritatis egere vita eff, ut Captivorum & Exulum, ex Anglia, Reditum, præveniret, ne quid in approbatione sui honoris, eis, integrum Relinqueter, quorum & potentiam & Gratiam formidabat, & mentem a se alienam, ob diversum pietatis cultum non dubitabant. Buch. 531. vide Kn. 35. Spot. 71.
practices of the Party, but so soon as the Parliament (having concluded the Match) was over, and he set at Liberty, with the Queen Dowagers advice (who was all over French and Papist) He convenes the Clergy, represents to them the impossibility of their standing, the certain Ruine of the Catholick Religion, every thing that could be frightful to them, unless that Confederacy with England were broken; obliges them therefore to tax themselves, and raise great Sums of Money, for Bribing some of the Nobility, that were not proof against its Charms and Beauties; And to use all their Rhetorick with others, to the same purpose: And lastly, it was concluded in that Religious Meeting, That the Match and Alliance should be preach against from the Pulpits; and that all possible pains should be taken to excite the Populace to Tumults and Rabbles, and treat the English Ambassador, with all affronting Tricks and Rudeneses. (o) In short, the Faction never gave over till they had cajol'd the weak Regent into ane Abjuration of Protestantism (as was told before) and reconciled him to the French, which, then, in Scotland, was all one with the Popish Interest. Nay His Holiness himself again interested himself in this juncture, as Le®ly tells us; (p) sending Petrus Franciscus Contarens, Patriarch of Venice, his Legate, into Scotland, to treat with the Regent and the Nobility, in the Popes Name, and promise them large assistances
Studebat enim avertente illorum animos a Nuptiis cum Anglo contra
hendis, quod suspicaretur, per illam Conjunctionem, aliquam fieri
poteuisse, in Scotia, Religionis eversionem, &c. Lest. 449.

assistance against the English, if they would break the Con-
tract of Marriage betwixt Edward and Mary; which
had so fatal an aspect towards the Catholick Reli-
gion. By this Taste, 'tis easy to discern how much the
Popish Party were persuaded,
of the great influence, England had on
Scotland in order to a Reformation of Reli-
gion: And laying all together that hath
been said, 'tis as easy to perceive, they
wanted not reason for such a persuasion.
Having thus given a brief Deduction of
the State of our Reformation in King
Henry's time, and made it apparent, that
it was much encouraged and quickened by
English Influences, then, I think, I need not
inhabit much on the succeeding Reigns.
Briefly then.

7. As Edward the Sixth had the same
reasons for interesting himself in our Scottish
affairs, which his Father Henry had before
him, so we find his Counsels were suited
accordingly. No sooner was Henry dead,
and Somerset warm'd in his Protectoral
Chair, than the Demands about the Match
were renewed. And being rejected by the
Popish Party, here, who had our weak
Regent at their Beck, and were then the
governing Party, the Matter ended in a
Bloody War. Somerset raised a great
Army, and entered Scotland: But before
it came to fighting, he sent a Letter to the Scots (q) written in such an obliging stile, and containing so kind, and so fair, so equitable propositions, That the Regent, advis'd by some Papists about him, thought fit not to publish it to his Army, but to give out, that it tended to quite contrary purposes than it really contained; That it contain'd Threats that the English were come to carry off the Queen by force, and Ruine and Enslave the Nation, &c. Dreading, no doubt, that if he had dealt candidly, and shewed the Letter to such men of interest in the Nation, as were there, it would have taken so with them, that they would have laid aside thoughts of Fighting. Indeed! this was no groundless jealousy, the matter was above-board: For, as Buchanan tells us, In the next Convention of Estates which was holden shortly after that fatal Battel of Pinkie, those who were for the Reformation, being of the same Religion with England, were zealous for the English Alliance, and against sending the Queen into France; and that they were the Papists only who were for sending her thither.

8. When Edward died, and his Sister Mary ascended the Throne, a heavy Cloud indeed did hang over both Nations, and threatened a dreadful storm to the Reformation of Religion. Mary, according to F

\[\text{Erant qui ob Religionis Consensum Anglorum oblatam amicitiam cenferent amplestendam—Gallicæ factioni favebant omnès Papari. Buch. 566. Spot. 89.}\]
her surly humour, fell to downright Per-
secution in England: And our Dowager
having shouldered out Arran, and possest
herself of the Scottish Regency, in her subtle
way, was as zealous to maintain the Super-
stitutions of Popery, using less Cruelty, in-
deed, than Mary, but more policy, and to
the same purposes. And now the purga-
tion of Christianity, seem'd to be brought
to a lamentable stand, in both Kingdoms,
and the hopes of those to be quite daññt,
who were breathing for the profession of
that Holy Religion in its purity. "Yet
"God, in his kind providence, did other-
"wise dispose of things, and made that a
"means to advance Religion amongst us,
"which, men thought, should have utter-
ly extinguisht it: For some of those who
"fled from Mary's persecution in England,
"taking their Refuge into this Kingdom,
"did not only help to keep the light which
"had begun to shine, but made the Sun
"to break up more clear than before, as

(r) Spot. Spotswood hath it from Knox. (r) For then
came into Scotland, William Harlaw, John
Willok, John Knox, &c. of whom more
hereafter. Thus we were still deriving
more light and heat from England.

9. Mary died, and Elizabeth succeeded,
in November 1588. our Queen was then in
France: It was morally impossible to reco-
ver her thence: The English influences, which
in Henry and Edwards time, had cherished
our Reformation, ( except so far as God
sent us Harlaw, Willock and Knox, by his special providence, as I told just now) were quite cut off all the time of Mary's Government. Our Reformers, therefore, to make the best of a bad hand, were earnest to be amongst the foremost Courtiers with the Queen Regent: They were ready to serve her design with all possible frankness: particularly, they were amongst the most forward for carrying on the Match with the Dauphine of France, and voted cheerfully that he should have the Matrimonial Crown conferred upon him, after the solemnization of the Marriage. In consequence of this their frankness, the Earl of Argyle and the Prior of St. Andrews, two first-rate Protestants, were the persons nominated to pass into France, to honour the Dauphine with that complement: And they undertook it cordially.

But, in the very instant, almost, they were informed that Mary of England was dead, and Elizabeth on the Throne, and withal professing Protestantism. This altered their whole Scheme: They presently considered, The English Influences, so long slopt in their Courses, might now begin to Drop again: And there were hopes of Assistance from that Female Soveraign: So, these two Lords (no doubt, with the advice of the rest of the fraternity) gave over thoughts of their French Voyage: The Dauphine might purchase a Crown for himself, or wait till his Father dyed, if he could not do better: They re-
solved to carry him no Matrimonial Crowns from Scotland. Indeed their hopes of Assistance from England to carry on the Reformation of Religion, were better grounded then than ever. For,

Upon the Death of Queen Mary of England, by French advice, our Queen, as Next Heir to that Crown, had assumed the English Titles. 'Tis not to be thought Elizabeth lik'd this well; and resolving to continue Queen of England, she had no reason: For who knows not that her Title was Questionable? But our Queens Decent was Uncontroverted. What wonder then if Elizabeth thought herself concerned to secure herself as well as she could? And what more feasible and proper way for her security, than to have the Affections, and by consequence the Power of Scotland on her side? And what measure so natural for obtaining that, as to cherish the Reformation of Religion in Scotland, and weaken the Popish, and by consequence, the French interests there, and get the Rule of that Kingdom put in the hands of Protestants? The politic was obviously solid; all the work was to set it a going: But that difficulty was soon over; for no sooner did she employ some private instruments, to try the Scottish pulses, than they smelt the matter, and relit it immediately. The least intimation that she was so inclined, was to them as a spark of fire amongst Gun-powder, it kindled them in a thought: They address her, quickly beg'd
beg'd her protection, and plighted their Faith that they would depend upon her, and stand by her, and to the outmost of their power, secure her interests; if she would grant them suitable assistances. Thus the bargain was readily agreed to on both sides; and both perform'd their parts successfully. For who knows not that our Reformation was carried on by Elizabeth's Auspices? by English Arms, and Counsels, and Money in the year 1560? And who knows not, that by the Treaty at Leith in July, that same year, after the French were expelled Scotland, when our Reformers, by her help, had got the upper hand, her Crown was secured, as far as the Scottish Protestants could secure it? Who knows not, I say, that it was one of the Articles of that Treaty, That the Queen of Scotland and King of France, should not, thereafter, usurp the Titles of England and Ireland, and should delete the Arms of England and Ireland out of their Scutchions? and whole Household-stuff? (s) By this time, I think, it may competently appear, how much our Scottish Reformation, under God, depended on English influences. But I have two things more to add.

10. Then, it is considerable that some of our Chief Luminaries, of those, who had a principal hand in preaching and planting the Gospel in Purity among us, had drunk in these principles in England, and brought them, thence, to Scotland with them. Thus the
the excellent Martyr Mr. George Wishart, (of whom in part before) as Spotswood tells us, (t) had spent his time in Cambridge, and return'd to his own Country to promote the Truth in it, Anno 1544. And Mr. John Spotswood, that worthy man who was so long Superintendent of Lothan after our Reformation, was one of Cranmers Disciples, as you may see in the beginning of the Life of Archbishop Spotswood his Son, and also in his History. (u) And John Willock and William Harlaw had both lived in England, before they preacht in Scotland, as I have already accounted; and perhaps a strict Enquiry might discover some others.

11. and lastly, On the other hand, (except so far as John Knox was Calvinist, and a Lover of the Forms of Geneva, for which, perhaps, I shall account hereafter) none of our Historians give so much as one particular instance, of a Scotch Reformer who had his Education in any other foreign Church, except Mr. Patrick Hamilton, who, I think, cannot be proven to have been a Presbyte-rian; and tho it could be done, it could amount to no more than the Authority of a very young man, considering he was but 23 years of age when he died. Neither do they mention any Foreigner, who came here to Scotland, to assist us in our Reformation?

Lesty, (v) indeed, says, that the Scotch Protestants sent Letters and Messengers to Germany, to call thence Sacramentarian Ministers, as being very dexterous at fostering Sedition,
Sedition, and subverting Religion; but no other Historian says so; and he himself says not that ever any such came to Scotland. Thus, I think, I have accounted competently for the first thing proposed, viz. That our Reformation, under God, was principally Cherished and Encouraged by English Influences, I proceed to the

2. Which was, That, in Correspondence to these Influences, our Reformers were generally of the same Mind with the Church of England, in several momentous instances relating to the Constitution and Communion, the Government and Polity of the Church, wherein, our present Presbyterlan principles stand in direct opposition and contradiction to her.

That our Reformers agreed with those of the Church of England, in the Common Articles of the Christian Faith, in their Creed, was never called in Question. But it is not my present purpose to consider the sentiments of our Reformers in relation to the Church as it is a Sect, but as it is a Society, neither shall I be curious to amuse many particulars; I shall content myself with two or three of considerable weight and importance. And

1. Our Reformers, generally, or rather, unanimously, lookt on the Church of England, as a Church so well constituted, that her Communion was a Lawful Communion. For this we have two as good Evidences as the nature of the thing is capable of, viz.

The
The constant and uniform practice of our Reformers joining in the Communion of the Church of England, when they had occasion, as those of the Church of England did, with the Church of Scotland; and their open profession in their publick deeds that they thought it Lawful.

1. I say it was the constant practice of our Reformers to join in the Communion of the Church of England, when they had occasion, as those of the Church of England did, with the Church of Scotland. Thus, we find all such of our Reformers, as, in times of Persecution, fled into England, still joining with the Church of England; e.g. Friar Alexander Seaton, (a) when he was forced to flee, in King James the 5th’s time, went to England, and became the Duke of Suffolk’s Chaplain, and died in that service. Alexander Ale's was in great favour with King Henry, and called the King’s Schollar. (b) He was a Member of the English Convocation, and disputed against Stokesly Bishop of London, and maintaine’d there were but two Sacraments, Baptism and the Eucharist, Anno 1536, or 37: (c) And he it was that first turn’d the English Liturgy into Latin, for Bucer’s use, Anno 1549, as both Heylin and Burnet, in their Histories of the English Reformation, tell us. (d) John Fife, and one Mr Dowdal stayed as long in England as Ale's did. (e) And 'tis not to be doubted that they were of the same principles. John Mr. Bee during his abode in England, was liberally
liberally entertained by Nicol. Saxton Bishop of Salisbury, who made much account of him, (f) which is no argument, I think, (f) Ibid. that he was a Presbyterian. Sir John Borthwick was charged with Heresie, Anno 1640, for maintaining, That the Heresies, commonly called the Heresies of England, and their New Liturgy, was Commendable, and to be embraced of all Christians: And, That the Church of Scotland ought to be govern'd, after the manner of the Church of England, (g) i. e. under the King, and not the Pope, as Supreme Governor. Friar Thomas Guillam, the first publick Preacher of the Reformed Religion, in Scotland, He, by whose Sermons John Knox got the first lively impressions of the Truth (h), Life This Guillam, I say, after Arran, the Regent, Apostatized, withdrew, and went into England, (i) and we hear no more of him; (i) Spot. From which 'tis reasonable to conclude, 73. That he kept the Common Course with the other Reformers, there.

John Rough was the Regent's other Chaplain; while he was Protestant; He likewise fled to England, tho' sometime after Guillam: He preached some years in the Towns of Carlisle, Berwick and Newcastle; and was afterwards provided to a Benefice by the Archbishop of York, where he lived till the Death of King Edward. When Mary's Persecution turn'd warm, he fled, and lived some time in Friesland. He came to London, about some business, Anno 1557. was apprehended, and brought before Bonner; Questioned
Questioned if he had preached any, since he came to England? Answered he had preached none: But in some places where godly people were assembled, He had read the Prayers of the Communion Book set forth in the Reign of King Ed. VI. Question'd again, what his Judgment was of that Book? Answered, He approved it, as agreeing in all points with the word of God; And so suffered Martyrdom. I think this man was neither for Parity, nor against Liturgies. But to proceed.

The excellent Mr. Wishart, as he had spent some time in England (as was told before) so, it seems, he returned to Scotland, of English (I am confident, not of Presbyterian) Principles: For, he was not only for the Lawfulness of Private Communion, as appeared by his practice; but Knox (k) gives us fair intimations, that he ministered it by a Set-form. I know King Edward's Liturgy was not then composed: But it is not to be imagined, That the Reformers in England, in Wishart's time administered the Sacrament without a Set-form. The Extemporaneity Spirit was not then in vogue: And why, else, could Sir John Borthwick have been charged with the Great Heresy of Commending the English Liturgy? However, I shall not be peremptory, because I have not the opportunity of enquiring, at present, what Forms the English Reformers had, then. All I shall say, is, if they had a Liturgy, 'tis very probable, Wishart used it; For, as Knox
Knox tells us; when he celebrated the Eucharist, before his Execution, "After he " had blessed the Bread and Wine, he took " the Bread and Brake it, and gave to every " one of it, bidding each of them, Remember " that Christ had died for them, and feed on it " spiritually; so taking the Cup, he bade " them Remember that Christ's Blood was shed " for them, &c. So Knox, word for word, which account, I think, seems fairly to intimate, that Wishart used a Form, but if he did, what other could it be than such as he had learned in England?

I have accounted already how John Willock and William Harlaw had served in the English Church, before they came to Scotland, (l) I might perhaps make a fuller (l) Spot.

Collection: But what needs more?

Even Knox himself lived in Communion with the Church of England, all the time he was in that Kingdom: He went not there to keep Conventicles, to erect Altar against Altar, to gather Churches out of the Church of England, to set up separate and schismatical Churches, as some of our present Parity-men have sometimes done: No, he preached in the publick Churches, and, in subordination to the Bishops; and he preached before King Edward himself, as he himself tell us, in his Admonition to the Professors of the Truth in England; (m) (m) p. 52 which, it is very improbable, he would have been allowed to have done, if he had Condemned the Communion of the Church of
of England, as it was then established: For who knows not, that, in King Edwards time, all Schism and Non-Conformity were sufficiently discouraged? And, through that whole Admonition, he, still, speaks of himself as One of the Ministers of the Church of England. Nay

If it be Reasonable to Collect mens Sentiments from their Reasonings, I am sure, in that same Admonition I have enough for my purpose: For, he reasons upon suppositions, and from Principles, which, clearly, condemned Separation from the Church of England, as then established. For, when he gives his thoughts of that fatal Discord which happened between the two great men (Somerfet, and the Admiral, as I take it) He discourses thus; God compelled my tongue (says he) openly to declare, That the Devil and his Ministers (the Papists) Intended only the Subversion of Gods true Religion, by that Mortal Hatred amongst those who ought to have been, most assuredly, Knit together by Christian Charity——— And especially that the wicked and envious Papists (by that ungodly Breach of Charity) diligently minded the overthrow of him (Somerfet) that, to his own Destruction, procured the Death of his innocent friend (and Brother)— All this trouble was devised, by the Devil and his instruments, to stop and lett Christ's Disciples and their poor Boat (i.e. the Church.) What can be more plain (I say) than, that Knox, here, proceeds on suppositions, and reasons from Principles, which con-

(76)
condemned Separation from the Church of England, as then established? Doth he not suppose, that the Church of England, as then established, was Christ's Boat, his Church? And that the Sons of the Church of England were Christ's Disciples? Doth he not suppose, that these two Brothers, as Sons of the Church of England, ought to have been assuredly knit together, by Christian Charity? That the Breach between them was an ungodly Breach of that Charity, by which, Members of that same Church ought to have been assuredly knit together? And that it was a contrivance of the wicked and envious Papists, thereby, to Ruine the Church of England? Doth he not suppose all these as undoubted Truths, I say. Or rather, doth he not positively or expressly assert them? And now, if Separation from the Church of England, and condemning her Communion as an Unlawful Communion can consist with these principles and suppositions; or, if he who reasons on these suppositions, and from these principles, can be deem'd, at the same time, to have been for the Unlawfulness of the Communion of the Church of England, I must confess I know not what it is to collect mens sentiments from their Principles and Reasonings.

Whoso pleases may find more of Knox's sentiments to this purpose, in his Exhortation to England for the speedy receiving of Christ's Gospel; Dated from Geneva, January 12, 1559. For, there, he calls England happy. In that, God
God by the power of his verity, of late years (i.e. in King Edward's time) had broken and destroyed the intolerable yoke of her spiritual Captivity, and brought her forth, as it had been, from the bottom of Hell, and from the Thraldom of Satan (in which she had been holden blinded by Idolatry and Superstition) to the fellowship of his Angels, and the possession of that rich Inheritance, prepared to his Dearest Children with Christ Jesus his Son. And a little after, he says of the Church of England, that in that same King Edward's days, she was a Delectable Garden planted by the Lords own hand. (o) And in his Letter to Secretary Cecil, from Diep, April 10, 1559. he tells him, He expects that same favour from him, which, it becometh one Member of Christ's Body to have for another. (p) And in his Letter to 2. Elizabeth from Edinburg, 28 July 1559. He renders thanks unfeignedly to God, That it hath pleased him of his eternal Goodness, to exalt her Head to the Manifestation of his Glory, and the Extirpation of Idolatry. (q) Is this like the Clamour which has been ordinary with our Presbyterians, about the Idolatry of the Church of England? And in the conclusion of that Letter, he prays, that the Spirit of the Lord Jesus may so rule her, in all herActions, and Enterprizes, that, in her, God may be Glorified, his Kirk Edified, and she, as a lively Member of the same, may be an Example of Virtue and Godliness of Life, to all others. Are these like the sayings of one, who, in the mean time, judged the Communion of the Church of England, ane Unlawful Communion,
"Tis true, indeed, John Knox was displeased with some things in the English Liturgy: He thought she had some Modes and Ceremonies there, which were scandalous, as symbolizing too much with the Papists; and it cannot be denied, that he disturbed the peace of the English Church at Frankfurt: But, if I mistake not, he did so, not that he thought the terms of her Communion truly sinful; but, that he judged his own, (or rather the Genevan) Model, purer; For, 'tis reasonable to think, he proceeded on the same principles, and was of the same sentiments with his Master, Calvin: And nothing can be clearer, than, that Calvin did not condemn the things scrupled at, as impious or unlawful, but as not agreeable to his Standard of Purity, as appears from the Citation on the Margin, and might easily be made appear more fully, if one were put to it; but 'tis needless, now, considering that all, I aim at, is, that it cannot be inferred from what Knox did at Frankfurt, That he judged the Communion of the Church of England, ane Unlawful Communion, tho', I must confess in making these firsts, he proceeded, not according to the true Catholick Principles of Christian Communion. But enough of him at present. To proceed,
As our Reformers thus generally looked upon the Church of England, as a true Church, and her Communion, as a lawful Communion, so, after our Reformation was established, those of the Church of England, had the same sentiments of the Church of Scotland: The Ambassadors, who, at any time, for many years, came from England to the Scottish Court, made no scruple to live in the Communion of the Church of Scotland, and join in her publick Worship. Thus the Earl of Bedford (r) who came to assist at the Solemnization of the Princes (afterwards K. James the Sixth's) Baptism, Anno 1566. went daily to Sermon, i.e. (by a Synecdoche very familiar in Scotland) to the publick Worship. Neither did I ever observe the least intimation, in any monument of these times, I have seen, of these two Churches having opposite Communions, till many years after the Reformation. But I have insisted long enough on this Consideration. The sum whereof is, briefly, this: Our Reformers so far as can appear from their private sentiments and practices, looked upon the Church of England as a true Christian Church: They lived in her Communion when they had occasion to be within her Bounds; not one of them condemned her Communion as an unlawful Communion; not one of them set up Conventicles in England, when they were there, nor erected separate Churches, &c. From all which, it seems to follow, at least, very probably, That they reformed, generally, upon the same Principles; entirely.
entirely, upon the same, as to Church Communion. The reason why I have insisted so long on this argument, is, that it smooths the way for the next, which is

2. That our Reformers, in their publick deeds, openly and solemnly profess that they were of one Religion, one Communion, with the Church of England. This, as I take it, is a point of considerable importance, and therefore I shall endeavour to set it, at least, in a competent Light.

1. Then, Unity of Religion (and by good Consequence, I think, Oneness of Communion) between the Scots and the English Protestants, was the great Argument insisted on by the Scots, in their Addresses to England for Assistance to turn out the French, and establish the Reformation in Scotland, Anno 1559: And it was one of the main Grounds, on which all that great Revolution was transacted, that year, and the next, viz. 1560. Take the account, as I have it from that which is commonly called Knox his History.

When the Lords of the Congregation found it would be necessary for them to implore foreign Assistance for driving out the French, then, the great Obstacles to the Reformation; They resolved, in the first place, to apply to England, and the Reason, given for this Resolution was, That ENGLAND WAS OF THE SAME RELIGION.

Or, if ye please take it in the Authors own (a) Hans words (a) We thought good to seek aid, and 170.

G support,
support, of all Christian Princes, against her (the Queen Regents) Tyranny, in case we should be more sharply persued, AND BECAUSE THAT ENGLAND WAS OF THE SAME RELIGION, and lay next unto us, it was thought expedient first to prove them, &c.

It was rational enough to try, there, first, indeed, considering what I have already observed concerning Queen Elizabeth; And, Tryed it was, and found successful; For Secretary Cecil, no sooner heard of their intention, than he sent them word, That their Enterprize miscarried not the English Council (b). Upon the light of this great Ministers Letter, which brought them so comfortable news; they instantly return'd ane Answer: Knox has it word for word;

(b) Kn. 128.

(c) Kn. ib. (c) I shall only take ane Abstract of what is proper for my present purpose. In short then;

"They perceive their Messenger, Master Kircaldie of Grange, hath found Cecil ane unfeigned favourer of Christ's true Religion: As touching the Assurance of a perpetual Amity to stand betwixt the two Realms, as no earthly thing is more desired by them, fo, they crave of God to be made the Instruments, by which, the Unnatural Debate which hath so long continued between the Nations may be composed, To the Praise of Gods Name, and, the Comfort of the Faithful in both Realms: If the English Wisdom can foresee and devise how
how the fame may be brought to pass; they may persuade themselves not only of the Scotch Consent and Assistance, but of their Constancy, as Men can promise, to their lives end; And of Charge and Commandment to be left by them to their posterity, that the Amity between the Nations (IN GOD) contracted and begun, may be, by them, kept inviolate for Ever: Their Confederacy, Amity and League shall not be like the passions made by worldly men, for worldly profit, but, as they require it, FOR GODS CAUSE, so, they will call upon his Name for the Observation of it: As this their Confederacy requires Secrecy, so, they doubt not, the English Wisdom will communicate it only to such as they know to be favourers of such A GODLY CONJUNCTION: And, in their opinion, it would much help, if the Preachers both in persuasion, and in publick prayers (as theirs in Scotland do) would commend the same unto the people. And thus, after their most humble Commendation to the Queen’s Majesty, (whose Reign they wish may be prosperous and long, to the Glory of God and Comfort of his Church) they heartily commit him to the Protection of the Omnipotent. Given at Edinburgh, July 17. Anno 1559.

Before I proceed further, I must tell my Reader, that all our Historians are extreamly defective as to this great Transaction between Scotland and England, I am now accounting
accounting for. None of them (neither Buchanan, nor Lefty, nor Spotwood) hath this Letter except Knox, and he calls it, the first Letter to Sir William Cecil from the Lords of the Congregation, which imports there were more, as no doubt there were many, and yet he hath not so much as a second. Besides, I find by Knox, Buchanan and Spotwood (d) that, in November 1559, Secretary Maitland was sent by the Lords of the Congregation, to treat with the Queen of England. I find likewise that he managed the matter so, and brought it to such maturity, that, immediately upon his return, the League between the Queen of England, and the Scottish Lords was transacted and finished; and yet I can, no where, find, what Commission he had, nor what Instructions; how he manag'd his business, nor upon what terms the Queen of England and He came to an Agreement; and several other such lamentable defects I find, so that it is not possible for me to give so exact a Deduction of such an important Matter as were to be wished. Tho, I doubt not, if it had been clearly and fully deduced, it might have brought great Light to many things about our Reformation, which, now, so far as I know, are buried in Obscurity. Any man may readily imagine how sensible one, that would perform my present task, must needs be, of so great a disadvantage. However, when we cannot have what we would, we must satisfy our selves the best way we can. And so I return to my purpose.
purpose, which, tho' I cannot dispatch so punctually as might be desired, yet I hope to do it sufficiently, and to the satisfaction of all sober, tho' not, nicely critical Enquirers. To go on then.

By the aforementioned Letter, you see, The Lords of the Congregation, refer'd it to the Wisdom of the English Council, to foresee and devise the Means and Assurances (they are the very words of the Letter) how an effectual Confederacy might be made, between them, for God's Cause. Now let us reason a little upon the common principles of prudence, where Matter of Fact is so defective.

What was more natural for the English Council to require, than, that (now that the English Reformation was perfected and legally established, and the Scottish was only in forming) the Scots should engage to transcribe the English Copy, and establish their Reformation upon that same foot, i.e.: receive the Doctrine, Worship, Rites and Government of the Church of England, so that there might be no difference between the two Churches, but both might be of the same Constitution, so far as the necessary distinction of the two States would allow? The point in Agitation was a Confederacy in opposition to Popery, and for the security of the Reformed Religion in both Kingdoms. It was obvious, therefore, to foresee, that it would be the stronger, and, every way, the better suited to that great End, if both Churches
Churches flood on one bottom: For who fees not that Different Constitutions are apt to be attended with Different Customs, which in process of time may introduce Different Sentiments and Inclinations? Who fees not that the smallest Differences are apt to create jealousies, divisions, cross-interests? And that there's nothing more necessary than Uniformity for preserving Unity? Besides,

Queen Elizabeth was, peculiarly, concerned to crave this. There's nothing more necessary to support a State, especially a Monarchy, than Unity of Religion. It was for the Support of her State, the Security of her Monarchy, that she was to enter into this Confederacy. She was afraid of the Queen of Scotland's pretensions to the Crown of England; For this cause she was confederating with the Queen of Scotland's Subjects, that she might have them of her side. It was her concern, therefore, to have them as much secured to her interests as possibly she could: they were, then, at a great Bay without her succour; and had referred it to her and her Council, to foresee and devise the terms on which she would grant it. And now laying all these things together, what was more natural, I say, than that she should demand, that they should be of the same Religion, and their Church of the same Constitution, with the Church of England.

This politic was so very obvious, that 'tis not to be imagined, she and her wise Council could overlook it; And tho' it had been
been no where upon Record, that she craved it, yet the common sense of mankind would stand for its Credibility; what shall we say then, if we find it recorded by ane Historian, whose Honesty is not to be questioned in this matter? And such ane one we have, even Buchanan himself, tho he misplaces it, and narrates it, a long time after it was done, and as it were only by the by.

The occasion on which he records this, is, when in the year 1569. (the tenth year after this Confederacy between the Scots and the English was concerted, as I take it) the Earl of Murray, then Regent, had gone to the Northern parts of the Kingdom to settle matters there, Accounts were brought to him of the Duke of Norfolk's Conspiracy, which was so well compacted, and so deep laid, that it was judged morally impossible to disappoint it; and Murray's friends were earnest with him to retreat in time, and disengage himself of the opposite party, with whom he had hitherto sided; and so when Buchanan comes to give the History of this juncture, he, to find a just rise for his Narration, returns no less than ten years backward, discoursing thus, The State of English affairs oblige me to look back a little; because, in these times, the interests of both Kingdoms were so twisted, that the concerns of the one cannot be represented without the other: The Scots, some years before, being delivered from the Gallican Slavery by the English assistance.
Here, you see, the thing is plainly and undeniably asserted: Yet, so careless (to say no worse) have all our Historians been, that not one of them mentions it, but he, and he does no more than mention it; and, to this minute, we are, generally, in the dark, when, how, by whom, and with what Solemnities it was done. Buchanan's words would seem to import that it was done after, that our Deliverance (as he calls it) was accomplisht. But not one word of it in the Treaty concluded at Leith, and proclaim'd July 8th, 1560, which succeed-ed immediately upon the back of that Deliverance; not one word of it (I say) in that Treaty, as it is either in Buchanan, Knox or Spotswood, or any other Historian, I have had occasion to see; neither have we any other publick Transaction or Deed that mentions it. I find it told by several Historians (e) that the Earls of Morton and Glencarne were sent
sent to England, after that our Deliverance, to return thanks to Queen Elizabeth, for her assistance: 'Tis possible it might have been done then; for, as Spotswood has it, "After "the Professors heard of the cold Enter-"tainment that Sir James Sandilands, who "went to France to give an account of the "Treaty, had got at that Court, their minds "were greatly troubled; for, they were "sensible of their own weakness, and "doubtful of Support from England, if "France should again invade, because of "the Loss the English had received in the "late Expedition; Neither, (says he) had "the Earls of Morton and Glencarne, who "upon breaking up of the Parliament, "were sent into England, to render thanks "to the Queen, and to entreat the Conti-"nuance of her Favour, given any adver-"tisement of their acceptance. If, upon this occasion, Commission was sent to these two Earls, to subscribe, in name of the rest of the Protestants, to such an Union in Religion, it exactly answers Buchanan's Ac-"count; but no such thing is so much as in-sinuated to have been done on that occasion. For my part, I humbly offer it to be consi-"dered, whether it is not possible, that Bu-"chanan intended not to lay any such stress upon the word [LIBERAT] as thereby to import, that it was after the Accom-
plishment of our Deliverance, that the Scots' subscribed: But, bringing in the whole mat-
ter, occasionally, where he mentions it, and intending
intending to dispatch it in as few words as he could; he did not stand nicely upon the wording of it. And if this holds, the most Rational and Natural Account will be, that Secretary Maitland, and Sir Robert Melvil, who were sent by the Scottish Lords, in the beginning of November 1559, to implore the Queen of England's Assistance, were impowered to agree, in name of the whole body, to this Union of Religion, if it should be demanded. That the Secretary had power to treat, and agree to, and sign Articles, is certain; for, amongst the Instructions given to the Commissioners for concluding the Treaty at Berwick, dated at Glasgow, Feb. 10. 1559, I find this as one. (f)

Item, If it shall be desired of you to confirm, for us, and in our Name, the things past and granted, by our former Commissioner, the young Laird of Lethington, ye shall, in all points, for us, and in our Name, confirm the same, so far as it shall make either for the WELL and CONJUNCTION of the two Realms, or this PRESENT CAUSE, or yet, for the security of our part for fulfilling of the same (g).

This, I say, is one of the Articles of these instructions; from which it is evident, that Lethington had signed Articles in England; tho we are no where told what they were. And may it not pass for a probable conjecture, that that concerning Unity in Religious Worship and Ceremonies was one of them? But whenever, or by whomsoever it was done, is not the Critical Hinge of the Con-
Controversie. We have Buchanan's word for it, that it was done; and I hope, my Presbyterian Brethren will not hastily reject his Authority; especially considering, that his Veracity, in this matter is so much attest-ed and made credible by the strain of the Letter directed to Secretary Cecil, on which we have already insistst. Neither is this all, For

2. The publick Thanksgiving, and Prayers made with great Solemnity, in St. Giles's Church in Edinburgh, (b) after the Pacification at Leith, in July 1560, amount to no less than a fair Demonstration of ane intire Union between the two Nations as to Church Matters, and Religion; for on that occasion it was thus addressed to Almighty God, with the common Consent, and as a publick Deed of our Scottish Reformers.

—Seeing that nothing is more odious in thy presence (O Lord) than is Ingratitude and Violation of ane Oath and Covenant made in thy Name; and seeing thou hast made our Confederates in England, the Instruments by whom we are now set at this Liberty, and, to whom in thy Name, we have promised mutual Faith again; Let us never fall to that Unkindness (O Lord) that either we declare our selves unthankful unto them, or Prophaners of thy holy Name. Confound thou the Counsel of those that go about to break THAT MOST GOGLY LEAGUE CONTRACTED IN THY NAME; And retain thou us so firmly together, by the power of thy holy Spirit,
That Satan have never power to set us again at Variance nor Discord. Give us thy Grace to live in that Christian Charity, which, thy Son our Lord Jesus Christ hath so earnestly commanded to all the Members of his Body; that other Nations provoked by our Example, may set aside all Ungodly War, Contention and Strife, and study to live in Tranquillity and Peace, as it becometh the Sheep of thy pasture, and the People that daily look for our final Deliverance by the coming again of our Lord Jesus, &c. Thus it was prayed, I say, in great Solemnity; at that time; and every Petition, is a Confirmation of Buchanan’s Fidelity and my Assertion. Further yet,

3. In the Old Scottish Liturgy compiled in these times, and afterwards used publickly in all the Churches, There is a Thanksgiving unto God, after our Deliverance from the Tyranny of the Frenchmen, with Prayers made for the Continuance of the Peace betwixt the Realms of Scotland and England, wherein we have these Petitions offered.

Grant unto us, O Lord, that with such Reverence we may remember thy Benefits received, that, after this, in our Default, we never enter into Hostility against the Realm and Nation of England. Suffer us never, O Lord, to fall to that Ingratitude and detestable Unthankfulness, that we should seek the Destruction and Death of those whom thou hast made instruments to Deliver us from the Tyranny of Merciless Strangers: Dissipate thou the Counsels of such as Deceitfully travel to stir the hearts of the inhabitants of eith-
Let their malicious practices be their own confusion; and grant thou of thy Mercy, that Love, Concord and Tranquillity may continue and increase amongst the Inhabitants of this Isle, even to the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whose glorious Gospel, thou, of thy Mercy dost CALL US BOTH TO UNITY, PEACE AND CHRISTIAN CONCORD, the full PERFECTION whereof we shall possess in the fullness of thy Kingdom, &c.

Here is a set of Demonstrations to the same purpose also: And now, let any man lay all these things together; The Letter to Cecil; The Confederacy betwixt Scotland and England; Buchanan's Testimony; and these Thanksgivings and Prayers, and then let him judge impartially whither or not, there is reason to believe, that, in those days, there was a good Agreement between the Scottish and English Protestants, as to Religion and Church Matters.

Thus, I think, I have sufficiently cleared that our Reformers, Generally, if not Unanimously, lookt upon the Church of England, as so well constituted, that they acknowledged her Communion to be a Lawful Communion. But before I proceed to other things I must try, if I can make any more advantage of what has been said: And I reason thus,

Was there not here truly and really, a Confederacy, an Oath, A Solemn League and Covenant, betwixt the Scottish and the English
Englih Protestants? Were not these English Protestants, then, united in that Society, which, at that time, was, and, ever since, hath been called The Church of England? And was not the Church of England of that same very constitution, then, that it was of in King Charles the First his time, for example, Anno 1642? But if so, then, I ask again, was not this Solemn League and Covenant, made, thus, by our Reformers with their Brethren in England, as much designed for the Security, the Defence, the Maintainance, of the Church of England, as then by Law established, as for the Establishment of our Reformation? Did not our Reformers promise Mutual Faith to the English, as well as the English promised to them? Would it have been consistent with the mutual bonds and obligations of this Confederacy, this Solemn League and Covenant, for the Scotch Reformers, to have raised ane Army, at that time, against Queen Elizabeth to invade her Dominions, in order to ruine the Church of England? I cannot imagine, any sober person can grudge to grant me this much also. But if this be granted, then I ask in the third place, Did not that Solemn League and Covenant, made by our Reformers, with those of the Church of England, run in a direct opposition to the Solemn League and Covenant, made by our Scotch Presbyterians with a Factious Party in England, for destroying the Church of England, in King Charles the First's time? Nay did not our Scotch Presbyterians in
in that King's time, by entering into that Solemn League and Covenant, directly, and effrontedly, break through the Charge and Commandment, which our Reformers left to their Posterity, That the Amity betwixt the Nations, in God contrasted and begun, might by them, be kept inviolate for ever? Nay, further yet, did not our Reformers solemnly pray against those who made the Solemn League and Covenant in the days of King Charles the First? Did they not address to God, that he would dissipate their Counsels, and let their Malicious Practices be their own Confusion? And now, let the world judge what rational pretences these Presbyterians, in that Holy Martyrs time, and, by consequence, our present Presbyterians, can make for their being the only true and genuine Successors of our First Reformers? Expecting solid and serious Answers to these Questions,

I shall now advance in the prosecution of my main undertaking on this Head, which was to shew, how our Reformers agreed with the Church of England in several momentous matters Relative to the Constitution and Communion, the Government and Polity of the Church, &c. But because I have insisted so long on this general one, which I have just now taken leave of, I shall only instance in two or three more, and dispatch them as speedily as I can.

2. Then, it is evident, and undeniable, that our Scottish Protestants, for some years, used
used the Liturgy of the Church of England in their publick Devotions. Indeed,

The very first publick step, towards our Reformation, made by the Lords of the Congregation, was to appoint this Liturgy to be used: It was ordered upon the third day of December, 1557, as both Knox and Calderwood have it. (a) Take the Ordinance in Knox his words: The Lords and Barons professing Christ Jesus convened frequently in Council, in the which, these Heads were concluded: First, It is thought expedient, advised and ordained, That in all Parishes of this Realm, the Common Prayer be read, weekly, on Sunday, and other Festival days, publicly, in the Parish Churches, with the Lessons of the Old and New Testament, conformable to the Book of Common Prayers: And if the Curates of the Parishes be qualified, that they read the same; And if they be not, or if they refuse, that the most qualified in the Parish use and read the same, &c. (b) Spotswood and Petrie give the same account. But such is the Genius of Mr. Calderwood, that you are to expect few things, which may make a gainst the Presbyterian Interest, candidly and sincerely represented by him. For instance, in his orderly account of this matter, he quite omits the mention of other Holy days, besides Sundays.

These consistent Testimonies of all those four Historians, are so full and plain a Demonstration of the Matter of Fact, that I cannot foresee so much as one Objection that can be made, or one Evasion that can be
be thought on, unless it be, That it is not said by any of them, that it was the Book of the Common Prayers of the Church of England. But this difficulty is soon removed. For

1. It was either the Book of the Common Prayers of the Church of England, or the Genevan Liturgy: For we no where read of a Third, ever pretended to have been used, in those times, in Scotland: Now that it was not the Liturgy of Geneva, is plain; for besides that it is utterly incredible, that there could have been so many Copies, of the Genevan Form in the vulgar Language, then, in Scotland, as might serve so many Parish Churches; Nay, that 'tis highly probable, there was not so much as one. Besides this, I say, in the Genevan Form, which was afterwards used in Scotland, there is no Order for, no footstep of, the observation of other Holy days, besides Sunday: Neither is there any Order in it for Reading of Lessons of the Old and New Testament, except in the Treatise of Fasting, which was not compiled till the year 1565. There, indeed, Lessons are appointed, such and such Psalms, and such and such Histories, in the Old, but not so much as one Tittle of the New Testament: In all the rest of the Book a deep Silence about Lessons; than which there cannot be a clearer Demonstration, that the Book appointed to be used in December 1557, was not that of Geneva. Indeed

2. None of our Presbyterian Historians, neither Petrie, nor Calderwood, have the confidence
confidence to pretend, nay to insinuate the possibility of its being the Common Order of Geneva; which, 'tis very probable, they would have done, if they had had the smallest hopes of making it feasible. On the contrary, Calderwood seems fairly to acknowledge, that it was the English Liturgy; but then this acknowledgement lies at such a distance from the year 1557, that, no doubt, he thought himself pretty secure, that few Readers would reflect upon it as an acknowledgement; he doth not make it till he comes to the year 1623, when he had occasion to tell how the use of the English Liturgy was brought into the New College of St. Andrews. Take it in his own words (c) Upon the 15th of January, Master Robert Howie, Principal of the New College of St. Andrews, Doctor Wedderburn, and Doctor Melvin, were directed by a Letter from Doctor Young, in the Kings Name, to use the English Liturgy, Morning and Evening, in the New College, where all the Students were present at Morning and Evening Prayers: Which was presently put in execution; notwithstanding they wanted the warrant of any General Assembly, or of any CONTINUED PRACTICE OF THE FORM in time, by-past, since the Reformation. Where, you see, he lays the stress of his Argument against it, on its not having had a continued Practice, since the Reformation, which is a clear concession that at the Reformation, it was in practice, tho' that practice was not continued. But
But whither he acknowledged this or not, is no great matter; we have sufficient Evidence for the point in hand, without it: For

3. Buchanan's Testimony, which was adduced before about the Scots subscribing to the Worship and Rites of the Church of England, is unexceptionable: And yet it is not all. For

4. The Order, as you see it appointed by the Lords of the Congregation, Decem. 3d, 1557, is, That the Book, there authorized, be used in all Churches from that very date: but we find by the First Book of Discipline (d)(d) Spots That the Order of Geneva was only coming in 1553, to be used, then, in some of the Churches, i.e. 1560. And it had nothing like a public Establishment, till the General Assembly held at Edinburg, Dec. 25, 1652. For then, and not till then, It was concluded, that ane Uniform Order should be kept in the Ministration of the Sacraments, Solemnization of Marriages, and Burial of the Dead, according to the Kirk of Geneva. So it is in the Ms. and so Petrie hath it; (e) But Nature works again with (e)Pet.233: Calderwood: For he has no more but this, It was ordained that ane Uniform Order be kept in the Ministration of the Sacraments, according to the Book of Geneva: (f) Omitting (f) Cald, Marriage, and the Burial of the Dead; Mar-riage; I believe, to bear the other Company; for the Burial of the Dead, was the Dead Flee: Why? The Book of Geneva allowed of Funeral Sermons, as he himself acknowledged; (g) A mighty Superstition! in (g)16. 24: the
the opinion of Presbyterians; so that it would have been offensive to the sincerer sort, as he commonly calls those of his own Gang, and inconsistent with the Exigences of the Good Cause to have let the world know, that *A General Assembly had ratified the Order of that Book about Burials, and thereby had justified the Superstition of Funeral Sermons.* Nay

5. It seems this Act of the General Assembly, Decem. 1562, has not been strong enough for turning out the English Liturgy, and introducing the form of Geneva: For if we may believe Caldermood himself, (b) The General Assembly holden at Edinbourgh, Decem. 25. 1564. found themselves concerned to make another Act, ordaining Every Minister, Exhorter, and Reader to have one of the Psalm books, lately printed at Edinbourgh, and use the Order contained therein, in Prayers, Marriage, and Administration of the Sacraments. Where observe further, that Prayers, not mentioned in the Act, 1562, are now put in; from which it may be probably conjectured, that, as much as Knox was against the English Liturgy, he found many difficulties to get it laid aside; so many that, it has not only been used by some (few or many, I cannot tell) in the Ministration of the Sacraments, &c. after the Act 1562. But the Clergy have not found themselves obliged to forbear the use of it, in the publick prayers; so that it was needful, in this Assembly 1564, to make a New Act, restricting
stricting them both as to Prayers and other Ministrations, to the Order of Geneva. And if this holds, we have the English Liturgy, at least, seven Years in continued practice in Scotland. But it is enough for my main purpose, that it was once universally in use, which I think cannot be denied by any who impartially considers what hath been said: And now

6. May not I adduce one Testimony more? 'Tis true it is of a latter date: But it is very plain and positive, and what I have adduced already is security enough for its Credibility: It is the Testimony of the Compilers of our Scottish Liturgy, which made the great Stir in the year 1637. And was made one of the main pretences for the first Eruptions of that execrable Rebellion which ensued; The Compilers of that Liturgy, I say, in their Preface to it, tell us, That it was then, known, that diverse years after the Reformation we had no other Order for Common Prayer, but the English Liturgy. A Third Principle wherein our Reformers agreed with the Church of England, and which stands in direct contradiction to the Principles of our Presbyterians, is, that they own'd, the Church had a great Dependence on the State; That it belonged to the Civil Magistrate to reform the Church; That People might appeal from the Church, to the Civil Magistrate, &c.

I am not now to enter into the Controversie concerning the Dependence or Indepen-
Evidence of the Church upon the State, that falls not within the compass of my present Undertaking: Neither will I say that our Presbyterians are in the wrong, as to the true substantial Matter agitated in that Controversie. All I am concerned for at present, is that, in these times, those of the Church of England own'd a great Dependence of the Church upon the State, and that our Reformers agreed with them in that Principle; and I think I may make short work of it: For That that was the Principle of the Church of England in these times, I think no man can readily deny, who knows any thing about her, at, and a good many years after, her Reformation. All my business is to shew, that our Reformers were of that same Principle. And I think that shall be easily made to appear: For As to the Civil Magistrates power to reform the Church what can be more clear, than the Petition presented to the Queen Regent, in November 1558? There our Reformers tell her Majesty, (i) that Knowing no Order placed in this Realm, but her Majesty and her grave Council, set, to amend, as well, the Disorder Ecclesiastical, as the Defaults in the Temporal Regiment, they do most humbly prostrate themselves, before her Feet, asking Justice, and her Gracious Help against such as falsely traduced and accused them as Hereticks and Schismaticks, &c. In which Address, we have these two things very clear and evident,
evident, 1. That they own'd, that the Civil Magistrate, had power to amend Ecclesiastical Disorders, as well as Temporal. 2. That, in conquence of this, they applied to the Civil Magistrate for protection against the pursuits of the Church. And in their Petition given in to the Parliament about that same time, "They most humbly beseech the sacred Authority to think of them as faithful and obedient Subjects, and take them into its Protection, keeping that Indifferency, which becometh Gods Lieutenants to use, towards those, who, in his Name, do call for Defence against Cruel Oppressors, &c. Meaning the then Church-men (k) Indeed, None clearer for this than Knox himself, (l) He lays down and endeavours to prove (m) Kn.Ap. this Affertion, That it is lawful to Gods Prophets, and to Preachers of Christ Jesus to appeal from the Sentence and Judgment of the visible Church, to the Knowledge of the temporal Magistrate, who, by Gods Law, is bound to hear their Causes and to defend them from Tyranny. And in that same Appellation, (m) he largely afferts and maintains the Dependance of the Church upon the State: The Ordering and Reforma- tion of Religion, with the instruction of Subjects (he says) doth appertain especially to the Civil Magistrate. For why? "Moses had great power in the Matters of Religion: God
"God revealed nothing particularly to Aaron (the Church-man) but commanded him to depend from the Mouth of Moses (the Civil Magistrate): Moses was impowered to separate Aaron and his Sons for the Priesthood: Aaron and his Sons were subject to Moses. Moses was so far preferred to Aaron, that the one commanded, the other obeyed. The Kings of Israel were commanded to read the Book of the Law all the days of their Lives, not only for their own private Edification, but for the publick preservation of Religion; so David, Solomon, Asa, Jehoshaphat, Hezekiah, Josiah understood it, and interested themselves in the Matters of the Church, accordingly. From which it is evident, (faith he) That the Reformation of Religion, in all points, together with the Punishment of false Teachers, doth appertain to the power of the Civil Magistrate: For what God required of them, his justice must require of others, having the like Charge and Authority; what he did approve in them he cannot but approve in all others, who with like Zeal and Sincerity do enterprize to purge the Lords Temple and Sanctuary. Thus Knox (I say) in that Appellation. I do not concern myself with the truth or falsehood of his positions; neither am I to justify or condemn his Arguments: All I am to make of it is, to ask my Presbyterian Brethren, whether these Principles of Knox's suit well with declining the Civil Magistrate as one incompetent judge in Ecclesiastical matters? with refusing..."
refusing to appear before him prima instantia for the trial of Doctrines preach'd in the Pulpit? with the famous distinction of the Kings having power about Church matters Cumulative but not Privative? &c. I am afraid it shall be hard enough to reconcile them.

I shall only instance in one principle more, which seems to have been common to our, and the English Reformers, but it is one of very weighty consequence and importance to my main design: It is

Fourthly, That Excellent Rule of Reformation, viz. That it be done according to the word of God, interpreted by the Monuments and Writings of the Primitive Church. That antient, solid, approved Rule: That Rule so much commended by that excellent Writer Vincentius Lirinensis: That Rule which the common sense of mankind cannot but justify, when it is considered soberly and seriously, without partiality or prejudice. A Rule, indeed, which, had the Reformers of the several Churches, followed unitedly and conscientiously, in those times, when the Churches in the Western parts of Europe were a Reforming; we had not had so many different Faiths, so many different Modes of Worship; so many different Governments, and Disciplines, as, Alas! this day, divide the Protestant Churches, and

and by consequence, weaken the Protestant Interest: A Rule, which had the pretenders to Reformed Religion, in Scotland, still stood by, we had not, possibly, had so many horrid Rebellions, so many unchristian Divisions, so many unaccountable Revolutions, both in Church and State, as, to our sad Experience, have, in the Result, so unhing'd all the Principles of natural justice and honesty, and disabled, nay, eaten out the principles of Christianity amongst us, that now we are not disposed so much for any thing as downright Atheism. But were our Reformers, indeed, for this Rule? That shall be demonstrated by and by, when we shall have occasion to bring it in again as naturally, to which opportunity I now refer it: in the mean time, let us briefly sum up all that hath been hitherto said, and try to what it amounts.

I have, I think, made it appear, that, while our Reformation was a carrying on, and when it was established Anno 1560, there was no such Controversie agitated, in the Churches, as that concerning the indispensible necessity of Presbytery, and the Unlawfulness of Prelacy, concerning the Divine Right of Parity, or the Unallowableness of imparity amongst the Governors of the Church. I have said enough to make it credible, that our Scottifh Reformers had no peculiar occasions, opportunities, provocations, abilities, for falling on that Controversie, or determining of it, more than the Reformers of other Churches: In consequence
Sequence of this, I have further shewed, that, from all the monuments of these times, I have seen, not so much as one of our Reformers can be adduced, as asserting the Presbyterian side of this Controversie. Lastly, I have, I think, made it evident, that our Reformers went very much upon the same Principles, on which the English Reformers went, who still continued Episcopacy; unquestionably, on many Principles of great weight and importance, as to the Constitution and Communion, the Government and Polity of the Church, which stand in direct opposition and contradiction to the Principles of our present Presbyterians. And now, let any judicious and impartial person lay these things together, and then let him ingenuously determine, whether it be not highly incredible, that our Reformers were for the divine institution and indispensable Right of Parity, and the Unlawfulness of Prelacy, which is the Principle, at least, the Profession of our present Presbyterians. Yet after all this,

I must tell my Reader, that I have insist-ed on these things, so much as I have done, principally for smoothing the way for the Evidences I am yet to produce for the certainty of my side of the Second Enquiry. And I am content, that these things I have already discoursed, should pass for no more than Rational Presumptions, till I have tried if more Strength can be added to them, and they can be rendered more cogent and concluding by
by a succession of plain, positive, direct, and formal proofs of my Assertion: And, to engage my Readers attention, I dare adventure to promise him that, to as high a degree as the nature of the thing is capable of, at least, can reasonably bear. And so, without further address, I thus proceed.

Before our Reformation was established by Law, our Reformers addressed to the Government by several Petitions, that Religion and the Church might be reformed. I shall take notice of Three, all pertinent to my purpose. One of them is no where (that I have seen) set down at length; the other two are in Knox his History.

That which is no where set down at length, is to be seen abridged in Buchanan, Lesly, and Spotswod, (a) but with some little variation; For Buchanan has given that Article, which I am at present concerned about, according to his way, in general terms; Thus, Ut Ministrorum Electio, juxta antiquam Ecclesiae consuetudinem, penes populum esset, Spotswood has translated Buchanan's words faithfully enough, in this matter, as he doth in many other things; but Lesly gives it a little more distinctly thus: Ut EPISCOPI deinceps, & PASTORES, illi, Dominorum ac Nobilium cujuscunque DIOCESIS, hi, PAROCHORUM assensione ac voluntate, ad BENEFICIA cooptentur. That this Petition thus abridged by these three Historians was a Petition different from that which we have published at length in Knox, seems
feems unquestionable; for that which is in Knox, has not one syllable about the Election of Ministers; and beside, Buchanan fairly insinuates, that there was another, distinct from that which he had abridged, tho not much different: For thus he discourses (b) Buch.
Papani, Edinburgi, ad eadem FERE postulata quaer Nobilitatem ad eam (Reginam prorogem) sunt delata, PENE paribus usi sunt Responfis. Now if it had been the same Petition, why would he have said, ad eadem FERE postulata, and PENE paribus Responfis? This I take notice of, that my Presbyterian Brethren may not have occasion to cavil, at the Article as it is in Lefy, as if it were not genuine, because it is not in the Petition recorded by Knox, and, from him (most imperfectly) abridged by Calderwood, their two great and authentic Historians. For, as for Mr. Petrie, he was so wise, as not to trouble himself with either of these Petitions: perceiving, belike, that neither of them was favourable to his beloved Parity. To proceed, now, with the Article as it is in Lefy.

If he has set it down faithfully, I think we have a fair account of the sentiments of our Reformers, concerning Mother Parity; (c) so very fair, that he who runs may read it. The Question then is, whither Lefy Bas Dor. has faithfully transmitted this Article to us? And for the affirmative, I offer these Rea-

1. There's
I. There's no reason to doubt of his integrity in this matter; he was a zealous Papist, and a Bishop to boot: And it is evident, as he was either of these, it was not his interest to make our Reformers such friends to Episcopacy, if they were not such, really: For if they had not made that Distinction between Bishops and Presbyters, if they had professed the Divine Right of Parity, he had had good ground for accusing them of receding from the undoubted principles, and universal practice of the Catholic Church, in all times, and in all places, in a point of so great weight and consequence in the Government of the Church: Ane occasion which one of his Zeal for his party would not probably have neglected to take hold of; far less would he have lied so palpably to save the Reputation of his Adversaries.

2. As he had no temptation to falsify in this matter, so, he had all other Qualifications of a credible Witness. He lived in these times; he himself was a Clergyman, then; probably, he was a Member of that same Convocation to which the Petition was offered; and I think no man will doubt of his Abilities to comprehend such a matter. Indeed

3. If he forged this Article, he was ridiculously impudent at Forging; for as he did it without any imaginable necessity, without any shadow of a degree of subserviency to his Cause, so he put himself upon a necessity
De Episcopis quoque ac Pastoribous eligendis, æquum imprimis esse, ut, quæ jure canonico carentur, ea Santa testa maneat, neque novi quid, abrogatis veteribus, ullo modo surrogetur, id quoque prudentur ad jeicerunt, cum prælatorum Electione, in Regia potestate, suffragante summo pontifici, effert, de ea, in renella Regiae aetate, contra, quæquam statuti, sine aperta temeritatis nota, ae Regiae potestatis imminutione, nutlo modo posse, Leis. 504.

4. That he neither forged the Article, nor the Convocations Answer to it, we have further undoubted Evidence; for I have seen ane Old Manuscript Scottish History (which I can produce if I am put to it) which exactly agrees with Lesly, as to the Article; for thus it hath it, The Election of the Bishops and Kirkmen, to pass. by the Temporal Lords, and People, of their Diocesses and Parishes. And, Buchanan, upon the matter, gives that same account of the Convocations Answer, af Hoc etiam amplius, ad eam partem, quæ erat de Ministrorum Electione; in hoc genere Quæstionum, aut juris Canonici, aut Concillii Tridentini Decretis Standum, Buch. 587.
firming, that, As to the Election of Ministers they answered, That such Matters were to be regulated by the Canon Law, or the Decrees of the Council of Trent.

5. Neither will it be found of any force, to say, that Buchanan has not the Article; nor Spotiswood, whose interest it was to have had it, if such a thing had been, considering his Principles, and what was one of his principal designs in writing his History. This is of no force, I say, for if as for Buchanan, it is evident from the whole tract of his History, That he aimed, principally, at Matters of State, bringing in Church Matters only by the by, as we say, so that it is no wonder, if he did not record them accurately, and with all the preciseness of Nicety: And yet, even as he sums up the Petition, he has something in it which plainly imports, the Petitioners had no thought to interrupt the Continuation of Imparity; for thus he puts the last Article,

Si per superiorum temporum Negligentiam, in- docti flapiitiofive ad hono- res obrepissent, ut iis a Ministeriis Ecclesiae remo- tis, aliis sufficerentur. Buch. 586.

If, by the Negligence of former times, ignorant or wicked men had been advanced to Ecclesiastical Dignities, they might be removed, and others substitutet in their Offices. In which words, 'tis plain, that as there had been HONORES, Ecclesiastical Dignities, and MINISTE- RIA, different Offices amongst the Clergy before, to now, there was nothing like petitioning, for abrogating any of them. But that
that these Dignities might be better bestowed, and these Offices better provided: The Dignities and Offices were to continue, no Change to be made but of the Dignitaries and Officers. 2. As for Spotswod, as, I grant, it had been very proper for his purpose to have taken notice of the Article as it is in Lefly; so, that he took no notice of it, is no argument that Lefly was in the wrong; for, besides that there is no colour of reason for discrediting one Historians accounts, because another is silent about them; the truth is, whoever reads Spotswords History, and compares it with the rest of our Histories, will find a very great many such Defects: And we shall have a very clear, as well as a very considerable instance by and by, when we come to the next Petition. In the mean time, let me add another irrefragable Evidence (so I think) of Lefly's integrity, as to this Article. It is

6. That when our Reformers had carried the day, and so came to establish the Government of the Church, they exactly reduced to practice, that which they had petitioned for in the Article, in the Election of Superintendents; as is clear both from the First Book of Discipline, and the Form of Electing Superintendents, as it is to be seen both in the Old Scottish Liturgy, and in Knox his History.

In the Fifth Head of the First Book of Discipline, it was appointed (d) That the (d) Spots Council should nominate the Superintendents, 159.
or give Commission to men of best Knowledge, and who had the fear of God, to do it; the Gentle- 
men and Burgess of Towns, within the Dio- 
cesses, being always made privy to the Election. 

And 

In the Order for Electing Superintendents, as 
'tis both in the Old Liturgy, and Knox's Hi- 
story (e) we are told, that the Council having 
given charge and power to the Churches of Lo- 
thian, to choose Master John Spotwood, 
Superintendent, sufficient warning was made, by 
publick Edict, to the Churches of Edinburgh, 
Linlithgow, Sterling, Trenent, Hading- 
town and Dunbar; as also to Earls, Lords, 
Barons, Gentlemen, or others that had, or might 
claim to have, Voice in Election, to be present, 
&c. This was done in the beginning of 
the year 1561. Now 

Lay these two things together, and what 
is the Result? what else, than giving power 
to the Nobility and Gentry of the Dioces to elect 
their Bishop, according to the Article, as Lesly 
hath it in his Breviate of the Petition? Thus 
we have found Lesly honest, and his account 
just and genuine; and thereby (as I take it) 
this proposition fairly demonstrated, that 
our Reformers were so far from being Pres- 
byterian, so far from being for the divine 
institution, and indispensable right of Parity, 
that, on the contrary, they were clear for 
Imparity, for Episcopacy. But this is not 
all. 

The Second Petition which I mentioned, 
and which is set down in full form in Knox's 
History,
History, tho' it doth not name Bishops, is every whit as plain and decory, that the sentiments of our Reformers were no ways inimicous to Prelacy (if I may make use of a word made fashionable, by a Nobleman of the fashion.) But, on the contrary, that they were plainly for it. This I take to be so fully and fairly express'd in the fifth and last Article of that Petition, that I will here transcribe it word for word. (f) 

"Lastly, we require most humbly, that the wicked, slanderous and detestable life of Prelates, and of the State Ecclesiastical, may be reformed, that the people, by them, have not occasion (as of many days they have had) to contemn their Ministry, and the preaching whereof they should be Messengers. And if they suspect, that we rather envy their Honours, or covet their Riches and Possessions, than zealously desire their Amendment and Salvation, we are content, that not only the Rules and Precepts of the New Testament, but also THE WRITINGS of the ANCIENT FATHERS, and the GODLY and AP- PROVED LAWS of JUSTINIAN the EMPEROR, decide the Controversie betwixt us and them: And if it shall be found, that, either malevolently, or ignorantly, we ask more than these fore-named have required, and continually do require, of able and true Ministers, in Christ's Church, we refuse not Correction, as your Majesty, with right Judgment, shall think meet: But if all the fore-named shall condemn "THAT which we condemn; and approve"
"THAT which we require; then we most earnestly beseech your Majesty, that, notwithstanding the long Custom which they have had to live at their lust, they be compelled either to desist from Ecclesiastical Administration, or to discharge their Duties, as becometh True Ministers. So that, the GRAVE and GODLY FACE of the PRIMITIVE CHURCH being REDUCED, Ignorance may be expelled, true Doctrine and good Manners may once again appear in the Church of this Realm.

Here our Reformers lay down a complexe Rule, according to which they crave the Church, and the Ecclesiastical State may be Reformed: This complexe Rule, is made up of the Rules and Precepts of the New Testament, the Writings of the Antient Fathers, and the Godly and Approved Laws of the Emperor JUSTINIAN. This is that solid, orthodox, proper, and adequate Rule of Reformation, which I mentioned before; as Vincentius Livienensis his Rule, and the Rule wherein our Reformers agreed with the English Reformers: By this Rule, our Reformers are content, that all the Controversies betwixt them and the Papists, be decided; they refuse not Correction, if they ask more than this Rule requires; they condemn no more than this Rule condemns: This Rule approves all they are asking. In short, they require no more than that according to this Rule, the grave and godly Face of the Primitive Church may be restored, as it was in JUSTINIAN's time; Let the Ecclesiastical State be reduced to that Frame
Frame and Constitution, and the Clergy live, and rule, and discharge their Trusts and Offices, as the Clergy did then, and they are satisfied: And now, if these Reformers who thus petitioned, and, in their Petition, thus reasoned and agreed to such a Rule of Reformation, were for the divine institution of Parity, and the sacred Rights of Presbytery; nay if they were not, not only for the Lawfulness, but the Continuance of Prelacy; I must confess my ignorance to be very gross, and so I refuse not Correction.

For this Evidence, as I said we are beholden to Knox, and to Knox only: 'Tis true indeed, Calderwood (g) gives us the Abstract of this Petition, but he conceals and suppresses the whole pith and marrow of this Article, summing it up in these few ill-complexion'd words, That the slanderous and detestable life of the Prelates, and the State Ecclesiastical may be reformed; which, at first view, one would imagin, lookt kindly towards Presbytery; but I am not surprized to find him thus at his Tricks; 'tis but according to his Custom: To have let down the full Article, or to have abridged it so as that its force and purpose might have been seen, had been to disserve his Cause, and do ane ill Office to his Idol, Parity. And Petrie (as I have said) was so wise, as not to touch it at all, left it had burnt his Fingers: but that Archbishop Spotwood should have overlooked it both in his History, and in his Refutatio Libelli, &c. seems very strange. For my part
part I should rather think we have not his History imire, and as he design'd it for the Presf (for which, I have heard other very pregnant presumptions) than that so great a man was guilty of so great an Oscitancy. But whatever be of this, Knox has it, and that is enough; and Calderwood has abridged it, and that's more than enough for my Presbyterian Brethren.

The Third Petition which I promised to adduce, is that which was presented to the Parliament which established the Reformation Anno 1560, for which we are obliged to Knox alone also; at least, so far as the present Argument is concerned. (b) For tho both Spotswood and Petrie (i) make mention of the Petition or Supplication, yet neither of them has recorded that which I take notice of; and Calderwood is so accurate an Historian, as to take no notice of the Petition. That which I take notice of in it, as it is in Knox, is, That when our Reformers came to crave the Reformation of the Ecclesiastical State, they bespoke the Parliament thus. And lest that your Honours should doubt in any of the premises (they had affirmed before, That the Doctrine of the Roman Church contained many pestiferous errors; that the Sacraments of Jesus Christ were most shamefully abused and profaned by the Roman Harlot; that the true Discipline of the antient Church, amongst that Sect, was utterly extinguisht; and that the Clergy, of all men within the Realm, were most cor-

(b) Kn. 261.
(i) Spot. 750.
Petr. 219.
rupt in life and manners, &c.) we offer our selves evidently to prove, that in all the Rabble of the Clergy, there is not one Lawful Minister, If God's Word, the Practices of the Apostles, the Sincerity of the Primitive Church, and their own ancient Laws shall Judge of the Election. Here, I say, our Reformers insist on that same very Rule, for finding if there be Corruptions in, and by consequence for reforming of, the Church, on which they insisted, in the aforementioned Petition; from which, 'tis evident, they perliisted of the same sentiments, and 'tis easy to draw the same inferences.

Such were the sentiments of our Scottish Reformers, before the Reformed Religion had the countenance of the Civil Government, and Acts of Parliament on its side, and was made the National Religion. Let us try next what kind of Government they did establish, when they had got Law for them? Whither they established a Government that was to be managed by Ministers acting in Parity, or in Imparity? And, here, I think, the Controversy might very soon be brought to a very fair issue. The First Book of Discipline, the Acts of many General Assemblies, the Acts of many Parliaments, Both, without interruption; the unanimous Consent of Historians, and the uncontroverted Practice of the Church for many years; all concurring to this Assertion.
That the first Establishment was of a Government, which was to be managed by Superintendents, and Parochial Ministers, Elders and Deacons, acting in Subordination, not in a State of Parity with, but in a State of inferiority in Power and Jurisdiction to these Superintendents. This Establishment, I say, is so clear and undoubted from all these fountains, That no more needed be said upon the whole Argument. But because our Presbyterian Historians and Antiquaries, tho' they cannot deny the thing, do yet endeavor with all their Might and Cunning to intricate it, and obscure it; I shall, further, undertake two things.

I. I shall give the world a fair prospect of the power of Superintendents, as they were, then, established, and of the Disparities between them and Parish Ministers.

II. I shall endeavour to dissipate these Mistakes, whereby our Presbyterian Brethren are so very earnest to involve and darken this Matter. As for the

I. The world may competently see, that Superintendents as established in Scotland, at the Reformation, had a considerable stock of Prerogatives, or Preeminencies (call them as ye will) which raised them far above other Churchmen, far above the allowances of that Parity, our Presbyterian Brethren contend for so eagerly, from the following Enumeration.

1. They
1. They had Districts or Dioceses of far larger extent than other Churchmen: Private Ministers had only their private Parishes, and might have been as many as there were Churches in the Kingdom: But according to the Scheme laid down by our Reformers in the First Book of Discipline, Head 5. (a) only ten or twelve Superintendents were design'd to have the Chief Care (as it is worded in the Prayer at the Admission of a Superintendent) of all the Churches within the Kingdom: Indeed ten are only, there, design'd, but it was because of the scarcity of qualified men, as we shall learn hereafter.

2. As they had larger Districts than Parish Ministers, so, there were correspondent Specialties in their Election. Parish Ministers were to enter to such Churches as had Benefices, by presentation from the Patron, and Collation from the Superintendent, as is evident from Act 7. Parl. 1. 9am. 6. and many Acts of Assemblies, as shall be fully proven afterward. If they were to serve where the Benefice was actually possessed by a Papist, they were to be chosen by the People of the Congregation, by the appointment of the First Book of Discipline, Head 4. (b) But the Election of Superintendents was quite different; they were to be nominated by the Council, and elected by the Nobility and Gentry, &c. within their Dioceses, as hath been already considered.

3. There
3. There was as great a difference in the matter of Deposition, if they deserved it. Parish Ministers by the First Book of Discipline, Head 8. (i) were depoatable by the Superintendent of the Diocess, and the Elders of the Parishes, where they were Ministers; but of this more hereafter. (d) But by that same First Book of Discipline, the Superintendent was to be judged by the Ministers and Elders of his whole Province, over which he was appointed; and if the Ministers and Elders of the Province were negligent in correcting him, one or two other Superintendents, with their Ministers and Elders were to convene him; providing it were within his own Province, or Chief Town, and inflict the Censure which his Offence deserved. Of the Reasonableness of this afterward.

4. There was as remarkable a difference in point of Ordination, which in the then, Scottish style was called Admission. Private Ministers were to be admitted by their Superintendents, as we shall find afterwards.

But by the First Book of Discipline, Head 5.

(e) Superintendents were to be admitted by the Superintendents next adjacent, with the Ministers of the Province.

5. In the case of Translation, the General Assembly holden at Edinburgh, Decem. 25. 1562. Gives power to every Superintendent, within his own bounds, in his Synodal Assembly, with consent of the most part of the Elders and Ministers of Kirks, to translate Ministers from one Kirk to another, as they shall consider the Necessity; Charging
Charging the Minister so translated to obey the Voice and Commandment of the Superintendent, (f) But according to the First Book of Discipline, Head 5. (g) No Superintendent might be translated at the pleasure or request of any one Province, without the Council of the whole Church, and that for grave Causes and Considerations.

6. A special care was to be taken of his Qualifications and Abilities for such an important office, for thus it is appointed by the First Book of Discipline, Head 5. (h) That after the Church shall be established, and three years are past, no man shall be called to the Office of a Superintendent, who hath not, two years, at least, given a proof of his faithful Labours in the Ministry. A Caution simply unapplicable to Parish Ministers.

7. He had a living provided for him by the First Book of Discipline, Head 5. (i) about five times as much, yearly, as was allotted for any private Minister. And it is to be observed, that this was in a time when the Popish Bishops still brooked their Benefices. But when the Resolution was, Anno 1567, to deprive all the Popish Clergy, it was agreed to, in the General Assembly, by the Churchmen on the one hand, and the Lords and Barons on the other, That Superintendents should succeed in their places, as both the Mfs. and Spotswood have it expressly. (k)

8. Superintendents, by vertue of their Office, were constant Members of the General Assemblies:
Affemblies: Therefore the General Assembly helden at Perth, June 25. 1563. statuted, That every Superintendent be present the first day of the Assembly under the pain of 40 £, to be given to the poor without Remission. So it is in the Ms. but Petrie has it barely, That they shall convene on the first day of every Assembly. (l) And it seems, because that punishment had not sufficient influence on them, it was, again ordained by the G. Ass. at Edinburgh, March 6. 1573. That they shall be present in the Assembly, the first day, before noon, under the pain of losing one half of their stipend for a year, &c. So both the Ms. and Petrie. (m) But as we shall find afterwards, such presence of Parish Ministers was not allowed, far less necessary.

9. It belonged to them to try those who stood Candidates for the Ministry, thus, 1. B. of Difc. Head 4: (n) Such as take upon them the Office of Preachers, who shall not be found qualified therefore, by the Superintendent, are by him to be placed Readers. And again, (o) Ib. 5. (o) No Child, nor person within the age of 21 years, may be admitted to the Office of a Reader: but such must be chosen and admitted by the Superintendent, as for their Gravity and Discretion may grace the Function that they are called unto. And the Ass. at Edinburgh, Dec. 15. 1562. Ordains, That Inhibition be made against all such Ministers as have not been presented by the people, or a part thereof, to the Superintendent, and be, after Examination and Tryal, has not appointed them to their Charges. So
So the Ms. and so Petrie; (p) and Spotswood (p) Pet. cites another Act of the General Assembly 333. at Edinburgh 1564. to the same purpose. (q) (q) Spot:

10. As appears by that Act of the Assembly, just now cited, and the Act Parl. 1 Jac. 6. cited before; also Superintendents had the power of granting Collations upon presentations. And the Assembly at Perth, held in June 1563. appoints, That when any Benefice chances to vaik, or is now vacant, that a qualified person be presented to the Superintendent of that Province where the Benefice beth, and that he being found sufficient be admitted, &c. So I find it cited by the Author of Episcopacy not abjured in Scotland.

11. A Superintendent had power to plant Ministers in Churches, where the people were negligent to present timeously; and indeed that power devolved much sooner into his hands by the First Book of Discipline, Head 4. (r) than it did afterwards into the hands of either Bishop or Presbytery; for there it is ordered, That if the people be found negligent in electing a Minister, the space of forty days, the Superintendent with his Counsel may present unto them a man whom they judge apt to feed the flock, &c. And as he had thus the power of trying and collating Ministers, and planting Churches in the case of a fūs Devol. lunum. So

12. He had the power of Ordination, which, as I said, was then called Admission, as is evident from the First Book of Discipline, (cap. 5.) and several Acts of Assemblies already cited.

13. All
13. All Presbyters or Parish Ministers, once admitted to Churches, were bound to pay Canonical Obedience to their Superintendents. Thus in the Assembly at Edinburgh, June 30. 1562. It was concluded by the whole Ministers assembled, that all Ministers should be subject to the Superintendents in all lawful admonitions, as is prescribed, as well in the Book of Discipline, as in the Election of Superintendents. So the Ms. And by that aforesaid Act of the Assembly at Edinburgh, Decem. 25. 1562. Ministers translated from one Church to another, are commanded to obey the Voice and Commandment of the Superintendent. Indeed, it was part of one Article presented by the Church to the Council, May 27. 1561. That one Act should be made appointing a (civil) Punishment for such as disobeyed or contemned the Superintendents in their Function. (s)

14. He had power to visit all the Churches within his Diocese, and in that Visitation (they are the words of the First Book of Discipline, Head 5. (t) To try the Life, Diligence and Behaviour of the Ministers, the Order of their Churches, the Manners of their People, how the Poor are provided, and how the Youth are instructed, &c. And further,

In these Visitations he had power, particularly, to take account of what Books every Minister had, and how he profited from time to time by them. By Act of Assembly at Edinburgh, June 29. 1562. So'tis in the Ms.

15. He had power to depose Ministers that deserved it; as appears from the First Book of
of Discipline, Head 8. already cited. And by the Assembly at Edinburg, March 6. 1573. It is statuted that, if any Minister reside not at the Church where his Charge is, he shall be summoned before his Superintendent, or Commissioner of the Province, to whom the Assembly gives power to depose him, &c. So the Mfs. and Petrie. (w) 16. He had power to translate Ministers from one Church to another, as appears from the Act already cited, Num. 4. and by ane Act of the Assembly at Edinburg, June 25. 1564. It is concluded, that a Minister, being once placed, may not leave that Congregation without the Knowledge of the Flock, and Consent of the Superintendent, or whole Church: (i.e. a General Assembly) So the Mfs. and so Pet. (v) These are all powers, methinks, scarcely reconcilable with ane opinion of the Divine Right of Parity; but there are more, and perhaps, more considerable, as yet to follow. For 17. He had power to nominate Ministers to be Members of the General Assembly. This is clearly asserted by the Acts of two General Assemblies: The first at Edinburg, in June 1562. where it was ordained, That no Minister leave his Flock for coming to the Assembly, except he have complaints to make, or be complained of, or at least be warned thereto by the Superintendent. So ’tis in the Mfs. and Spotswod cites it in his Refutatio Libelli, &c. The other Act was made by the Assembly holden at Edinburg, July 1. 1563. which I find
I find thus worded in the M's, fairly agreeing with Spotswood. (x) Anent the Order hereafter to be used in General Assemblies—— They all voted and concluded as followeth, viz. That if the Order already received, pleases not, by reason of the Plurality of Voices, it be reformed in this manner.

First, That none have place to vote, except Superintendents, Commissioners appointed for visit- ing the Kirks, and Ministers brought with them, presented as persons able to reason, and having knowledge to judge; with the aforesaid shall be joined Commissioners of Burghs and Shires, together with Commissioners of Universities. Secondly, Ministers and Commissioners shall be chosen at the Synodal Convention of the Diocess, by Consent of the rest of the Ministers and Gentlemen, that shall convene at the said Synodal Convention, &c. From which it is plain, that the Superinten- dent or Commissioner (who was a temporary Superintendent) nominated the Ministers they brought with them to the Assembly; and that the rest of the Ministers, &c. had only a power of consenting; and so it was, thereafter, practised unquestionably. And if there were need of more Light, it might be copiously received from the Lord Glamis his Letter to Mr. Beza, Anno 1576, where- in he tells him, that it had been the Custom, ever since the Reformation, that the Superintendents, or Bishops,
still nominated the Ministers, who met in the General Assemblies, than which, nothing can be more distinct and plain. And this Testimony is the more considerable, that it was not Glamis his own private deed, but that which was the Result of a considerable Consult; as we shall learn hereafter.

This was such a Branch of Episcopal power as mightily offended our Presbyterian Historians, it seems, for they have endeavoured to obscure it as much as they could: Neither Calderwood nor Petrie mentions the first of these two Acts; they mention the second, indeed, but how? Calderwood (y) huddles it up thus, It was thought meet, for eschewing of Confusion, that this Order be followed— That none have place, nor power to vote, except Superintendents, Commissioners appointed for visiting of Kirks, Ministers, Commissioners of Burghs and Shires, together with the Commissioners of Universities. Ministers and Commissioners of Shires shall be chosen at the Synodal Convention of the Diocesses, with consent of the rest of the Ministers and Gentlemen, &c. Leaving out intirely these words [brought with them (i. e. with the Superintendents and Commissioners of Kirks) presented as persons able to reason, and having knowledge to judge] whereby the power of the Superintendents and Commissioners for visiting of Kirks, is quite stifled, and the whole sense of the Act perverted; for what sense is it, I pray, to say that the Ministers were to be chosen by consent of the rest of the Ministers, when you tell not
who was to choose, or who they were, to whose Choice or Nomination the rest of the Ministers were to give that consent? But it is no strange thing with this Author to let sense shift for it self, if the good Cause cannot be otherwise served. Neither is Petrie less unfaithful, for, he not only draws the Curtain over the whole power of the Superintendent, &c. so that you cannot have the least Glimpse of it from his account; But he intermixes lies to boot; only he stumbles not on Nonsense. He accounts thus, (z)

Because heretofore all Ministers, that would come, were admitted to vote; (not one word of this, in the Narrative of the Act, as it is in the MS. or any other Historian; and it is directly contrary to the Act 1562, already mentioned; so that 'tis plain it is a figment of his own) And now the Number is increased, and Commissioners of Shires were chosen in the Sheriff Court (no other Historian, or Record I have seen, has one syllable of this either, tho 'tis probable enough it was so) This Assembly makes an Act of three parts, concerning the Admission of Members: 1. That none shall have place to vote, but Superintendents, Commissioners for visiting Churches, Ministers and Commissioners of Shires and Burghs, chosen as follows, together with Commissioners of Universities. 2. Ministers and Commissioners of Shires shall be chosen at the Synod of the Bounds, by the Ministers and Gentlemen convening there, &c. Not, with the consent of the rest of the Ministers, &c. you see, as Calderwood ridiculously
culouly had it, but, *chosen by the Ministers; &c.* without the least syllable that might import the Superintendents having any (and far less the principal) power in that Election. This is clean work of it. Thus, I say, these two Historians of the Party treat this notable branch of the power which our Reformers thought reasonable to confer on Superintendents; but we shall not want occasions enough, for admiring their ingenuity. Return we now to our task.

18. They had *power to hold Diocesan Synods:* Or "dains further (they are the words of ane Act of the Ass. holden in Decem. 1562. as 'tis both in the Mfs. and Pet. * (a)*) (a)1b.233. That the Superintendents appoint Synodal Conventions twice in the year, viz. in the months of April and October, on such days of the said months as the Superintendents shall think good. Whereby two things appear, 1. That he had the sole appointment of the day of meeting. 2. That he alone was Pres. of the meeting; indeed they are frequently, or rather constantly, called his Synods.

19. Superintendents had *power,* within their own bounds, to appoint Diocesan Fasts, granted to them, by ane Act of the Assembly holden at Edinburgh, March 5. 1570. For there it is enacted, *That all Superintendents and Commissioners to plant Kirks, in their first Synodal Conventions, hereafter following, with the advice of their Ministers, shall reason and appoint publick Fasting, if it shall be thought necessary.* So the Mfs. and Petrie. * (b) (b)1b.359*
20. Another considerable instance of the power of Superintendents, was that of modifying or assigning to Parish Ministers, their Stipends or Livings. This is clear from an Act of the General Assembly, holden at Edinburgh on the seventh of July 1569, as it is both in (c) Ib. 365, the Mfs. and Petrie (r) wherein, The Kirk presently convened found it most needful and expedient that all Superintendents, Ministers, Exhorters and Readers, should have their own particular Assignations (out of the Thirds of Benefices, as shall be more fully discoursed hereafter) appointed them, to be received from the hands of the Labourers respective, or others added to in payment of the Thirds. And therefore the Kirk in one voice by this their Act, gave their full power and commission to every Superintendent and Commissioner, within their own bounds, with Advice and Consent of their Synodal Conventions, to give to every Minister, Exhorter and Reader, particular assignments ad vitam, as they should find the same expedient, under the Superintendents Subscription, and Ministers aforesaid, with all Clauses needful and expedient thereto; which shall be as sufficient, as if the same were sped by the General Assembly of the Kirk; and as concerning the Superintendents and Commissioners of Kirks, their Provision and Assignation to be made by the General Assembly.

21. Appeals were to be made to them from inferior Judicatories. Thus, by the Assembly (d) Mfs. at Perth in June 1563. (d) Concerning the Order Pet. 237. of Appellation, it is statuted and ordained, that, Cald. 33. if any person find himself hurt, by any Sentence, given
given by any Minister, Elders or Deacons (i.e., by any Kirk Session, as we call them) It shall be lawful for the person so hurt, to appeal to the Superintendent of the Diocese, and his Synodal Convention, within ten days, next after; and the said Superintendent shall take Cognition, whether it was well appealed or not, and give his sentence thereupon. 'Tis true indeed. (and it was reasonable) by the same Act, the person, if he thought himself injured, by the Superintendent's sentence, might appeal to the General Assembly. Nay,

22. If the Superintendent found it Male Appellatum, he had power of Fining; thus it is ordered by the same Assembly. If the Appellant justifies not his Appellation, before the Superintendent and his Convention aforesaid; then the Superintendent shall impute a pain upon the said Appellant, as he shall think good, beside the expense of the party. That he had this power is all I am concerned for; let others judge whether it was purely Ecclesiastical. And as the Superintendent had this power of receiving Appeals made from inferior Courts, so agreeably

23. He had the power, with the advice of his Synod, or such of the Ministers of his Diocese as he should choose for that purpose, to determine intricate Cases of Conscience or Government. Thus, by the Assembly at Edinburg, Decem. 25. 1564. (e) It is ordained, that no Questions be proposed by any Brother, till the affairs of the Kirk, and the Order thereof be first treated and ended; and thereafter, if any

(e) Ms. Pet. 34x.
Brother have a Question, worthy to be proposed, that the same be presented in writ; and if the same requires hasty Resolution, it shall be decided in the present Assembly before the end thereof; otherwise, the Decision of the same shall be referred to every one of the Superintendents, within whose bounds the Question is proposed; and they, and every one of them, with a certain number of Ministers, as they shall think meet to appoint, for assisting, shall hear the Reasonings of the aforesaid Questions, and thereafter present the Reasons in writ affirmative, or negative, which every one of them shall report to the next Assembly. Again, by the Assembly holden at Eden in July 1568. (f) It is statuted and ordained, that Ministers, Exhorters, Readers, or other persons, hereafter, trouble not, nor molest, the General Assembly, with such things as Superintendents may, and ought to decide in their Synodal Conventions; and if any chance to do hereafter, in the contrary, their Letters shall be rejected. Which Act, as is obvious, extends both to Cases of Right and of Fact; and extending to Cases of Fact, it clears a little further, the former Head of Appeals, intimating fairly, that they were not to be made per saltum, neither yet Delations; but both in their proper Gradation, were to be brought, first, before the Superintendent, and by him, only, if he thought it needful, to be advanced, before the General Assembly: But most home to the present point, is the Act of the Assembly March 5. 1571. (g) by which it is statuted, That all Questions be first proposed.
proposed to Superintendents, or Commissioners, in their Synodal Conventions, and there, receive Solution; and if they think them too hard, that they bring them to the General Assembly; but that no private Ministers bring Questions to the Assembly prima instantia.

24. It belonged to the Superintendents, particularly, to judge of Divorces; a point of great intricacy, as well as importance: Thus, I find, the Assembly at Edinburgh, Decem. 25. 1562. (as it is in the Mss.) ordains, That no Ministers, nor others bearing Office in the Kirk, take in hand to cognosce or decide in the Actions of Divorcement, except the Superintendents; and they, to whom they shall give special Commission,

25. It was a branch of their power also to injoin Penance to greater Criminals: So the General Assembly holden at Edinburgh, June 25. 1564. (as it is in the Mss.) where it is thus, Touching such as relapse the third time in any kind of crime, such as Fornication or Drunkenness, it is statuted and ordained, that no particular Minister admit such persons to Repentance, but that they send them to the Superintendent of the Diocess, where the crimes are committed, with information; who shall give them such injunctions, as they think may make the offence to be helden in horror; but chiefly that they compel the Offender to satisfy where the Offences were made, more days than one, as the Superintendent shall think good. And by the Gen. Ass. at Eden. March 5. 1571. (b) It is (h) Mss. ordained that Adulterers, and other such [sic] been
dalose persons, shall hereafter be called by the Superintendent or Commissioner of the Province, to compear before their Synodal Convention, and there receive their injunctions. And accordingly we find the Custom of the Church in those times, particularly, in the Case of the Countess of Argyle, Anno 1567. She had been guilty of a mighty scandal in being present at the Christening of the Prince, (afterwards James the Sixth) which was performed after the Popish manner; she behoved therefore to give satisfaction to the Church: And was ordered to do it, by the General Assembly, in such manner, and at such time, as the Superintendent of Lothian, (within whose bounds the Scandal was committed) should appoint. So both Spot. and

26. Another branch, was, to restore Criminals to the Exercises of their Offices, if they had any dependance on the Church, after they had performed their Penance, and received Absolution. Thus Thomas Duncanson, Reader at Sterling, had fallen in the Sin of Fornication; for this he was silenced: He had performed his Penance, and was absolved. Then the Question was put to the General Ass. met at Eden. Decem. 25. 1563. Whether having made publick Repentance, he might be restored to his Office? And the Assembly determined, He might not, till the Church of Stirling should make Request to the

27. To
27. To the Superintendents was reserved the power of Excommunication, in Cases of Contumacy, &c. Thus it is statuted by the Gen. Ass. at Eden, July 1. 1562. That in Cases of Contumacy the Minister give notice to the Superintendent, with whose advice Excommunication is to be pronounced. So. the Mfs. and both the Mfs. and Petrie have another long Act of the Assembly holden at Eden. Sept. 25. 1565. to the same purpose. (1)

28. It belonged also to them to delate Atrocious Criminals to the Civil Magistrate, that condign corporal punishments might be inflicted on them. To this purpose, I find it enacted by a Convention of the Kirk (as it is called in the Mfs.) met at Eden, Decem. 15. 1567. to wait on the motions of the Parliament, That Ministers, Elders and Deacons make search within their bounds, if the crimes of Incest or Adultery were committed, and to signify the same to the Superintendent, that he may notify it to the Civil Magistrate. Such was the power of Superintendents in the Government of the Church, and her Discipline. But because, several things may have relation to the Church, tho not formally and directly, yet reductively, and by way of Analogical Subordination, their power extended even to these things also, I shall only instance in two.

29. Then, because Universities, Colleges and Schools, are the Seminaries of Learning; and by consequence Nurseries for the Ministry; the power of Superintendents over them, was
was very considerable. Thus by the First Book of Discipline, Head 5. (m) if, e. g. The Principal, or Head of any College within the University of St. Andrews died, the Members of the College, being sworn to follow their Consciences, were to nominate three of the most sufficient men within the University: This done, the Superintendent of Fife, by himself, or his special Procurators, with the Rector and the rest of the Principals, were to choose one of these three, and constitute him Principal. And when the Rector was chosen, he was to be confirmed by the Superintendent, (n) by that same Book: And again, by that same Book (o) The Money collected in every College for upholding the Fabric, was to be counted and employed at the sight of the Superintendent. Further, the Gen. Ass. convened at Eden. Jan. 25. 1565. presented this Article in a Petition to the Queen, That none might be permitted to have charge of Schools, Colleges, or Universities, &c. but such as should be tried by the Superintendents. So 'tis in the Ms.'Tis true it was not granted at that time; but it shews the inclinations of our Reformers, as much as if it had been granted. And because it was not granted then, it was proposed again in the Ass. in July 1567. and consented to by the Nobility and Gentry, and ratified by the Eleventh Act of the First Parliament of King James the Sixth, in December, that same year. And accordingly we find the Laird of Dun. Superintendent of Angus and
and Mearns, in July 1563, holding a Visitation of the University of Aberdeen, and by formal sentence turning out all the Popish Members. The very air and style of the Sentence, as Petrie hath it (p) is a notable Evidence of the paramount power of Superintendents; for thus it runs. I, John Areskin, Superintendent of Angus and Mearns, having Commission of the Church to visit the Sheriffdoms of Aberdeen and Bamf, by the Advice, Counsel, and Consent of the Ministers, Elders and Commissioners of the Church, present, decree, conclude, and for final Sentence pronounce, That Master Alexander Anderson, &c.

30. Because bad Principles may be disseminated by bad Books, and thereby both the Purity and Peace of the Church may be endangered; the Revising and Licensing of Books was committed to the Care of the Superintendents, by the General Ass. holden in June 1563. whereby it is ordained, That No work be set forth in Print, neither yet published in Writ, touching Religion or Doctrine, until such time as it shall be presented to the Superintendent of the Diocess, and advised and approved by him, or by such as he shall call, of the most learned within his bounds, &c. (q)

Thus I have collected no fewer than Thirty Disparities betwixt Superintendents, as they were established in Scotland, by our Reformers, and private Parish Ministers; each of them a Demonstration of inequality either of power or figure; perchance a more nice and accurate Enquirer may find out more:

(q) Mis. Pet. 237.
more: But methinks these may be sufficient for my purpose, which was to give the world a fair prospect of the Preheminence of Superintendents, and of the Differences betwixt them and other Churchmen. And having thus perform'd the first part of my Undertaking, it is obvious to all who can pretend to be of the thinking part of mankind, that the second part is needless. For if these 30 Disparities amount not to an invincible proof, that our Church, at the Reformation, was not govern'd by Ministers acting in parity, I may justly despair of ever proving any thing. Yet because I know many simple and less thinking people, are imposed on by the Noise and Dust our Presbyterian Brethren have raised about this matter; I shall proceed to the next thing I undertook, which was

II. To dissipate these Mistakes, wherewith our Parity-men are so very earnest to involve and darken this Prelatical power of Superintendents. They may be reduced to these Three.

1. The Establishments of Superintendents was only temporary, and for the then Necessities of the Church; Superintendency was not intended to be a perpetual Standing Office.
2. It was not the same with Episcopacy.
3. It was never established by Act of Parliament.

Tis pleaded that Superintendency was only design'd to be a temporary, not a perpetual
Thus speaking of the First Book of Discipline, we may safely say (says he) the whole was recommended to be perpetually observed, except some few things, as the Office of Superintendents—whereunto they were forced, as they thought, by necessity, &c. And in his Breviate of the first book of Discipline he offers at a Reason why it was so. They make aDifference, at this time among Ministers, some to be Superintendents, some to be ordinary Ministers; not because Superintendents were of divine institution, as one Order to be observed perpetually in the Kirk, but because they were forced only, AT THIS TIME, to make the Difference, left, if all Ministers should be appointed to make continual Residence in several places, when there was so great Rarity of Preachers, the greatest part of the Realm should be destitute of the preaching of the word. And G. R. in his first Vindication of the Church of Scotland, printed at Edinburgh 1691, in answer to the first of the ten Questions, following Calderwood exactly, (as, indeed, he doth all alongst; and it seems he has never read another of our Historians, so that he had some reason to call him, THE HISTORIAN, ibid.) delivers it thus: 'Tis true the Protestant Church of Scotland did set up Superintendents, but this was truly, (and declared so to be) from the Force of Necessity, and design'd only for that present Exigency of the Church, &c. And more pointedly in his true Representation of Presbyterian Government, printed at Edinburgh 1690.
prop. 18. where he lays it down as an undesigned truth, that Superintendency was only established through necessity, when a qualified Minister could scarcely be had in a Province, &c. And Petrie seems to aim at the same way of reasoning. Now (c)

1. Supposing all this true, what ground have they gained by it? Do they not fairly acknowledge, that the Prelacy of Superintendents was established at the Reformation? And is not that all I am concerned for? For the question is not whither Superintendency was design'd to be perpetual or temporary? but whither it was a Prelacy? And if it was a Prelacy, the Church of Scotland was not, then, govern'd by Ministers acting in parity. The Perpetuity, or Temporariness of it doth not affect its nature: If it was a Prelacy at all, it was as really a Prelacy, tho it had lasted but for a Day, as it had been, tho it had lasted till the Day of Judgment. Just as our Presbyterian Brethren were as really Addressers to K. by addressing once, as they should have been, tho they had continued addressing to him till this very minute. This alone, in all conscience, might be enough for discussing this plea. Yet, that I may not offend the Party, by seeming to think so meanly of this mighty argument: I shall insist a little longer, and consider

2. If they have any sufficient Fund, in the Records of these times, for this pretence? And

3. What
3. What Force or Solidity is in the reason insisted on to make this pretence seem plausible? As to the first, viz. Whether there is any sufficient Fund in the Records of these times for this pretence? All I have observed insisted on for this, is only one phrase in the fifth Head of the First Book of Discipline, AT THIS TIME. Take the whole period as it is in Petrie; for he censures Spotwood for curtailing it. As Petrie has it, it runs thus. If the Ministers whom God hath endued with his singular Graces, among us, should be appointed to several places, there to make their continual Residence, the greatest part of the Realm should be destitute of all Doctrine; which should not only be the occasion of great Murmur, but also dangerous to the Salvation of many; and therefore we have thought it a thing expedient AT THIS TIME, That from the whole number of Godly and Learned Men, now, presently, in this Realm, be selected Ten or Twelve (for in so many Provinces we have divided the whole) to whom Charge and Commandment should be given to plant and erect Kirks, to set, order, and appoint Ministers to the Countries, that shall be appointed to their care, where none are now. (d) This is the whole foundation of the Plea, for the Temporariness of Superintendency; but, if I mistake not, the true Gloss of this period, will amount to no more than this, "That because there were, then, so few men qualified for the Office of Superintendency, tho Ten or Twelve were, by far, too small a number for the whole
whole Kingdom, yet, at that time, they thought it expedient to establish no more. And tho, when the Church should be sufficiently provided with Ministers, it would be highly reasonable, that the Superintendents should have places appointed them, for their continual Residence; yet, in that juncture, it was necessary that they should be constantly travelling thro' their Districts, to preach and plant Churches, &c. That the period will bear this Gloss is obvious to any who considers it impartially. And that this, and not the Presbyterian, is the true Gloss, I hope, may competently appear, if these things be considered.

I. It is notorious, that the Compilers of that First Book of Discipline, were generally, to their dying day, of Prelatical Principles. They were six, as Knox tells us: (e) Mr. John Winram, who died Superintendent of Strathern; John Spotswood, who was many years a Superintendent, and a constant Enemy to parity, as appears from his Sons account of him. (f) John Willock, who died Superintendent of the West. John Douglas, who died Archbishop of St. Andrews. John Row, who was one of the three that defended the Lawfulness of Episcopacy, at the Conference appointed by the General Assembly 1575; and John Knox, of whom we have said enough already. Now, I ask, is it credible, that these men, all, so much for Prelacy, all their Lives, without any constraint on them
(As 'tis certain, there was none) should, while digesting a Model of Policy, have been only for a Prelacy that was to be laid aside, within, God knows, how short a time; so soon as the Parish Churches could be planted with Ministers? I know nothing can be said here, unless it be, that Knox was not so prelatical as the rest, and he would have it so, and the rest have yielded: But there's no ground for this. For

2. Even Knox himself, if he was the Author of the History which bears his Name, amongst our Presbyterian Brethren, assigns a quite other reason than the then Necessities of the Church, for the Establishment of Superintendency: Superintendents and Overseers were nominated (says he) that all things in the Church, might be carried with order, and well. A Reason, which, as it held since the Apostles times, will continue to hold so long as the Church continues. And is it not told again in that same History, (b) That, at the Admission of Spotwood to the Superintendency of Lothian, John Knox in his Sermon asserted, the Necessity of Superintendents or Overseers, as well as Ministers? The Necessity, I say, and not the bare Expediency, in that juncture. Further, now that I have Knox on the Stage, I shall repeat over again, a Testimony of his, which I have once transcribed already from his Exhortation to England for the speedy embracing of Christ's Gospel. Let no man be charged in preaching of Christ Jesus (says he) above that
that which a man may do: I mean, that your Bishopricks be so divided, that of every one, (as they are now for the most part) may be made ten; and so in every City, and great Town, there may be placed a godly learned Man, with so many joined with him, for preaching and instruction, as shall be thought sufficient for the bounds committed to their Charge. Than which testimony, it is not possible to find a better Comment upon that period of the First Book of Discipline, (penned also by Knox himself) which is the subject of our present Controversie; and it agrees exactly with my Gloss: For, from this Testimony, it is clear, that he was for a great number of Bishops, and little Diocesses; and that in a Church sufficiently provided with Ministers, the Bishop should not be obliged to travel from place to place, for preaching; but might stay at the Chief City or Town of his Diocese. What I have said, might be sufficient for preferring Mine, to the Presbyterian Gloss: But I have more to say. For

3. This sense of the period accords exactly with the whole tenour of the First Book of Discipline; in which, there's not another syllable, the most partial Reader can say, favours the mistaken Conception about the Temporariness of Superintendency, but much to the contrary. Thus

In the Head of the Election of Superintendents (k) the very first words are, Such is the present Necessity, that the Examination and Admission of Superintendents cannot be so strict as afterwards

(k) Spot.
afterwards it must. Clearly importing, that, as Necessity forced them to establish a small number at first, so also, to take them as they could have them; but that a stricter accuracy in their tryal would be needful, when the number of qualified men should increase, which runs quite counter to the whole design of the Presbyterian Gloss.

Again, (f) If so many able men cannot be (g) Ibid found at present, as Necessity requireth, it is better that these Provinces wait till God provide, than that men unable to edify and govern the Church be suddenly placed in the Charge, &c. Another Demonstration, why, at that time, they established so few Superintendents.

Again, (m) If any Superintendent shall de-(m) Ibid part this life, or happen to be deposed, Rules are laid down for supplying the Vacancy. But to what purpose, if Superintendency was to be of so short continuance?

Farther yet, (n) After the Church shall be (n)Ib.160 established, and three years are past, no man shall be called to the Office of a Superintendent, who hath not, two years, at least, given a proof of his faithful Labours in the Ministry of some Church. What could more plainly import, that the Office was to be durable?

Once more, (o) When this Book of Disci- (o)Ib.162 pline comes to the business of the Universi- 163 ties, it supposes that Superintendents and Colleges were to be of equal continuance; for the Superintendent was still to be at the choos- ing and installment of Principals and Re¬tors; and the Moneys collected for upholding the Fa-
brick, were to be counted yearly upon the 15th day of November, in the presence of the Superintendent of the bounds, and_imployed with his advice, &c. Neither is this all yet; For

4. The Form and Order of the Election of the Superintendent, to be found both in Knox's History, (p) and the Old Scottish Liturgy, is every way as part for the continuance of the Office, as the First Book of Discipline. For the first thing we meet with there, (as I have already observed) is, The Necessity of Ministers, and Superintendents or Overseers without any Exception or Speciality about the one more than the other. And as our Reformers had petitioned the Government for the Establishment of a Method, to be observed in the Election of Bishops and Presbyters, without any intimations of the Temporariness of either Office; as we have shewed before; so, here we find it put in practice (as hath likewise, before, been observed) without so much as one syllable, favouring the Presbyterian side of the present Controversie; but on the contrary, all along for mine. Thus,

The People are asked, If they will obey and honour him as Christ's Minister, and comfort and assist him in every thing pertaining to his Charge? And their Answer is, They will, and they promise him such Obedience, as becometh Sheep to give unto their Pastor, (not so long as the present Necessity forceth, or, the present Exigence requireth, but) so long as he remaineth faithful
faithful in his Charge. In short, the Order or Form for admitting a Superintendent, and a Parish Minister, was all one; and there was nothing in it importing the one Office to be temporary, more than the other. And, however Calderwood thought fit to affirm, That Superintendents were not, then, established as of Divine Institution; yet, in all this Form the divine Institution of their Office, is as much to be found as the divine Institution of Ordinary Ministers. The People, as we had it just now, were asked, if they would obey him as Christ's Minister? And he himself was asked, If he knew that the Excellency of this Office, to the which GOD CALLED HIM did require that his Conversation should be irreprehensible? And again it was asked the People, Will ye not acknowledge this your Brother for the Minister of Christ Jesus? Your Overseer and Pastor? Will ye not maintain and comfort him in his Ministry and watching over you, against all such as wickedly would rebel against God, and HIS HOLY ORDINANCE? And in the Prayer after his Inauguration, we have this petition, Send unto this our Brother, whom, IN THY NAME, we have charged with THE CHIEF CARE of thy Church within the bounds of Lothian, &c. Thus our Reformers thought of Superintendency when they composed this Form. Now, if they looked upon it as God's Ordinance, &c. with what reason can it be said, they designed it meerly to be temporary, and for the, then, Necessities of the Church. I think it will
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be hard to prove, that it was the Divinity of these times, that men might dispense with divine Institutions; but of this more afterwards. In the mean time, proceed we to a further, and indeed, an irreproachable Topick for confirming my side of the present Controversie; and that is

5. That, as the First Book of Discipline, and the Form of admitting Superintendents, do both fairly import, that our Reformers intended nothing less than the Temporariness of Superintendents, so 'tis as clear from a vast number of Acts of General Assemblies.

Most of these Acts I have already adduced for shewing the Disparities between Superintendents and Ordinary Ministers, when they are seriously considered, will be found uncontrovertibly to this purpose: But there are many more; for example consider these following.

The Assembly May 27, 1561, (a) addressed to the Council, That special and certain provision might be made for the Maintenance of the Superintendents, Ministers, Exhorters and Readers; and that Superintendents and Ministers might be planted where none were.

The Assembly at Eden. Decem. 25, 1562, (as the Ms. has it) enacted, That, notwithstanding the proposing and nominating of the Superintendents for Aberdeen, Bamf, Jedburgh, and Dumfries, appointed before in the Third Session: and the days appointed for the Election of the same; the further Advisement and Nomination of the persons should be remitted to the Lords
Lords of the secret Council; providing, always, that the days appointed for their Election be not prolonged. Observe here that Aberdeen and Bamf were now design'd, each to have their Superintendent, whereas both were to be under one by the first Nomination, in the Book of Discipline.

One of the Articles ordered by the Assembly at Eden, Decem. 25. 1564. to be presented to the Queen, was, To require that Superintendents might be placed in the Realm, where none were, viz. in the Mers, Teviotdale, Forset Twedale, and the rest of the Dales, in the South, not provided; with Aberdeen, and the other parts of the North, likewise desitute: So it is in the Ms. Petrie (b) has it only (b) Pet. in short, That Superintendents be placed where 34 none are. But as it is in the Ms. it shews plainly that, now that the Church was of four years standing, and the number of qualified men was increasing, the Assembly were for increasing, proportionally, the number of Superintendents: As is demonstrated thus; by the Establishment in the First Book of Discipline, the Superintendent of Lothians Dioeces comprehended the Sheriffdoms of Lothian, Stirling, Mers, Lauderdale, and Twedale. (c) Spotswod was set over this Dioeces in March 1569. He was still alive, (c) Spot, and in the Exercise of his Office; and yet 158 here, now, the Assembly craves that Superintendents may be placed in the Mers and Twedale, and the rest of the Dales. From which it follows, that that which was but
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one Diocets, Anno 1560. when qualified men were few, was design'd by the Assembly, Anno 1564. when the number of qualified men was somewhat increased, to be divided, at least, into three or four. Exactly agreeable to what I have all along asserted.

In the Assembly at Eden. July 20. Anno 1567. That famous Assembly, whereof Buchanan was Moderator, and which tum-bled Queen Mary from her Throne, it was agreed, by the Nobility and Barons on the one hand, and the Church on the other, That all the Popish Clergy should be dispossessed, and that Superintendents, Ministers and other NEEDFUL MEMBERS of the Kirk, should be planted in their places. So it is in the

(d) Ib. 210. M.'s. and so Spotwood hath it: (d) But both Calderwood and Petrie, tho they mention the thing, yet, labour to obscure it; for they do not so much as name Superintendents, far less, take notice that, they are reckoned amongst the Necessary Members, or were to succeed the Popish Bishops. (e)

Farther, by the Aff. at Eden. July 1. 1568. it is resolved, To advise with my Lord Regent his Grace and Council, that in the Rowms and Countreys where no Superintendents are, they may be placed. So the M's. and Pet. (f) Nay

Doth not Calderwood himself tell us, that, the Aff. Holden at Eden. March 1. 1570. when it appointed the Order to be observed thereafter, in handling affairs brought before General Assemblies, ordained, in the sixth
sixth place, That the Complaints of Countrey
for want of Superintendents should be heard and
provided for, &c. (g) Further, doth not the
same Calderwood record, that, when in the
year 1574. the Superintendents of Angus,
Lothian, and Strathern, would have dimitted
their Office, the Assembly would not ad-
mit of their Dimission, but ordered them
to continue in their Function? (b) For
what reason they offered to demit, perhaps,
we shall learn hereafter. All I am con-
cerned for at present is, that the Assembly
would needs continue them in their Office
now, fourteen years after the first legal
Establishment of the Reformation. The
truth is, this Assembly was holden in March,
and Master Andrew Melvill, the Protoplast
Presbyterian in Scotland, came not to the
Kingdom, till July thereafter.

By this time, I think, I have made it
appear, that our Reformers intended no-
thing less than to make Superintendency only
temporary, and subservient to the then pre-
tended Necessities of the Church. And like-
wise I have sufficiently made it appear, that
it was merely for scarcity of qualified men,
that so few Superintendents were at first de-
sign'd, by the First Book of Discipline; which
was the one half of my Gloss upon the con-
troverted period in that Book.

The other half; which was, that when
once the Church was competently provided
with Parish Ministers, the Superintendents
were no longer obliged to their Evangelistical
way
way of travelling constantly through their Diocesses, to preach, &c. is plain from what both Petrie and Spotswond agree in, as contained in the Book., viz. That they were to follow that method no longer than their Kirks were provided of Ministers, or, at least, of Readers. (i) Thus I have dispatched the first thing which was proposed to be enquired into, viz. Whither there was any sufficient fund in the Records of these times, for believing that our Reformers intended, that Superintendency should only be temporary. It remains now that we should consider the

2. viz. What Force or Solidity is in the reason insisted on by our Presbyterian Brethren, to make this pretence seem plausible?

The reason insisted on, by them, is, The Force of Necessity; there being so few men, then, qualified for the Ministry; scarcely one in a Province, &c. Now who sees not that this so often repeated reason is entirely naught and inconsequential? For, what tho, in these times, there were few qualified men for the Ministry? How follows it, that therefore it was necessary to raise up Superintendents, and set them above their Brethren? If the principles of parity had, then, been the modist principles, could not these few, who were qualified, have govern'd the Church, suitably to these principles? Suppose we Twenty, Thirty, Forty men, in the Kingdom, qualified for the Office of the Ministry; could not these
20, or 30, or 40, have divided the Kingdom into a proportionable number of large Parishes? And, still, as more men turn'd qualified, could they not have lessened these greater Parishes, till they had multiplied them to as great a number as they pleased, or was convenient? It was easy to have done so: so very obvious, as well as easy, that, it is not to be doubted, they would have done so, if they had been of these principles. Why might not they have done so, as well as our Presbyterian Brethren, now adays, unite Presbyteries where they have a scarcity of Ministers of their Perswasion? Where lies the impossibility of Uniting Parishes, more than uniting Presbyteries? Indeed

This way of reasoning is more dangerous than it seems our Presbyterian Brethren are aware of, for it quite cuts the sinews of Parity, and demonstrates irrefragably, that it cannot be the Model, our blessed Lord instituted for the Government of his Church. For who can believe he would institute a Model of Government for his Church, which could not answer the ends of its institution? And is it not plain, that Parity cannot answer the ends for which Church Government was instituted, if the Church can be reduced to that State, that the Governors thereof, forced by Necessity, must lay it aside, and, for a time, establish a Prelacy? Besides, what strange Divinity is it to maintain, that Parity is of divine Institution, and yet, may
may be laid aside in Cases of Necessity? ’Tis true G. R. in his True Representation of Presbyterian Government, cited before, is bold to publish to the world, such Divinity: But let him talk what he will of the Case of Necessity, the Force of Necessity, the Law of Necessity, let him put it in as many Languages as he pleases, as well as he hath done in Latin, telling, that Necessitatis quicquid coegit, defen-dit: (tho, I must confess, I have seen few Authors more unhappy at Latin;) And all that shall never persuade me, ought never persuade any Christian, that any Necessity can oblige Christians to forsake, far less, to cross Christ's institutions; for if it can oblige to do so in one Case, why not in all Cases? Indeed to talk of crossing Christ's institutions, when forced to it by the Laws of Necessity, what is it else, than to open a Door to Gnosticism, to Infidelity, to Apostacy, to all imaginable kinds of Antichristian Perfidy and Villany? But enough of this at present.

That which I am concerned for, is only this, that, being it was so very obvious and easy for our Reformers to have cast the very first Scheme of the Government of the Church, according to the Rules and Exigencies of Parity, if they had believed the divine and indispensable institution of it; and being that they did it not, we have all the reason in the world to believe, that they believed no such principle. For my part, I am so far from thinking it reasonable, that Prelacy
Prelacy should be only needful, where there is a scarcity of men qualified to be Ministers; that on the contrary I do profess, I am of opinion, that Prelacy seems to be every whit as needful and expedient, if not more, (supposing we had it in our power to cut and carve (as we say) on Christ's institutions) where there are many, as where there are few Ministers. Sure I am, Experience hath taught so, and teaches so daily: and as sure I am, it can, with great reason, be accounted for, why it should be so; but if it is so, I think, it is only help at a dead Life (as we say) to say, that Superintendency was established at our Reformation, only, because of the Scarcity of men qualified to be Ministers. And so I proceed to our Brethrens next Plea, which is,

SECONDLY, That Superintendency was not the same with Episcopacy. Calderwood assigns seven or eight differences between Superintendents and Bishops; (a) and his (a) Cald. faithful Disciple G. R. in his First Vindication, 26, 27. in answer to the first Question, resumes the same Plea, and insists mostly on the same Differences. Calderwood reckons thus,

1. In the Election, Examination and Admission of Ministers, the Superintendents were bound to the Order prescribed in the 4th Head of the First Book of Discipline; which is far different from the Order observed by Prelates.

2. Superintendents kept not the bounds, nor the limits of the old Diocesses.

3. Superintendents
3. Superintendents might not remain above twenty days in any place, till they had passed through the whole bounds; must preach, at least, thrice in the week; must stay no longer in the Chief Town of their Charge, than three or four Months at most; but must re-enter in Visitation of the rest of the Kirks in their bounds. Bishops think preaching the least of their Charge.

4. The Election, Examination, and Admission of the Superintendent, is set down far different from the Election, Examination and Admission of Bishops now adays, &c.

5. Superintendents were admitted without other Ceremonies than sharp Examination, &c. To the Inauguration of a Bishop is required the Metropolitan Consecrations.

6. There were no degrees of superior and inferior, provincial and general Superintendents: It is otherwise in the Hierarchy of the Prelates, &c.

I have set down these six huge Differences, without ever offering to consider them particularly; are they not huge Differences? Behold them, examine them carefully; is not each of them as essential and specific as another?

Think not, courteous Reader, it was 'Malice or Ill-will to Episcopacy, made our Author muster up these Differences: These make but a small number; if he had been acted by passion or vicious Byass, if his Malice had been vigorous and earnest to discharge it self that way; he could have easily reckoned six hundred, every whit as considerable
derable Differences: He might have told them, that Bishops wore Black Hats, and Superintendents Blue Bonnets; that Bishops wore Silks, and Superintendents Tartan; that Bishops wore Gowns and Cassocks, and Superintendents Trews and slant Doublets; and God knows, how many such differences he might have readily collected. And if he had adduced such notable differences as these, he had done every way as Philosophically, and as like a good Difference-maker. But in the mean time what is all this to Parity or Imparity amongst the Governors of the Church? Do these differences, he has adduced, distinguish between Bishops and Superintendents as to preheminence of power, and the essentials of Prelacy? Do they prove that Superintendents had no Prerogative, no Authority, no Jurisdiction, over Parish Ministers? I have treated him thus courtely, because I know no other way of treatment Authors deserve, who will needs speak Nonsense rather than speak nothing. 'Tis true indeed:

One difference he has mentioned, which seems something material, and therefore I shall endeavor to account for it with some more seriousness. It is that by the Constitution, as we have it, both in the First Book of Discipline, and the Form and Order of electing Superintendents, Superintendents were made obnoxious to the Tryal and Censures of the Ministers within their own Diocesses. This I acknowledge to be true; and I acknowledge further,
further, that, herein, there was a considerable difference between them and Bishops; as Bishops stood eminenced above Presbyters in the primitive times, and as they ought to stand eminenced above them in all well constituted Churches. But then I have these things to say,

1. I shall not scruple to acknowledge that, herein, our Reformers were in the wrong; and that this was a great Error in the Constitution. I do avowedly profess, I don't think my self bound to justify every thing that was done by our Reformers: If that falls to any mans share, it falls to theirs who established this Article in the Claim of Right, which gave occasion to this whole Enquiry. That our Reformers, herein, were in the wrong, I say, I make no scruple to acknowledge; and I think it cannot but be obvious to all, who have spent but a few thoughts about matters of Policy and Government. Indeed, to make Governours subject to the Censures and Sentences of their Subjects, what is it else than to subvert Government, to confound Relations, to sap the Foundations of all Order and politick Establishment? It is (as King James the sixth has it in his Discourse about the true Law of Free

(6) K.J. his Monarchies, (b) and I cannot give it better) to invert the Order of all Law and Reason; to make the commanded, command the Commander; the judged, judge their Judge; and them who are governed to govern, their time about, their Lord and Governour. In short, to give a just account
account of such a Constitution, it is very near of Kin, to that bantering Question I have sometimes heard proposed to Children or Ideots, If you were above me, and I, above you, which of us should be uppermost? I add further

2. That, as I take it, our Reformers put this in the Constitution, that they might appear consequential to a principle, then espoused and put in practice by them, about Civil Government; which was, that the King was superior to his Subjects in their distributive, but inferior to them in their collective Capacity. † This principle, I say, in those days was in great Credit: Knox singulis, had learned it from the Democrats at Geneva; his Authority was great, and he was very fond of this principle, and disseminated it with a singular zeal and confidence. Besides, our Reformers were, then, obnoxious to the civil Government; the standing Laws were against them, and the Soveraigns persuasion, in matters of Religion, jumpt with the Laws. This Principle, therefore, (had it been a good one) came to them most seazonably; and coming to them in such a nick, and withal, meeting, in them, with Scotch Mettal, † they put it in practice; † Majors vidum minor universalis. and being put in practice, God suffered it to be successful; and the success was a new Endearment, and so it came to be a Principle of Credit and Reputation. Indeed, they had been very unthankful to it, and inconsequential to boot, if they had not adopted
adopted it into their Ecclesiastical, as well as their Civil System; and the Superintendents, having had a main hand in reducing it to practice against the Prince, could not take it ill if it was made a Law to themselves; it was but their own measure. This, I say, I take to be the natural History of this part of the Constitution. Nay,

3. So fond, it seems, they were of this principle, that they extended it further, so far, as even to make Ministers accountable to their own Elderships. So 'tis expressly established by the First Book of Discipline, Head 8. (c) The Elders ought also to take heed to the Life, Manners, Diligence and Study of their Minister: And if he be worthy of Admonition, they must admonish him; if of Correction, they must correct him; and if he be worthy of Deposition, they, with the Consent of the Church and Superintendent, may depose him. Here was a pitch of Democracy which, I think, our Presbyterian Brethren themselves, as self denied as they are, would not take with, so very kindly. And yet I am apt to believe, the Compilers of the Book, never thought on putting these Elders in a state of parity with their Ministers; tho this is a Demonstration, that they have not been the greatest Masters at Drawing Schemes of Policy. But to let this pass.

4. Tho this unpolitical stroke (to call it no worse) was made part of the Constitution by that Book, as I have granted; yet I have no where found, that ever it was put in
in practice. I have no where found, that *De Facto* a Superintendent, was judged by his own Synod; whether it was, that they behaved so exactly, as that they were never censurable, or that their Synods had not the insolence to reduce a Constitution to very absurd, and unreasonable, to practice, I shall not be anxious to determine. But it seems probable it has been as much, if not more, upon the latter account than the former; for I find Superintendents frequently tried, and sometimes censured by General Assemblies; and there was reason for it, supposing that General Assemblies, as then constituted, were fit to be the supreme Judicatories of the National Church: For there was no reason that Superintendents should have been Popes, *i.e.* absolute and unaccountable; so that, if I am not mistaken, our Brethren raise Dust, to little purpose, when they make so much noise about the Accountableness of Superintendents to General Assemblies, as if that made a difference between them and Bishops: For I know no man that makes Bishops unaccountable, especially when they are confederated in a National Church. But this by the way: That which I take notice of is, That seeing we find they were so frequently tried by General Assemblies, without the least intimation of their being, at any time; tried by their own Synods, it seems reasonable to conclude, that it has been thought fit to let that unreasonable
Stretch in the first Constitution fall into Disquietude: But however this was, I have all safe enough. For

5. Such a Constitution infers no such thing as parity amongst the Officers of the Church. Those who maintain, that the King is inferior to his Subjects, in their Collection, are not yet so extravagant as to say, he is not superior to every one of them in their Distribution: They acknowledge he is Major Singulis; and there's not a person in the Kingdom, who will be so unmannerly as to say, that he stands upon the same Level with his Sovereign. But what needs more? These same very Presbyterian Authors, who use this Argument, even while they use it, confess, That Superintendents, and ordinary Parish Ministers, did not act in parity; and because they cannot deny it, but must confess it, whether they will or not, they cannot forbear raising all the Dust they can about it, that unthinking People may not see clearly that they do confess it. And had it not been for this reason, I am apt to think, the world had never been plagued with such pitiful jangle, as such Arguments amount to. Neither is the next any better, which is,

3. That Superintendency was never established by Act of Parliament. This is G. R.'s Argument in his learned Answer to the first of the ten Questions; for there he tells us, That Superintendency was neither brought in, nor cast out, by Act of Parliament. And what then?
then? Doth he love it the worse that it was established, purely, by Ecclesiastical Authority? How long since he turn'd fond of Parliamentary Establishments? I wonder he was not afraid of the Scandal of Erastianism. But to the point: 'Tis true indeed, it was not brought in by Act of Parliament; but then, I think, he himself cannot deny, that it was countenanced, allowed and approved, by more than half a Dozen of Acts of Parliaments; which, if our Author understands any thing either of Law or Logick, he must allow to be, at least, equivalent to a Parliamentary In-bringing. I have these Acts in readiness to produce, when I shall be put to it: But I think his own Act which he cited (the most ridiculously, as shall be made appear afterwards) in the immediately preceding paragraph, may be good enough for him. For, "He concludes it as evident, that Episcopal Jurisdiction over the Protestants, was condemned by Law in the Parliament 1567. because it is, there, statute and ordained, that no other Jurisdiction Ecclesiastical be acknowledged within this Realm, than that which is, and shall be, within this same Kirk, established presently, or which floweth therefrom, concern-"ing preaching the Word, correcting of Manners, administration of Sacraments; and Prelat-"cal Jurisdiction was not then in Scotland. So he reasons. Now I dare adventure to refer it to his own judgment, whether it will not, by the same way of reasoning, follow,
fellow, and be as evident, that the Jurisdiction of Superintendents was allowed of, by this same Act, seeing he himself cannot have the Braw to deny, that it was, then, in its vigor, and daily exercised? I think this is Argument good enough, ad hominem; But, as I said, we shall have more of this Act of Parliament hereafter.

Thus I have dispelled some of these clouds our Presbyterian Brethren use to raise about the Prelacy of Superintendents; perhaps there may be more of them, but, considering the weaknesses of these, which, certainly, are the strongest, it is easy to conjecture what the rest may be, if there are any more of them. And thus, I think, I have fairly accounted for the Sentiments of our Reformers, in relation to Parity or Imparity amongst the Governors of the Church, during the First Scheme into which they cast the Government of the Church.

Before I proceed to the next, I must go back a little, and give a brief Deduction of some things which may afford considerable Light, both to what I am now to insist on, and what I have insisted on already.

Tho I am most unwilling to rake into the Mistakes or Weaknesses of our Reformers, yet I cannot but say, that our Reformation was carried on, and, at first established upon some principles, very disadvantageous to the Church, both as to her Polity and Patrony. There were Mistakes in the
the Ministers on the one hand, and minister and worldly designs amongst the Laity, on the other: and both concurred unhappily, to produce Great Evils in the Result.

There was a principle had, then, got too much footing amongst some Protestant Divines, viz. That the best way to reform a Church, was to recede as far from the Papists as they could; to have nothing in common with them, but the Essentials; the necessary and indispensible Articles and Parts of Christian Religion; whatever was, in its nature indifferent, and not positively and expressly commanded in the Scriptures, if it was in fashion in the Popish Churches, was therefore to be laid aside, and avoided as a Corruption; as having been abused, and made subservient to Superstition and Idolatry.

This principle John Knox was fond of, and maintained zealously; and the rest of our reforming Preachers were much acted by his Influences. In pursuance of this principle, therefore, when they compiled the First Book of Discipline, they would not reform the Old Polity, and purge it of such Corruptions as had crept into it, keeping still by the main Draughts and Lineaments of it; which undoubtedly had been the wiser, the safer, and every way the better course, as they were then admonished, even by some of the Popish Clergy: (a) But they laid it quite aside, and instead thereof hammered out a New Scheme, keeping at as great

(a) Spot 174.
great a distance from the Old one, as they could, and as the Essentials of Polity would allow them; establishing no such thing, however, as Parity, as I have fully proven. And no wonder; for as Imparity has, obviously, more of Order, Beauty and Usefulness in its Aspect, so it had never, so much as by Dreaming, entered their Thoughts, that it was a Limb of Antichrist; or a Relique of Popery.

That our Reformers had the aforesaid principle in their view, all along, while they digested the First Book of Discipline, is plain to every one that reads it. Thus,

In the First Head, they condemn Binding Men and Women to a several and disguised Apparel; to the superstitious observing of Fasting Days — Keeping of holy days of certain Saints, commanded by Man, such as be all these THE PAPISTS HAVE INVENTED, as the Feasts of the Apostles, Martyrs, Christmas, &c. (b) In the Second Head, The Cross in Baptism and Kneeling at the Reception of the Symbols, in the Eucharist. In the Third Head, they require not only Idolatry, but all its Monuments and Places to be suppressed; and amongst the rest, Chappels, Cathedral Churches, and Colleges, i. e. as I take it, Collegiate Churches. And many other such instances might be adduced; particularly, as to our present purpose: They would not call those, whom they truly and really, stated in a Prelacy above their Brethren, Prelates or Bishops, but Superintendents: 

They
They would not allow of Imposition of hands in Ordinations: They made Superintendents subject to the Censures of their own Synods; they changed the bounds of the Dioceses; they would not allow the Superintendents the same Revenues which Prelates had had before: They would not suffer Ecclesiastical Benefices to stand distinguished as they had been formerly; but they were for casting them all, for once, into one heap, and making a new Division of the Churches Patrimony, and parcelling it out in Competencies, as they thought it most expedient. In short,

A notable instance of the prevalency of this principle we have, even in the year 1572, after the Restauration of the Old Polity was agreed to. For, then, by many in the General Assembly, Exceptions were taken at the Titles of Archbishop, Dean, Archdeacon, Chancellor, Chapter, &c. as being Popish Titles, and offensive to the Ears of good Christians; (c) As all Historians agree. But then,

As they were for these and the like alterations, in pursuance of this principle; so they were zealous for, and had no mind to part with, the Patrimony of the Church. Whatever had been dedicated to Religious Uses; whatever, under the notion of either Spirituality or Temporality, had belonged to either Seculars or Regulars, before, they were positive, should still continue in the Churches hands, and be applied to her Maintainance
Maintenance and Advantages; condemning all Dilapidations, Alienations, Improprations, and Laick Usurpations, and Possessions of Church Revenues, &c. as is to be seen fully in the Sixth Head of the Book. (d) Thus, I say, our Reformers had digested a New Scheme of Polity, in the First Book of Discipline, laying aside the Old one, because they thought it too much Popish. And now that we have this Book under consideration, it will not be unuseful (nay it will be needful for a full understanding of what follows) to fix the time when it was written.

Knox (and Calderwood follows him) says, (e) it was written after the Dissolution of the Parliament, which fate in August 1560. and gave the legal Establishment to the Reformation. But Petrie (f) says, it is expressly affirmed in the beginning of the Book it self, that the Commission was granted for compiling it on the 29th of April, 1560. and that they brought it to a Conclusion, as they could for the time, before the 20th of May (a short enough time, I think, for a work of such importance.) So Petrie affirms, I say, and it is apparent he is in the right; for, his account agrees exactly with the First Nomination of Superintendents, which both Knox and Spotswood affirm to have been made in July, that year. (g) And, besides, it falls in naturally with the Series of the History; for the Nobility and Gentry's having seen the Book, and considered it be-
fore the Parliament fate, according to this account, makes it fairly intelligible, how it was entirely neglected, or rather rejected, not only, so far, as that it was never allowed of nor approved by them, as we shall learn by and by; but, so far, that, in that Parliament no provision, at all, was made for the Maintenance and Subsistence of the Reformed Ministers. For understanding this more fully, yet,

It is to be considered, that there had been Disceptations and Controversies the year before, viz. 1559. about the Disposfal of the Patrimony of the Church. This I learn from a Letter of Knox's to Calvin, (dated August 28. 1559. to be seen amongst Calvin's Epistles, Col. 441.) wherein he asks his sentiments about this question, Whether the yearly Revenues might be payed to such as had been Monks and Popish Priests, even tho' they should confess their former errors, considering that they neither served the Church, nor were capable to do it? And tells him frankly, that he had maintained the negative, for which he was called too severe, not only by the Papists, but even by many Protestants. From which 'tis plain, not only that there were, then, Controversies about the Disposfal of the Patrimony of the Church, as I have said, but also, that Knox (and by very probable consequence, the Protestant Preachers, generally) was clear, that the Ecclesiastical

Hæc, quæ nego, plus æquo severus judicor, non a folis Papisticls, verum etiam ab iis qui sibi variatus patroni videntur.
factual Revenues had been primarily desti-
nated to the Church for the ends of Reli-
gion; and therefore whatever person could
not serve these ends, could have no just
Title to these Revenues: By which way of
reasoning, not only ignorant Priests and
Monks, but all Lay men whatsoever, were
excluded from having any Title to the Pa-
trimony of the Church. Now,

While this Controversie was in agitation,
as to point of Right, the Guife was going
against Knox's side of it, as to matter of
Fact: For, in the mean time, many Abbeys
and Monasteries were thrown down, and
the Nobility and Gentry were daily posses-
sing themselves of the Estates that had be-
longed to them; and so before the First
Book of Discipline, (which was Knox's per-
formance, and so, no doubt, contain'd his
principle) was compiled, they were finding
that there was something sweet in sacrilege,
and were by no means willing to part with
what they had got, so fortunately, as they
thought, in their Fingers. Besides, They
foresaw, if Knox's project took place, seve-
ral other, which they judged considerable,
inconvenients would follow: If the Monks
and Priests, &c. who acknowledged their
former errors, should be so treated, what
might they expect, who persisted in their ad-
herence to the Romish Faith and Interests?
Tho they were blinded with Superstition
and Error, yet they were Men, they were
Scottish men; nay they were generally of their
own
own Blood, and their very near Kinsmen: And would it not be very hard to deprive them entirely of their Livings, and reduce them, who had their Estates settled upon them by Law, and had lived so plentifully and so hospitably, to such ane Hopeless State of Misery and Arrant Beggary? Further, by this Scheme; as they behoved to part with what they had already griped, so their Hopes of ever having opportunity to profit themselves of the Revenues of the Church, thereafter, were more effectually discouraged, than they had been even in the times of Popery: The Popish Clergy, by their Rules, were bound to live single, they could not marry, nor, by consequence, have lawful Children to provide for. The reformed, as the Law of God allowed them, and their Inclinations prompted them, indulged themselves the Solaces of Wedlock, and begot Children, and had Families to maintain and provide for; there were no such Expectations, therefore, of easy Leaves, and rich Gifts, and hidden Legacies, &c. from them, as from the Popish Clergy. Add to this, the Popish Clergy foresaw the Ruine of the Romish Interests; they saw no likelihood of Successors, of their own Stamp and Principles. They had a mighty Spite at the Reformation. It was not likely, therefore, that they would be anxious what became of the Patrimony of the Church, after they were gone. It was to be hoped they might squander it away, dilapidate, alienate, &c. without
without difficulty; (as indeed they did) And who but themselves (the Laity) should have all this gain?

Upon these and the like Considerations, I say, the Nobility and Gentry had no liking to the First Book of Discipline; And being once out of Love with it, it was easy to get Arguments enough against it: The Novelties, and the numerous needless Receptions from the Old Polity, which were in it, furnished these both obviously and abundantly. So it was not only not established, but, it seems, the Nobility and Gentry, who have ever the principal sway in Scottish Parliaments, to let the Ministers find how much they had displeased them, by such a Draught, resolved to serve them a Trick. Indeed they served them a monstrous one; for tho in the Parliament, 1560. they established the Reformation, as to Doctrine and Worship, &c. and by a Legal Definition, made the Protestant the National Church, yet they settled not so much as a Groat of the Churches Revenues upon its Ministers, but continued the Popish Clergy, during their Lives, in their possessions.

'Tis true, indeed, thro the importunity of Dr. Knox, and some others of the Preachers, some Noblemen and Gentlemen subscribed the Book in January 1569. (b) But as they were not serious, as Knox intimates, so, they did it with this express provision (apparently levelled against one of the main designs of the Book) That the Bishops, Abbots, Priors, &c.
Priors, and other Prelates, and Beneficed Men, who had already joined themselves to the Religion, should enjoy the Rents of their Benefices, during their Lives, they sustaining the Ministers for their parts, &c. But it was never generally received; on the contrary it was treated in Ridicule, and called a DEVOUT IMAGINATION, which offended Knox exceedingly. (i) Nay, it seems, the Ministers (i) Kn. 16. themselves were not generally pleased with it, after second thoughts, or, The Laity have been more numerous in the General Assembly held in December 1561. For (as Knox himself tells us (k) when it was moved, there, that the Book should be offered to the Queen, and her Majesty should be supplicated to ratify it, the Motion was rejected.

The Reformation thus established, and through the Badness, or, at least, the Disagreeableness of the Scheme laid down in the Book on the one hand, and the Selfish and Sacrilegious Ends of the Laity on the other, no provision made for the Ministers; it was unavoidable that they should be pincht. And pincht they were, indeed, to purpose; For, for full Eighteen or Nineteen Months, after the Reformation was established by Law, they had nothing to live by, but Shift or Charity; and, which heightned the Misery, all this time of Want, they had little or no prospect of the end of it: For when a Parliament, so much Protestant, as in the Queens absence, to establish the Purity
Purity of Doctrine, &c. had treated them so unkindly, what was to be expected, now that she was at home, every inch Popish, and zealously such? Tho a Parliament should now incline to pity them, yet how could it meet? Or what could it do without the Soveraigns Allowance? And what ground had they to hope that she would befriend them? Indeed, nothing was to be attempted that way; it was not to be expected that the Popish Clergy should be dispossessed of the Revenues of the Church, and the Reformed entituled to them, by Act of Parliament. Another project was to be fallen upon.

The Project fallen upon was, That the Council, then, entirely Protestant, should deal with the Queen to oblige the Popish Clergy, Possessors of the Benefices, to resign the Thirds of them, into her Majesty's hands, that they might be a fund for the Maintainance of the Protestant Ministers. The Nation was, then, generally Protestant, and that Interest was too strong for the Queen, so that they were not to be too much provoked: Besides, one Argument was used which prevailed much with her Majesty. The Revenues of the Queen were, then, very low, and she loved to spend; and pains were taken to persuade her that, beside what would be subsistence enough for the Ministers, she would be sure to have what might considerably relieve her own necessities. This was a taking proposition, so, the
the project succeeded. The Popish Clergy were put to it, and resign'd the Thirds. (l) (i) Kn.
Collectors were appointed to bring them in to the Exchequer: The Ministers, were, shence, to receive their Allowances. Well! tufe.

Were they well enough provided now? Alas! Poor Men! It was but little that was pretended to be provided for them; the Thirds of these Benefices which the Laity had not already swallowed: And yet far less was their real portion. They found by sad experience that it was not for nothing, that the Thirds were ordered to be brought into the Queens Treasury. For when they came to be divided, how mean were their Allotments? Ane hundred Merks Scottish, i.e. about 5 l. 11 s. English, to an ordinary Minister in the Country. Three hundred (faith Knox (m)) was the highest that was appointed to any, except the Superintendents, and a few others.

All this, the Ministers, indeed, resented highly. John Knox (n) said publickly in his Sermon, If that Order for maintaining the Ministers ended well, his judgment failed him—for he saw two parts freely given to the Devil, (the Popish Clergy) and the third must be divided betwixt God and the Devil, i.e. betwixt the Protestant Ministers, and the Popish Queen. And, no doubt, her Share was truly considerable. But neither did the Misery end here: As poor as these small Pittances were, they could not have them either seasonably, or fully paid. The Thirds came in but slowly.
and the Queens Necessities behoved to be first served; by which means, the Ministers were forced to wait, many times, very long, for their Money: And, sometimes, to take little, rather than want all. In short, their sense of the treatment they met with was so lively, that this turn'd to a Proverb, amongst them: The Good Laird of Pittaro was an Earnest Professor of Christ; but the Great Devil receive the Controller. (o) Thus, poor Men! they were hardly treated: they had great Charges, and a weighty Task; and they were ill provided, and worse paid.

This bred them much work in their General Assemblies: For, scarcely did they ever meet, but a great part of their time was spent in forming Petitions, and importuning the Government for Relief of their Necessities; but all in vain, they were never the better, no not so much as heard, almost, till July 1567. Then, the Nobility and Gentry, resolved to lay aside the Queen from the Government, and finding it necessary to have the Ministers of their side, began to bespeak them a little more kindly. Then, indeed, it was made the Second Article of that League, into which they entered, That the Act already made (by the Queen and Council) concerning the Thirds of the Benefices within this Realm, principally, for sustaining the Ministers, should be duly put in Execution, according to the Order of the Book of the Appointment of Ministers Stipends, as well
well of them that are to be appointed, as of them who are already placed, and that the Ministers should be first duly answered, and sufficiently sustained, of the same, to the Relief of their present Necessity, ay and while a perfect Order might be ta'ne, and established, towards the full Distribution of the Patrimony of the Kirk, according to God's word, &c.

So I read in the Mfs. and Spotswood (p) has the same upon the matter: But this was not all, Burnt Bairns Fire dread. The Ministers sensible, it seems, of the mean and uncertain way of Living, they had had before, resolved now to make the best advantage they could of that opportunity; and so they obtain'd this likewise for another Article of that Confederacy, and the Nobility promised, That how soon a lawful Parliament might be had, or that the Occasion might otherwise justly serve, they should labour at their uttermost, that the Faithful Kirk of Jesus Christ, professed within this Realm, might be put in full Liberty (i. e. possession) of the Patrimony of the Kirk, according to the Book of God, and the Order and Practice of the Primitive Kirk, and that nothing should pass in Parliament, till the Affairs of the Kirk were first considered, approved and established; and also, that they should reform themselves, in the Matters of the Church, for their own parts; Ordaining the Contraveeners and Refusers of the same to be secluded from the Bosom of the Kirk, &c. So the Mfs. and Spotswood also. (q)
Here were fair promises indeed! Were not the Ministers well enough secured now? Was not the *Patrimony* of the Church, now, to run in its *Right Channel*? Alas! All promises are not performed. No sooner had these Nobles and Barons carried their main point, which was the *dethroning* of the Queen, (to which also the Ministers were forward enough) than they quite forgot their promises. For, tho' the Parliament met in December, thereafter, and tho' the Restitution of the *Patrimony* of the Church was promised to be the first thing that should be done in Parliament, yet nothing like performance! Nay, tho' ane Act was made for putting the Articles about the *Thirds* in Execution; yet, the Ministers were forced to wait long enough, before they found the effects of it. In short, they continued in the same traits they had been in before, for full two years thereafter, that is, till July 1569. at which time, I find by the M's and Mr. Petr (r) the Church was put in possession of the *Thirds*; for which their Necessities made them very thankful, as appears from the Narrative of the Act of their Assembly at that time, which runs thus, as I find it in the M's. Forasmuch as this long time by gone, the Ministers have been universally defrauded and postponed of their Stipends, and, now, at last, it hath pleased God to move the hearts of the superior power, and the Estates of this Realm, &c. A Narrative, which, it is probable, they would
would not have used when the Thirds were, at first, projected for their Maintenance: Sure, I am, of a quite different strain from Knox's Refentment, which I mentioned before. But by this time, Experience had taught them to thank God for little; and that it was even Good to be getting something. However,

All this while they continued still to have the same sentiments concerning the Patrimony of the Church; that, unless God by immediate Revolution, should dispense with her Right, it belonged to her unalienably; that it was abominable Sacrilege to defraud her of it; and that neither Church nor State could be happy, so long as it was so much in the hands of Laicks. And as they had still these sentiments, (and no wonder, so long as they had any sense of Religion) so, they were still using their best endeavours, trying all experiments, and watching all opportunities to bring the Nobility and Gentry to a reasonable Temper; and to put the Church in possession of her undoubted Revenues; but all in vain. On the contrary, these Leeches having once tasted of her Blood, were thirsting still for more, and daily making farther Encroachments. For

A Parliament met in August 1571, and made one "Act, obliging all the Subjects, who in former times, had held their "Land and Possessions of Priors, Prioreesses, "Convents of Friars and Nuns, &c. there-"after to hold them of the Crown. This

N 3 "was
"was ane awakening, ane allaruming Act.
These who, heretofore, had posslef
themselves of the Churches Patrimony,
"had done it by force, or by connivance;
without Law, and without Title; so,
there were still hopes of recovering what
was posslef so illegally. But this was to give
them Law on their side; As things stood
then, it would be easy to obtain Gifts, now,
that the King was made immediate Supe-
riour; and then, there was no recovering
of what was thus colourably posslefed. So,
I say it was ane awakening Act of Parliament;
and indeed it rouzed the Spirits of the Cler-
y, and put them in a quicker motion. Now
they began to see the Error of Drawing the
New Scheme of Polity in the First Book of Dis-
cipline, and receding from the Old one:
Now they perceived sensibly that, that
making of a New one, had unhinged all the
Churches Interests, and exposed her Patrimony,
and made it a Prey to the Ravenous Laity;
and that it was therefore, time, high time,
for them to bethink themselves, and try
their strength and skill, if possibly a stop
could be put to such notorious Robbery. (j)

(1) Vide Spot. 258. And so I am fairly introduced to

THE SECOND MODEL into
which the Government of the Church was
cast, after the publick Establishment of the
Reformation. For

The General Assembly of the Church,
meeting at Stirling, in that same month of

August,
August 1571. "Gave Commission to certain Brethren, to go to the Lord Regent his Grace, and to the Parliament, humbly to request and desire, in Name of the Kirk, the granting of such Heads and Articles, and redress of such Complaints, as should be given to them by the Kirk, &c. So it is in the MS. and so Spotswod and Petrie have it. Before I proceed, there is one seeming difficulty which must be removed; it is, that this General Assembly be met before the Parliament. How then could it be that Act of Parliament which so awakened them? But the Solution is easy. In those times, Parliaments did not sit so long as they are in use to do now; but all things were prepared, and in readiness, before the Parliament met. "Proclamation was made a month, or so, before the Parliament was to meet, requiring all Bills to be given in to the Register, which were to be presented in the succeeding Session of Parliament, that they might be brought to the King, or Regent, to be perused and considered by them, and only such as they allowed were to be put into the Chancellors' hands to be proposed to the Parliament, and none other, &c. Who so pleases may see this account given by King James the Sixth of Scotland, and First of England, to his English Parliament, in his Speech dated 1607. Indeed the thing is notorious, and Calderwood himself gives a remarkable instance of this method, \( \text{(u)} \) for \( \text{(w)} \) Cala.
he tells how, in the end of April, or beginning of May 1621. A Charge was published by Proclamation, commanding all that had Suits, Articles, or Petitions to propose to the Parliament, to give them into the Clerk of the Register before the twentieth day of May, that by him they might be presented to so many of the Council, who were appointed by his Majesty to meet, some days before the Parliament, and to consider the said Bills, Petitions and Articles with Certification, that the same should not be received, read, nor voted in Parliament, except they were passed under his Highness hand. And yet the same Calderwood tells us, (v) That the Parliament was not appointed to meet till the Twentieth and Third of July; so that here were two full months between the giving in of the Bills, &c. and the Meeting of the Parliament. This being the Custom in those times, it is easy to consider how the General Assembly, tho it met some days before the Parliament, might know very well what was to be done in Parliament; for if this Bill was allowed by the then Regent to be presented, there was no doubt of its passing. And that it was very well known what the Parliament was to do in that matter, may be further evident from John Knox's Letter directed, at that time, to the General Assembly, wherein he is earnest with them, that with all Uprightness and Strength in God, they gainstand the mercylefs Devourers of the Patrimony of the Church, telling them, that if Men will spoil, let them do it to their
their own Peril and Damnation; but it was their Duty to beware of communicating with their sins, but by publick protestation to make it known to the world, That they were innocent of Robbery, which would, ere long, provoke God's Vengeance upon the Committers, &c. From which nothing can be clearer, than that he had a special eye to that which was then in agitation, and to be done by the Parliament. (\*) For this Letter see Spot. 258.

Having thus removed this seeming difficulty, I return to my purpose.

The Earl of Lennox was, then, Regent. He was murdered in the time of the Parliament: So, at that time, things were in confusion, and these Commissioners from the General Assembly could do nothing in their business. The Earl of Mar succeeded in the Regency; Application was made to him. It was agreed to between his Grace, and the Clergy who applied to him, that a Meeting should be kept between so many for the Church, and so many for the State, for adjusting matters. For this end, an Assembly was kept at Leith, on the 12 of January 1573. By this Assembly, Six were delegated to meet, with as many to be nominated by the Council to treat, reason and conclude, concerning the Settlement of the Polity of the Church. After diverse Meetings, and long Deliberation, (as Spotswood has it,\(w\) ) they came to an Agreement, which was, in effect, That the Old Polity should revive, and take place; only with some little alterations, which seemed necessary from
from the Change that had been made in Religion. Whoso pleases may see it more largely in Calderwood, (x) (who tells us, that the whole Scheme is Registered in the Books of Council) more briefly, in Spotiswood and Petrie. (y) In short,

It was a Constitution, much the same with that, which we have, ever since, had, in the times of Episcopacy. For by this Agreement, those who were to have the Old Prelatical power, were also to have the Old Prelatical Names and Titles, of Archbishops and Bishops; the Old Division of the Dioceses was to take place; the Patrimony of the Church was to run, much, in the Old Channel; particularly, express provision was made concerning Chapters, Abbots, Priors, &c. That they should be continued, and enjoy their Old Rights and Privileges, as Churchmen; and, generally, things were put in a regular Course.

This was the Second Model (not a new one) of Policy, established, in the Church of Scotland, after the Reformation; at a pretty good distance, I think, from the Rules and Exigencies of Parity. The truth is, both Calderwood and Petrie acknowledge, it was Imparity, with a witness. The thing was so manifest, they had not the brow to deny it; all their Endeavours are only to impugne the Authority of this Constitution, or raise Clouds about it, or find Weaknesses in it. So far as I can collect, no man ever affirmed, that, at this time, the Government...
ment of the Church of Scotland was Presbyterian, except G.R. who is truly singular for his skill in these matters: But we shall have, some time or other, occasion to consider him. In the mean time let us consider Calderwood's and Petrie's Pleas against this Establishment. They may be reduced to these four.

1. The Incompetency of the Authority of the Meeting at Leith, in January 1571.

2. The Force which was, at that time, put upon the Ministers by the Court, which would needs have that Establishment take place.

3. The Limitedness of the power, then, granted to Bishops.

4. The Reluctancies which the subsequent Assemblies discovered against that Establishment.

These are the most material Pleas, they insist on, and I shall consider, how far they may hold. The

1. Plea is, the Incompetency of the Authority of the Meeting at Leith, Jan. 12, 1571, which gave Commission to the Six for agreeing with the State to such an Establishment. "It is not called ane Assembly, but "a Convention, in the Register. The ordinary "Assembly was not appointed to be holden "till the 6th of March thereafter. (a) As it (a) Cal. 49; "was only a Convention, so it was in very Pet. 372, "great haste, it seems, and took not time "to consider things of such importance, so "deliberately, as they ought to have been "considered. (b) It was a corrupt Con- (b) Cal. 50; "vention, 374."
"Invention," for it allowed Master Robert Pont, a Minister, to be a Lord of the Session. (c) These are the Reasons they insist on to prove the Authority of that Meeting incompetent. And now to examine them briefly.

When I consider these Arguments, and for what end they are adduced, I must declare, I cannot but admire the Force of prejudice and partiality, how much they blind mens Eyes, and distort their Reasons, and by as to the most ridiculous Undertakings. For,

What tho the next ordinary Assembly was not appointed to meet till March thereafter? Do not even the Presbyterians themselves maintain the Lawfulness, yea, the Necessity of calling General Assemblies extraordinarily, upon extraordinary occasions? prove nata (as they call it)? How many such, have been called since the Reformation? How much did they insist on this pretence Anno 1638? And,

What tho the Register calls this Meeting a Convention? was it therefore no Assembly? Is there such an opposition between the words, Convention and Assembly, that both cannot possibly signify the same thing? Doth not Calderwood acknowledge, that they voted themselves ane Assembly, in their second Session? Doth he not acknowledge, that all the ordinary Members were there, which used to constitute Assemblies? But what if it can be found that ane undoubted, uncon-
uncontroverted Assembly own’d it as an Assembly; and its Authority, as the Authority of an Assembly? What is become of this fine Argument then? But can this be done indeed? Yes, it can; and these same very Authors have given it in these same very Histories (d), in which they use this as an Argument, and not very far from the same Pet. 376. very pages. Both of them (I say) tell, that the General Assembly held at Perth, in August immediately thereafter, made an Act which began thus, Forasmuch as the Assembly held in Leith, in January last, &c.

But if it was an Assembly, yet, it was in too great haste; it did not things deliberately. Why so? No Reason is adduced, no Reason can be adduced, for saying so. The Subject they were to treat of was no new one; it was a Subject that had implored all their Heads for several months before: Their great business, at that time, was to give a Commission to some Members to meet with the Delegates of the State, to adjust matters about the Polity and Patrimony of the Church. This Commission was not given till the Third Session, as Calderwood himself acknowledges. (e) Where then, was the great haste? Lay it in doing a thing in their Third Session, which might have been done in the First?

But were not these Commissioners in too great haste to come to an Agreement when they met with the Delegates of the State? Yes, if we may believe Petrie, for he says, (f) That
That the same day (viz. January 16.) the Commissioners conveened and concluded, &c: But he may say, with that same integrity, whatever he pleases. For, not to insist on Spotswood's account, (g) who says, it was after diverse Meetings and long Deliberation, that they came to their Conclusion; not to insist on his authority, I say, because he may be suspected as partial; doth not Calderwood (h) expressly acknowledge, that they began their Conference upon the Sixteenth of January, and (i) that matters were not finally concluded and ended till the First of February?

But was it not a corrupt Convention? Did it not allow Pont, a Minister, to be a Lord of the Session? A mighty Demonstration, sure, of its Corruption! Well! Suppose it was a Corruption, was it such a plaguy one as infected all the other Acts of that Convention? Is one corrupt Act of ane Assembly enough to reprobate all the rest of its Acts? If so, I think, it will fare ill with a good many Assemblies. Whither was it a Corruption in ane Assembly to oblige men to do penance for doing their Duty? to declare against the Kings Negative Voice in Parliament, and so to Unking him, &c.? But to go on, why should this Assembly bear the whole Blame of this Corruption, if it was one? was it not ratified by a subsequent Assembly? And should not it bear its Share? Both Authors knew this very well, for both of (k) Cal. 62. Pet. 379.

(f) Pet. 353. (g) Spot. 260. (b) Cal. 50. (h) It was the Assembly helden
holden at Eden. March 6. 1573. The Regent craved some learned Men of the Ministry (they are Calderwood's own words) to be placed Senators of the College of Justice. The Assembly, after reasoning, at length, voted, that none was able to bear the said two Charges, and therefore inhibited any Minister to take upon him to be a Senator of the College of Justice, Master Robert Pont only excepted, who was already placed with advice and consent of the Kirk. Petrie gives the same account, only he ends it thus, By Advice, &c. He thought it expedient, it seems, to conceal the mention made of the Kirk. And no doubt he did wisely, i.e. suitably to his purpose; for Calderwood added it but foolishly, considering that there could not be a clearer Acknowledgement of the Authority of the Convention at Leith, than giving it thus the name of The Kirk; but what needs more? If this was a Corruption, it was one, even in the times of Presbytery, after the year 1580. For did not Pont, even then continue to be a Lord of the Session? Or will our Brethren say, that 'tis a fault to introduce a Corruption, but it is none to continue it when it is introduced? All this is said upon the supposition that it was a Corruption, tho I am not yet convinced that it was one, at least so great a one as might have given ground for all this stir about it. I doubt, if the Members of this Assembly at Leith, had been through paced Parity-men, vigorous for the Good Cause, it should, no more have been a Corruption in them to
to have allowed Pont to fit as a Lord of Session, than it was in the Kirk, once upon a day, to allow Mr. Alexander Henderson to fit as a Member of a Committee, you know for what. And so much for the first Plea, proceed we to the

2. The Force, the Court, at that time, put upon the Clergy, to accept of that Establishment. Calderwood is mighty on this Plea. The Superintendent of Angus (who had a principal hand in the Agreement at Leith) a man too tractable, might easily be induced, by his Chief, the Earl of Mar, Regent, for the time, to descend to the Heads and Articles of this Book.

(1) Cal. 55.

(2) And, It was easy to the Court to obtain the Consent of many Ministers to this sort of Episcopacy—Some being poor, some being covetous and ambitious, some not taking up the gross Corruption of the Office, some having a Carnal Respect to some Noblemen their Friends. (m) And how often doth he impute it all to the Earl of Morton? And Calderwood's faithful Follower G. R. in his First Vindication, &c. tells us that the Convention of Churchmen met at Leith was too much influenced by the Court. (n) Now for answer to all this, in the first place, what if one should allow all that is alleged? will it follow from that allowance that Prelacy was not, then, agreed to? The Question is not how it was done? but if it was done? For if it was done it is an argument that the Clergy, then, thought little on the indispensibility of Parity; or that they were very bad men, who, tho they believed that
that indispensibility, did yet agree to Prelacy. 'Tis true, indeed, Calderwood makes them, here, every whit as bad as that could amount to:

He makes them a pack of poor, covetous, ambitious, ignorant, Carnal Rogues, who were thus Court-ridden. But behold the Difference between Mercat days, as we say; the same Author, when he comes, afterward, to tell who were appointed to compile the Second Book of Discipline, (a task agreeable to his temper) gives the same Men, who were Commissioners, at the Agreement at Leith, (for they were generally nominated for that work) a far different Character: Our Kirk hath not had worthier men, since, nor of better Gifts. (o) This might be enough; yet I will proceed further, because what I have to say may be useful for coming by a just sense of the state of affairs in these times. I say therefore,

That all this Flea is mere groundless Noise and Fiction. The Court had no imaginable reason for pressing this Establishment, which was not as proper for the Clergy to have insisted on; and the Clergy had one Reason more than the Court could pretend to.

The great Reasons the Court could, then, insist on, what else could they be, than that Episcopacy stood still established by Law? That according to the fundamental Constitution, which had obtained time out of mind, the Ecclesiastics had made one of the
the Three Estates of Parliament? That such an Essential Alteration, in the civil Constitution, as behoved necessarily to result from the want of that Estate, being the First of the Three, was infinitely dangerous at any time, as tending to turn the whole Constitution loose, and shake the very Foundations of the Government? That it tended to the Subversion of the High Court of Parliament, and naturally, and necessarily, inferred Essential Nullities in all the Meetings, the other two Estates could have, and all the Acts they could make? That it was more dangerous, at that time, during the King's Minority, to have the Constitution so disjoined, than on other occasions? That whoever was Regent, or whosoever were his Counsellors, might be called to an account for it, when the King came to perfect Age? And it was obvious that it might easily be found High Treason in them, that they had suffered such Alterations? That the best way to preserve the Rights of the Church, and put her, and keep her in her Possession of her Patrimony, was to preserve that Estate? That the best way to preserve that Estate, was to continue it in the old, tried, wisely digested, and long approved Constitution of it? What other arguments, I say, than these, or such as were like them, can we conceive, the Court could then make use to persuade the Clergy to agree to the Old Polity? Is it to be imagined they turn'd Theologues, and endeavoured to indoctrinate
doctrinate the Clergy, and convince them from Scripture, and Antiquity, and Ecclesiastical History, &c. that Episcopacy was of divine Institution, or the best, or a lawful Government of the Church? If it mistake not, such Topicks, in these times were not much thought on, by our Statesmen. But if they were such Arguments as I have given a Specimen of, which they insisted on, as no doubt they were, if they insisted on any, then I would fain know, which of them it was that might not have been as readily insisted on by the Clergy, as by the Statesmen? Nay, considering that there were no Scruples of Conscience then, concerning the Lawfulness of such a Constitution; how reasonable is it to think, that the Clergy might be as forward as the Statesmen could be, to insist on these Arguments? Especially if it be further considered, that, Besides these and the like Arguments, the Clergy had one very considerable Argument to move them for the Re-establishment of the Old Constitution, which was, that they had found by Experience, that the New Scheme fallen upon in the First Book of Discipline had done much hurt to the Church, as I have already observed; that by forsaking the Old Constitution, the Church had suffered too much already; and that it was high time, for them, now, to return to their Old Fond; considering at what losses they had been since they had deserted it. And all this will appear more reasonable.
reasonable and credible still, if two things more be duly considered. The

First is, That the Six Clergymen who were commissioned by the Assembly, on this occasion, to treat with the State, were all sensible men; men who understood the Constitution both of Church and State, had Heads to comprehend the consequences of things, and were very far from being Parity-men. The

Second is, The Oddness, (to call it no worse) of the Reason, which our Authors feign to have been the Motive which made the Court, at that time, so earnest for such an Establishment; namely, that thereby, They might gripe at the Commodity. (as Calderwood (p) words it) That is, possess themselves of the Churches Patrimony. What? Had the Clergy so suddenly fallen from their daily, their constant, their continual Claim to the Revenues of the Church? Had they in an instant, altered their sentiments about Sacrilege, and things consecrated to Holy uses? Were they now willing to part with the Churches Patrimony? Did that which moved them to be so earnest for this Meeting with the State, miraculously slip out of their Minds, so that they unconcernedly quate their pretensions, and betrayed their own interests? Were they all fast asleep when they were at the Conference? So much asleep, or senseless, that they could not perceive the Court intended them such a Trick? On the other hand,
If the Court had such a design as is pretended, I must confess, I do not see how it was useful for them to fall on such a wild project for accomplishing their purposes. Why be at all this pains to re-establish the Old Polity, if the only purpose was to rob the Church of her Patrimony? Might not that have been done without, as well as, with it? Could they have wished the Church in weaker circumstances for affording her own Rights than she was in, before this Agreement? Was it not as easy to have possessed themselves of a Bishoprick, ane Abbacy, a Priory, &c. when there were no Bishops, nor Abbots, nor Priors, as when there were? What a pitiful politick, or rather what an insolent wickedness was it, as it were, to take a Coat which was no mans, and put on one, and possessed him of it, and call it his Coat, that they might rob him of it? Or, making the uncharitable supposition, that they could have ventured on such a needleless, such a mad fetch of iniquity, were all the Clergy so short-sighted, that they could not penetrate into such a palpable, such a gross piece of Cheatry? But what needs more?

'Tis certain that by that Agreement, the Churches Patrimony was fairly secured to her, and she was put in far better condition than she was ever in before, since the Reformation. Let any man read over Calderwoods account of the Agreement, and he must confess it: And yet perhaps the account
account may be more full and clear, in the Books of Council, if they be extant.

'Tis true, indeed, the Courtiers, afterwards, played their Tricks, and robb’d the Church; and it cannot be denied, that they got some bad Clergymen, who were sub-fervient to their purposes: But this was so far from being pretended to be aimed at, by these Courtiers, while the Agreement was a making; It was so far from these Clergymen minds, who adjusted matters at that time with the Laity, (these Courtiers) to give them the smallest advantages that way, to allow them the least Scope for such Encroachments; That, on the contrary, when, afterwards, they found the Nobility were taking such Methods, and plundering the Church; they complained mightily of it, as a manifest breach of the Agreement, and one horrid iniquity.

But whatever Truth is in all this Reasoning, I have spent on this point, is not much material to my main purpose: For, whither, at that time, Episcopacy was imposed upon the Church or not; or, if imposed, whither it was out of a bad design or not; affects not, in the least, the principal Controversie. For however it was, 'tis certain the Church accepted of it, at that time, which we are bound, in Charity, to think, a sufficient Argument that she was not then of Antiprelatical principles; She had no such Article in her Creed, as the Divine Right of Parity; which is the great point
point I am concerned for in all this tedious Controversie.

3. The Third Plea, is, The Limitedness of the Power which was, then, granted to Bishops. They had no more Power granted them by this Establishment, than Superintendents had enjoyed before. This all my Authors insist upon with great Earnestness. I confess it is very true: This was provided for both by the Agreement at Leith, and by ane Act of the Assembly holden at Eden. But then 1. If they had the same power which Superintendents had before, I think they had truly Prelatic Power; they did not act in Parity with other Ministers. 2. Though they had no more power, yet it is certain they had more Privilege: They were not answerable to their own Synods, but only to General Assemblies, as is clear, even from Calderwoods own account of the agreement at Leith. In that point, the absurd Constitution in the First Book of Discipline was altered. 3. One thing more I cannot but observe, here, concerning Mr. Calderwood. This judicious Historian, when he was concerned to raise Dust about the Prelacy of Superintendents, found easily 7 or 8 huge Differences between Superintendents and Bishops. And now, that he is concern'd to raise Dust about the Prelacy of Bishops, he thinks he has gain'd a great point if he makes it the same with the Prelacy of Superintendents. What a mercy was it that ever poor Prelacy out-lived the Dust of such
Onset? But it seems it must be a tough-lived thing, and cannot be easily chased out of its Nature.

There is another considerable Thrust made at it by Calderwood, and his Disciple G. R. (s) which may come in as a Succession to the former Argument: What is it?

It is even, that in the Gen. Assembly at Eden March 6. 1573. David Ferguson was chosen Moderator, who was neither Bishop nor Superintendent. And so down falls Prelacy! But so was honest George Buchanan, in the Assembly holden in July 1567. who was neither Superintendent, Bishop, nor Presbyter, and so Down falls Presbytery! Nay Down falls the whole Ministry! Is not this a hard Lock, Prelacy is brought to, that it shall not be it self, so long as one wrong step can be found to have been made by a Scotch General Assembly?

I have adduced and discussed all these Plea's, not that I thought my Cause in any hazard by them; but to let the World see, what a party one has to deal with in this Controversie: Whatever it be, Sense or Nonsense, if their Cause requires it; they must not want an Argument. But to go on. But

4. The Fourth, and greatest Plea, is, That

(a) Cal. 56. this Episcopacy was never owned by the Church:
(b) Cal. 56. It was never allowed by the General Assembly. (a)
(c) Cal. 56. It was only tolerated for three or four years. (b)
(c) Cal. 53. It was protested against as a Corruption. (c) As

these Articles were concluded without the Knowledge
ledge of the Assembly, so the whole Assembly opposed them earnestly. (d) They were obtruded upon the Church, against her Will. (e) The Church from the beginning of the Reformation opposed that kind of Bishops. (f) The Church did only, for a time, yield to Civil Authority, yet so that she would endeavour to be free of these Articles. (g)

These and many more such things are boldly and confidently asserted by Calderwood, Petrie, and the strenuous Vindicator of the Church of Scotland, who seldom misleads of saying what Calderwood had said before him; and I shall grant they are all said to purpose, if they are true: But how far they are from being that may sufficiently appear, I hope, if I can make these things evident.

1. That the Agreement at Leith was fairly and frequently allowed, approven, and insisted on, by many subsequent Assemblies.

2. That after Episcopacy was questioned, and a Party appeared against it, it cost them much strugling, and much time, before they could get it abolished.

1. I say, The Agreement at Leith was fairly and frequently allowed, approven, and insisted on, by many subsequent Assemblies. This Assertion cannot but appear true to any unbyass'd Judgment, that shall consider but these two things.

1. That, in Every Assembly, for several years, after that Establishment, or Agreement, or Settlement at Leith, Bishops were present,
present, and sat, and voted as such; and, as such, were obliged to be present, and sit, and vote, &c. As both Calderwood and Pe-trie acknowledge, and shall be made appear by and by.

2. That these two Authors have been at special pains, to let the world know, how punctually they were tried, and sometimes rebuked and censured for not discharging their Offices, as they ought to have done. Both Authors, I say, have been very intent and careful to represent this in their accounts of the subsequent Assemblies. I know their purpose, herein, was to expose the Bishops, and cast all the Dirt, they could, upon Episcopacy. But then, as I take it, their pains, that way, have luckily furnished me with a plain Demonstration of the falsehood of all they have said, in this Plea, I am now considering: For

Would these Assemblies have suffered them to be present, and sit, and vote as Bishops? Would they have tried and censured them as Bishops? Would they have put them to their Duty as Bishops, if they had not own’d them for Bishops? And was there any other Fond for owning them for Bishops, at that time, except the Agreement at Leith? This alone might be sufficient, I say, for dispatching this whole Plea. Yet

3. To put this matter beyond all possibility of ever being, with the least colour of probability, controverted hereafter; I recommend to the Readers consideration, the following
following Series of Acts made by subsequent Assemblies.

The Agreement at Leith, as was observed before, was concluded, on the First day of February, Anno 1573. The Ordinary Assembly met at Saint Andrews, on the Sixth of March thereafter: The Archbishop of St. Andrews (newly advanced to that See, by the Leith Agreement) was present, and the first person named (as Calderwood himself hath it, (b) ) to be of the Committee that was appointed for Revising the Articles agreed upon at Leith: And one Act was made in that Assembly, (as it is both in the Mfs. and Petrie(i) ) Ordaining the Superintendent of Fife to use his own Jurisdiction, as before, in the Provinces not subject to the Archbishop of St. Andrews; and requesting him to concur with the said Archbishop, in his Visitations, or otherwise, when he required him, until the next Assembly—

And in like manner, the Superintendents of Angus and Lothian, without prejudice of the said Archbishop, except by Virtue of his Commission.

By the Assembly holden at Perth, August 6, 1572. this Act was made: Forasmuch as in the Assembly (not the Convention) of the Church holden at Leith, in January last, Certain Commissioners were appointed to deal with the Nobility, and their Commissioners, to reason and conclude upon diverse Articles and Heads, thought good, then, to be conferred upon; according to which Commission, they have proceeded in January Conventions, (is this consistent with Petrie's assertion, that, the
the same day, they met and concluded; and have concluded for that time, upon the Heads and Articles as the same produced in this Assembly, proportion: In which, being considered, are found certain Names, as Archbishop, Dean, Archdeacon, Chancellor, Chapter, which Names are thought slanderous and offensive in the Ears of many of the Brethren, appearing to sound towards Papistry; Therefore, the whole Assembly in one voice, as well they were in Commission at Leith, as others, solemnly protest, that they mean not, by using such Names, to ratify, consent, or agree to any kind of Papistry or Superstition; wishing rather the said Names to be changed into other Names, that are not scandalous and offensive; and, in like manner, they protest, That the said Heads and Articles agreed upon, be only received as an Interim, until farther, and more perfect Order be obtained, at the hands of the Kings Majesty's Regent and Nobility: For the which, they will press, as occasion shall serve. Unto the which Protestation the whole Assembly, in one voice, adhere. So the Mss. Spot. Cald. Pet. (k)

This is the Act, on which, Calderwood, Cald. 57. Petrie, and G. R. found their assertion, That Episcopacy, as agreed to at Leith was protested against, and earnestly opposed, by a General Assembly; but with what Shadow of Reason, let any Man consider: For, what can be more plain, than, that they receive the substance of the Articles, and only protest against the Scandalousness of the Names used in them? What reason they had
had for that, besides the over-zealous Principle I mentioned before, let the curious enquire: That's none of my present business.

But, They protest that they receive these Articles only for ane Interim: True; But how doth it appear that they received them only for ane Interim, out of a Dislike to Episcopacy? Had they believed the Divine Right of Parity, how could they have received them so much as, for ane Interim? How could they have received them at all? The Truth is, there were many things in the Articles which required amendment, even tho' the Gen. Ass. had believed the Divine Right of Episcopacy. And that they did not receive them, for ane Interim, upon the account of any Dislike they had to Episcopacy, shall be made evident, by and by. In the mean time, we have gained one point, even, That they were received by this Assembly; unless receiving for an Interim be not receiving: But if they were received, I hope it is not true, that they were never allowed by a General Assembly. And if Episcopacy was not protested against at all, and if there was no such word or phrase in the Act, as had the least Tendency to import that they judged it a Corruption, I hope, it may consist well enough with the Laws of Civility, to say that G. R. was talking without Book, when he said, It was protested against as a Corruption, by this General Assembly. I doubt, if he had found any of the Prelatifs talking with so much Confidence, where they had so little ground, he would have
have been at his beloved Lies and Calumnies. But enough of this, proceed we in our Series.

By the Universal Order (so it is worded in the M's.) of the General Ass, holden at Eden, March 6, 1573. It was Statuted and Ordained, that all Bishops, Superintendents, &c. present themselves in every Gen. Ass. that hereafter shall be holden, the first day of the Assembly before Noon, &c. 

Again, It is thought most reasonable and expedient, That Bishops, &c. purchase General Letters, without any delay, commanding all Men to frequent Preaching and Prayers according to the Order received in the Congregations, &c.

In the Ass. holden at Eden. Aug. 6. 1573.

The Visitations Books of Bishops, &c. were produced, and certain Ministers appointed to examine their Diligence in Visitations.

Assembly, Patoun, Bishop of Dunkeld, was accused that he had accepted the Name, but had not exercised the Office of a Bishop, not having proceeded against Papists, within his bounds. He was also suspected of Simony and Perjury, in that, contrary to his Oath, at the receiving of the Bishopprick, he gave Acquittances, and the Earl of Argyle received the Profits.

If these things were true, he was a foolish, as well as a bad Bishop. But then it was evident, that this Assembly fairly own'd Episcopacy. Further, that by the Agreement at Leith, express provisions were made against Simony and Dilapidation of Benefices; and that Bishops should swear to that purpose, &c. which, I think, is not well
well consistent with the Plea insilifted on, before, viz. That the Agreement at Leith was forced on the Clergy, by the Court, out of a design, it had, upon the Revenues of the Church.

I find these further Acts made by this Assembly, in the Acts.

Touching them that receive Excommunicates, the whole Kirk, presently assembled, ordains all Bishops, &c. to proceed to Excommunication against all Receivers of Excommunicate persons, if after due Admonition the Receivers rebel and be disobedient.

The Kirk ordains all Bishops, &c. in their Synodal Conventions, to take a List of the Names of the Excommunicates, within their Jurisdictions; and bring them to the General Assemblies, to be published, to other Bishops and Superintendents, &c. That they, by their Ministers, in their Provinces, may divulgate the same, in the whole Countries, where Excommunicates haunt.

The Kirk presently assembled, ordains all Bishops and Superintendents, &c. to convene before them, all such persons as shall be found suspected of consulting with Witches; and finding them guilty, to cause them make publick Repentance, &c.

That Uniformity may be observed in processes of Excommunication, It is ordained that Bishops, and Superintendents, &c. shall direct their Letters to Ministers, where the persons that are to be Excommunicated dwell; commanding the said Ministers to admonish accordingly, and in Case of Disobedience, to proceed to Excommunication, and
and pronounce the Sentence thereof, upon a Sunday, in time of Preaching; and, thereafter, the Ministers to indorse the said Letters, making mention of the days of their Admonitions, and Excommunication, for Disobedience aforesaid, and to report to the said Bishops, &c. according to the Direction contained in the said Letters.

(p) Ib. 380. Petrie (p) has the substance of most of these Acts, but has been at pains to obscure them. And no wonder; for here are so many Branches of true Episcopal power, established in the persons of these Bishops, that it could not but have appeared very strange, that a General Assembly should have conferred them on them, if there was such an aversion then, to the Order, as he and his Fellows are willing to have the world believe, there was. But

Honest Calderwood was wiser, for he hath not so much as an intimation of any one of them. And Calderwood having thus concealed them, nay, generally, all alongst, whatever might make against his Cause, as much as he could; what wonder if G. R. who knows nothing in the matter, but what Calderwood told him, stumbled upon such a notable piece of Ignorance, in his first Vindication, as to tell the world, That Nothing was restored at Leith but the Image of Prelacy? That these Tulchan Bishops had only the Name of Bishops, while Noblemen and others had the Revenue, and the Church all the power? Nay, That, notwithstanding of all, was done at Leith; The real Exercise of Presbytery, in all
all its Meetings lesser and greater, continued and was allowed? But of this more hereafter.

The Assembly, holden at Eden. March 6, 1574. Concluded concerning the Jurisdiction of Bishops, in their Ecclesiastical Function, that it should not exceed the Jurisdiction of Superintendents, which, heretofore, they have had, and presently have: And that they should be subject to the Discipline of the General Ass, as Members thereof, as Superintendents had been heretofore, in all sorts. And again, This Assembly Ordains, That no Bishop give Collation of any Benefice within the bounds of Superintendents within his Diocess, without their Consent and Testimonials, subscribed with their hands: And that Bishops, within their Diocess visit by themselves, where no Superintendent is; and give no Collation of Benefices without the Consent of three well qualified Ministers.

Here indeed both Calderwood and Petrie (q) (q) Cald. appear briskly, and transcribe the Mss. 66. Pet. 383. word for word: Here was something like limiting the power of the Bishops; and that was an opportunity not to be omitted. But, as I take it, there was no very great reason for this Triumph, if the true reason of these Acts be considered, as it may be collected from Spotwood and Petrie (r) which was this,

The Earl of Morton, then Regent, and fordidly covetous, had flattered the Church Pet. 383. out of their Possession of the Thirds of the Benefices; the only sure Stock, they could as yet claim, by any Law, made since the P Refor-
Reformation of Religion; promising, instead thereof, to settle local'd Stipends upon the Ministers; but having once obtain'd his end, which was to have the Thirds at his Disposal, he forgot his promise; and the Ministers found themselves miserably trickt. Three or four Churches were cast together, and committed to the Care of one Minister; and a Farthing, to live by, could not be got, without vast attendance, trouble and importunity. Besides, the Superintendents, who had had a principal hand in the Reformation, and were Men of great Repute, and had spent liberally of their own Estates in the Service of the Church, were as ill treated as any body: For when they sought their wonted allowances, they were told, there was no more use for them; Bishops were now restored; it was their Province to govern the Church: Superintendents were now superfluous and unnecessary. The Superintendents thus Mal treated, what wonder was it if they had their own Resentments of it? So, when the General Assembly met, Areskin, Spotswood and Winram, three of them (and, by that time, 'tis probable, there were no more of them alive) came to the Assembly, offered to dimit their Offices, and were earnest that the Kirk would accept of their Dimission: They were now turn'd useless Members of the Ecclesiastical body; their Office was evacuated; they could serve no longer. The whole Assembly could
could not but know the matter, and as they knew for what reasons these ancient and venerable persons were so much irritated, so their own concern, in the same common interest, could not but prompt them to a fellow-feeling; they knew not how soon the next Mortonian Experiment might be tried upon themselves; they, therefore, unanimously, refuse to accept of the Dimission, and whither the Superintendents will or not, they continue them in their Offices; and not only so, but they thought it expedient to renew that Article of the Agreement at Leith, viz. "That Bishops and Superintendents stood on the same Level, had the same Power, the same Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction; and were to be regulated by the same Canons: Importing thereby, that both were useful in the Church at such a juncture; and that the Church had not received Bishops to the Exaucitoration of the few surviving Superintendents; and now, in their old age, rendering them contemptible. And who could condemn the Assembly for taking a course that was both so natural and so obvious? Nay, it was even the Bishops interest, as much as any other Assembly-men to agree to this conclusion; For the great business in hand, was not about Extent of Power, or Point of Dignity; had no Incentive to Jealousy or Emulation in it; but it was about the Revenues of the Church: To secure these against the intractable Avarice of a Griping Lord Regent. A
point the Bishops were as nearly concerned in as any Men: For if these three Superin-
tendents, who had so long born the heat of
the day, and done such eminent and extra-
ordinary services to the Church, should be
once sacrificed to Mortons Covetousnes,
how easie might it be for him to make
what farther Encroachments he pleased?
How easie, to carry on his project against
other men, who perhaps, had no such
Merit, no such Repute, no such Interest in
the Affections of the People? This, I say,
was the Reason for which these two Acts
were made in this Assembly; and not that
the Assembly were turning weary of Bishops,
or were become, any way, dissatisfied to
them. So that Calderwood and Petrie had
but little reason to be so boastful for these
two Acts.

That it was not out of any Dislike to
Episcopacy, that these two Acts were made,
is clear, as Light, from the next Assembly,
which met in August 1574. For therein
the Clergy manifestly continuing of the
same Principles, and proceeding on the
same Reasons, order a Petition consisting of
Nine Articles, to be drawn, and presented
to the Regent. Calderwood, indeed, doth
not mention this Petition. But it is in the
Ms. and Petrie (s) talks of it, but disingene-
uously; for he mentions it only Overly,
telling, That some Articles were sent unto the
Lord Regent; and he sets down but two,
whereas, as I laid, there are Nine in the Ms.
and most of them looking the Regents Sac- 
crilegious inclinations even Staringly in the 
Face. I shall only Transcribe such of them 
as cannot, when perplexed, but be ac-
knowledged to have tended that way. They 
are these:

1. That Stipends be granted to Superinten-
dents, in all time coming, in all Countreys defi-
tute thereof; whither it be where there is no Bi-
shop, or where there are Bishops, who cannot 
discharge their Office, as the Bishops of St. An-
drews and Glafgow; who had too large 
Diocesses. This Article Petrie hath but 
Mine'd: Indeed it is a very considerable one; 
For here you see, 1. That, in contradition 
to the Regents purposes, the Assembly owns 
and stands by the Superintendents: They are 
so far from being satisfied to part with the 
Three, they had; that, on the contrary, 
they crave to have more, and to have pro-
visions for them; and that, in all Coun-
tries, where Bishops either are not; or are, 
but have too large Diocesses. 2: They crave 
these things For all times coming, a Clause of 
such importance to the main Question, that 
Petrie has, unfaithfully, left it out: And 
truly, I must confess, if it were lawful for 
Men to be Unfaithful, when it might serve 
that which they conceived to be a Good 
End, he had great Reason, to try it, in this 
instance: For this Clause, when (not con-
cealed, but) brought above board, gives a 
fatal Overthrow, to all these popular Plea's 
of Episcopacy's being then obtruded on 
the
the Church; forced upon her against her Will; tolerated only for a time, &c. For, from this Clause, it is as clear, as a Clause can make it, that this Assembly entertain'd no such imaginations. They supposed Episcopacy was to continue for all time coming. For, for all time coming, they petition that provision may be made for Superintendents, where no Bishops are, or where their Diocesses are too large for them.

2. The Second Article is, That in all Burghs, where the Ministers are displaced, and serve at other Kirks, these Ministers be restored to wait on their Cures, and be not obliged to serve at other Churches, &c. Directly striking against the Regents politic of Uniting three or four Churches under the Care of one Minister. The

4. (Which Petrie also hath) is, That in all Churches destitute of Ministers, such persons may be planted as the Bishops, Superintendents and Commissioners shall name; and that Stipends be assigned to them. Ane Article, visibly, levell'd as the former.

5. That Doctors may be placed in Universities; and Stipends granted them; whereby, not only they who are presently placed may have occasion to be diligent in their Cure; but other learned Men may have Occasion to seek places in Colleges. Still to the same purpose, viz. the finding reasonable Uses for the Patrimony of the Church.

6. That his Grace would take a General Order with the poor, especially in the Abbeys, such as
are Aberbrothoick, &c. Conform to the Agreement at Leith. Here, not only the Leith Agreement insisted on; but farther pious Use for the Churches Patrimony.

9. That his Grace would cause the Books of the Assignation of the Kirk, be delivered to the Clerk of the General Assembly. These Books of Assignation, as they call them, were the Books, wherein the Names of the Ministers, and their several proportions of the Thirds were Recorded: It seems they were earnest to be reposest of their Thirds, seeing the Regent had not kept promise to them. But

The Eighth Article, which, (by a pardonable inversion, I hope) I have reserved to the last place, is, of all, the most considerable. It is, That his Grace would provide Qualified persons for Vacant Bishopsricks. Let the candid Reader judge, now, if Episcopacy, by the Leith-Articles was forced upon the Church against her Inclinations? If it was never approved (when Bishops were thus petitioned for) by a General Assembly? If it be likely that the Assembly in August 1572. protested against it as a Corruption? If the Acts of the last Assembly, declaring Bishops to have no more power than Superintendents had, and making them accountable to the General Assembly, proceeded from any Dislike of Episcopacy? If this Assembly, petitioning thus for Bishops, believed the divine and indispensible institution of Parity? If both Calderwood and Petrie acted
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not as became Cautious Presbyterian Historians; the One, by giving us None, the other, by giving us only a Minced account of this Petition? Well!

By this time, I think, I have not entirely disappointed my Reader: I think, I have made it competently appear, That the Agreement at Leith was fairly and frequently allowed, approved, and insisted on, by not a few subsequent General Assemblies. I could adduce some Acts more of the next Ass. which met at Eden, March 7. 1575. But, I think, I have already made good my Undertaking, and therefore I shall insist no further on this point: Only One thing I must add further; It is this.

After the most impartial, narrow, and attentive Search, I could make, I have not found, all this while, viz. from the first publick Establishment of the Reformed Religion in Scotland, Anno 1560. so much as One Indication of either publick or private Dislike to Prelacy; But that it, constantly, and uninterruptedly, prevailed, and all persons, cheerfully as well as quietly submitted to it, till the year 1575. when it was first called in Question. And here I might fairly shut up this long, and perhaps nauseous Discourse, upon the Second Enquiry which I proposed: For, whatever Men our Reformers were, whatever their other principles might be; I think I have made it plain, that they were not for the Divine Rights of Paritz, or the Unlawfulness of
of the Superiority of any Office in the Church, above Presbyters: No such principle was professed, or insisted on, or offered to be reduced to practice, by them. Before, At, or full fifteen years after the publick Establishment of the Reformation: And if this may not pass for sufficient proof of the truth of my Resolution of the Enquiry, I know not what may. However, because

THE SECOND thing I promised to shew, tho not precisely necessary to my main design, may yet be so far useful, as to bring considerably more of Light to it; and withal, give the world a prospect of the Rise and Progress of Presbytery in Scotland, I shall endeavour to make good my Undertaking; which was, that, after Episcopacy was question’d, it was not easily overturn’d; Its Adversaries met with much Resistance, and Opposition, in their Endeavors to subvert it. I shall study brevity as much as the weight of the matter will allow me. In short then; take it thus.

Master Andrew Melvil, after some years spent at Geneva, returned to Scotland in July 1574. He had lived, in that City, under the influences of Theodore Beza, the true Parent of Presbytery. He was a Man, by Nature, fierce and fiery, confident and peremptory, peevish and ungovernable: Education, in him, had not sweetned Nature, but Nature had sowed Education; and both conspiring together, had trickt him up into a true Original; a piece compounded
pounded of pride and petulance, of jeer and
jangle, of Satyr and Sarcafm; of venome
and vehemence: He hated the Crown as
much as the Mitre, the Sceptor as much as
the Crossier, and could have made as bold
with the Purple (a) as with the Rocket: (b)
His prime Talent was Lampooning and writ-
ing Anti-tami-Cami-Categorias's. In a word,
He was the very Archetypal Bitter Beard
of the Party.

This Man thus accoutred, was scarcely
warm at home, when he began to dissemi-
nate his sentiments, insinuate them into
others, and make a party against Prelacy,
and for the Genevian Model. For this I need
not depend on Spotswood's Authority, tho he
asserts it plainly: (c) I have a more Authen-
tick Author for it, if more Authentick can
be: I have Melvil himself for it, in a Let-
ter to Beza dated Novem. 13. 1579. (to be
found both in Petrie (d) and in the Pamphlet
called Vindicte Philadelphi, from which Pe-
trie had it) of which Letter, the very first
words are, we have not ceased these five
years to fight against Pseudepiscopacy, &c. Now rec-
kron five years backward, from Novem. 1579.
and you stand at November 1574. whereby
we find that within three or four Months,
after his arrival, the Plot was begun, tho'
it was near to a year thereafter, before it
came above board.

Having thus projected his work, and form-
ed his party, the next care was to get one
to Table it fairly: He himself was but late-
Come home; he was much a Stranger in the Country, having been ten years abroad: He had been but at very few General Assemblies, if at any; his influence was but green and budding; his Authority but young and tender: It was not fit for him, amongst his First Appearances, to propose so great an Innovation. And, it seems, the Thinking Men of his Party, however resolutely they might promise to back the Motion, when, once, fairly Tabled, were yet a little shy to be the first Proposers: So, it fell to the share of one, who, at that time, was none of the greatest Statesmen.

John Durie, one of the Ministers of Edinburg, was the person; as Spotswood describes him, (c) A sound hearted Man, far from all (e) Spot; Diffimulation, open, professing what he thought; earnest and zealous in his Cause, whatever it was; but too too credulous, and easily to be imposed on. However, (that I may do him as much justice, as Spotswood has done him before me,) A Man he was, who thought no Shame to acknowledge his Error, when he was convinced of it. For so it was, that, when, after many years Experience, he had satisfied himself, that Parity had truly proved the Parent of Confusion, and disappointed all his Expectations; and when, through Age and Sickness, he was not able, in person, to attend the General Assembly, Anno 1600, he gave Commission to some Brethren to tell them, as from him, That there was a Necessity of restoring the Ancient Government.
Government of the Church, &c. Such was the Man, I say, to whose share it fell to be the first, who, publicly, questioned the Lawfulness of Prelacy in Scotland; which was not done till the Sixth day of August 1575. as I said before, no less than full fifteen years after the first legal Establishment of our Scottish Reformation. And so I come to my purpose.

On this Sixth of August 1575. the Gen. Ass. met at Edinburgh, according to the Order, then, observed in General Assemblies; the first thing done, after the Assembly was constituted, was, the Tryal of the Doctrine, Diligence, Lives, &c. of the Bishops and other constant Members: So, while this was a doing, John Durie stood up and protested, That the Tryal of the Bishops might not prejudice the Opinions and Reasons, which he and other Brethren of his Mind, had, to propose against the Office and Name of a Bishop. (f) Thus was the fatal Controversie set on foot, which, since, hath brought such Miseries and Calamities on the Church and Kingdom of Scotland.

The Hare thus started, Melvil, the Original Huntsman, strait pursued her: He presently began a long, and, no doubt, premeditated Harangue; commended Durie's Zeal, enlarged upon the flourishing State of the Church of Geneva, insisted on the Sentiments of Calvin and Beza concerning Church Government; and, at last affirmed, That none ought to be Office-bearers in the Church,
whose Titles were not found in the Book of God: That tho' the Title of Bishops was found in Scripture, yet, it was not to be understood in the Sense, then, current: That Jesus Christ, the only Lord of his Church, allowed no Superiority amongst the Ministers, but had instituted them all, in the same Degree, and had endowed them with equal power: Concluding, That the Corruptions, which had crept into the Estate of Bishops were so great, as, unless the same were removed, it could not go well with the Church, nor could Religion be long preserved in Purity. (g) (g) Spot.

The Controversie thus plainly stated. Mr. David Lindsay, Master George Hay, and Master John Row, three Episcopalians, were appointed to confer and reason upon the Question proponed with Mr. Andrew Melvil, Mr. James Lawson, and Mr. John Craig; two Presbyterians, and one, much indifferent for both sides. After diverse Meetings, and long Disception faith Spotswood, (b) after (b) Spot. two days, faith Petrie, (i) they presented 275. these Conclusions to the Assembly, which, (i) Pet. at that time, they had agreed upon.

1. They think it not expedient, presently, to answer, directly, to the First Question. But if any Bishop shall be chosen, who hath not such Qualities as the word of God requires, let him be tried by the General Assembly De Novo, and so deposed.

2. The Name Bishop is common to all them who have particular Flocks, over which they have particular Charges, to preach the Word, administer the Sacraments, &c.

3. One.
3. Out of this Number may be chosen some to have power to Oversee and Visit such reasonable Bounds, beside his own Flock, as the General Kirk shall appoint; and, in these bounds, to appoint Ministers, with Consent of the Ministers of that Province, and of the Flock to whom they shall be appointed. Also, to appoint Elders and Deacons in every principal Congregation, where there are none, with Consent of the People thereof; and to suspend Ministers, for reasonable Causes, with Consent of the Ministers aforesaid. So the

Tis true, here are some things, which, perhaps, when thoroughly examined, will not be found so exactly agreeable to the Sentiments and Practice of the Primitive Church. However, 'tis evident, for this Bout, the Imparity-men carried the day; and it seems the Parity-men have not yet been so well fixed for the Divine and indispensible Right of it, as our Modern Parity-men would think needful; otherwise, how came they to consent to such Conclusions? How came they to yield that it was not expedient, at that time, to answer directly to the first Question, which was concerning the Lawfulness of Episcopacy? Were they of the Modern Principles, C. R's Principles? Did they think that Divine institutions might be dispensed with, crossed, according to the Exigencies of Expediency or Inexpediency? What an Honour is it to the Party if their first Hero's were such Casuists? Besides, is not the Lawfulness of Imparity clearly imp-
Ported in the Third Conclusion? Indeed both Calderwood and Petrie acknowledge so much.

Calderwood (l) faith, It seemeth that by (l) Cal. 69: Reafon of the Regents Authority, who was bent upon the Course (i. e. Epifcopacy) whereof he was the chief Instrument, that they answered not directly, at this time, to the Question. Here, you fee, he owns that nothing, at this time was concluded against the Course, as he calls it; whither he had reafon, to say, It seemed to be upon such an account, shall be con-

sidered afterward.

Petrie (m) acknowledges it too; but in (m) Pet. such a paflion, it seems, as quite mastered 387. his Prudence, when he did it; for these are his words. Howbeit in these Conclusions they express not the Negative, because they would not plainly oppose the particular interef of the Council, seeking security of the Poffeffions, by the Title of Bishops; yet these Affirmatives take away the pretended Office. Now let the world consider the Wisdom of this Author in advancing this fine period. They did not express the Negative, (they did not condemn Epifcopacy) because they would not plainly oppose the particular interef of the Council, seeking Security of the Poffeffions, &c. Now let us enquire who were these, They, who would not, for this reafon condemn Epifcopacy, at that time? It muft either belong to the Six Collocutors who drew the Concufions, or to the whole Assembly: If to the Collocutors, 'tis plain, Three of them, viz. Row, Hay, and Lindesay were
were innocent; they were persuaded in their Minds of the Expediency (to say no further) as well as the Lawfulness of Episcopacy, and I think that was reason enough for them not to condemn it. The Presbyterian Brethren, then, if any, were the persons who were moved not to condemn it, because they would not plainly oppose the particular interest of the Council, &c. But if so, hath not Master Petrie made them very brave fellows? Hath he not fairly made them such friends to Sacrilege, that they would rather baulk a divine Institution, than interrupt its Course, and offend its Votaries? If by the word, They, he meant the General Assembly; if the whole Assembly were they, who would not express the Negative, because they would not oppose, &c. I think, Mr. Petrie, were he alive, would have enough to do, to prove that that was the Reason they were determin'd by. What? Had the whole Church quare all their pretensions, they insisted on so much, on every Occasion? Had they now given over their Claim to the Revenues of the Church? Shall I declare my poor opinion in this matter? I am apt to believe that it was one of the great Arguments insisted on by the Three Episcopalian Collocutors, at that time, "That if "Episcopacy should be concluded unlawful, "and, by consequence, overturned, the "Patrimony of the Church would undoubt- "edly go to wreck; The hungry Courtiers "would presently possess themselves of the "Revenues
Revenues belonging to the Bishops:

Sure I am, as things then stood, there was all the Reason in the world for insisting on this Argument: But to pass this. Petrie it seems was not content with giving the quite contrary of that, which in all probability, was the true Reason, at least one of the true Reasons, for not overturning Episcopacy at that time; But he behoved to add something more Extravagant: He behoved to add, That the Affirmatives in the aforesaid conclusions took away the pretended Office of Episcopacy. What might he not have said, after this? It seems, that in this Author's opinion, all is one thing, to assert the Lawfulness of the Office, and thereupon to continue it, and to take it away. But perhaps I may be blamed for taking so much notice of ane angry mans Exceffes, For no doubt it was anger that such conclusions should have been made, that hurried him upon such Extravagances; and therefore I shall leave him, and return to my thread.

By what I have told, it may be easy to judge, how cold the first Entertainment was, which Parity got when it was proposed to the General Assembly: and so much the more, if it be further considered that, by this same Assembly, some 8 or 9 Articles were ordered to be presented to My Lord Regents Grace, whereof the First (as I find it in the MS. and in Petrie himself (n) Pet: (n) tho' neither so fully nor so fairly) was 383. this.

Imprimis.
Imprimis, for planting and preaching the word, thro' the whole Realm, It is Desired, that so many Ministers as may be had, who are yet unplaced, may be received, as well in the Country, to relieve the charge of them who have many Kirks, as otherwise, throughout the whole Realm, with Superintendents or Commissioners within these Bounds where Bishops are not, and to help such Bishops as have too great Charges: And that Livings be appointed to the aforesaid Persons: and also payment to them who have travelled before, as Commissioners, in the years of God 1573, and 1574, and so forth, in time coming, without which, the travels of such Men will cease.

This I say is the First of many Articles ordered by this Assembly for the Regent; From which it is Evident, not only, that Mr. Melvils Project made little, or no progress, at this time, but also that the Assembly continued firm and stedfast in the same very intentions, and of the same very Principles, which had prevailed in former Assemblies, viz. to stop the uniting of Churches; to multiply the number of persons cloathed with Prelatick power; To continue that power in the Church; and by all means to secure her Patrimony and guard against, and Exclude all alienations of it.

Melvil and his Partisans, thus successless in their first attempt, but withal, once engaged and resolved not to give over, began, it seems, against the next Assembly to reflect on what they had done, and perceive that they had mistaken their measures:
tures: And indeed it was a little precipitantly done, at the very first, to state the Question simply and absolutely upon the Lawfulness or Unlawfulness of Episcopacy, in the General, as they had stated it. It was a new Question which had never been stated in the Church of Scotland before: And it could not but be surprising to the greatest part of the Assembly. Thus to call in Question the Lawfulness of an Office which had been so early, so universally, so usefully, so incontestably, received by the Catholic Church. This was a point of great importance: For, to Declare that Office Unlawful, what was it else than to condemn all these Churches, in the primitive times, which had own'd it and flourish't under it? What else than to condemn the Scottish Reformation and Reformers, who had never Question'd it, but, on the contrary, had proceeded all, alongst, on principles which, clearly supposed its Lawfulness, if not its Necessity? Nay, was it not to condemn, particularly, all these General Assemblies which, immediately before, had so much Authorized and confirm'd it? Besides, as hath been already observed, to Declare Episcopacy Unlawful was, unavoidably, to stifle all these projects, they had been so industriously forming for recovering the Churches Patrimony: And not only so; but to expose it more and more to be devoured by the voracious Laity. It was plain, it could no sooner be declared Unlawful.
lawful, than it behoved to be parted with; and turn out the Bishops, once, and what would become of the Bishopricks? Nay, to turn them out, what was it else, than, to undo the whole Agreement at Leith, which was the greatest security, the Church, then, had for her Patrimony? For these and the like reasons, I say, laying aside the impiety, and insisting only on the imprudence of the Melvilian Project, it was, no doubt, precipitantly done, at the very first, to make that the State of the Question: And it was no wonder if the Assembly was unanimous in agreeing to the conclusions which had been laid before them by the six Collocutors: Nay, it was no wonder if Melvil and his Party, sensible of their error, and willing to cover it, the best way they could, yielded, for that time, to the other Three, who had, so visibly, the advantage of them, at least, in the point of the Churches interest: And therefore,

At the next Assembly, which was holden at Edinburgh, April 24. 1576. they altered the State of the Question, as Spotswod observes,(o) and made it this, Whether Bishops, as they were then in Scotland, had their Function warranted by the word of God? But even thus flared, at that time, it avail'd them nothing: For, (as it is in the MS.) The whole Assembly, for the most part, after Reasoning and long Disputation upon every Article of the Brethren (viz. the six Collocutors) opinion and advice, resolutely approved and affirmed the same, and
and every Article thereof, as the same was given in by them. And then the Articles are Repeated.

Calderwood and Petrie do both shuffle over the state of the Question, (p) but, upon (p) Cald, the matter, they give the same account of the Assembly's Resolution: However, I thought fit to take it in the words of the MS. the very file importing that they are the most Authentic. And in this Resolution we may observe these three things.

1. That whatever the Melvilian Party might then be, They were but the smaller Party: The whole Assembly for the most part, that is, as I take it, the far greater part of the Assembly was against them.

2. That the whole Assembly for the most part seemed to have been seriously persuaded they were in the right, and did not approve and affirm these Articles either indeliberately or faintly; For it was after Reasoning and long Disputation, that they approved and affirmed them, and they were sufficiently keen in the matter, for they did it Resolutely.

3. The Melvilian Party were over voted, even as the Question was, then, Stated: The whole Assembly for the most part, stood for Episcopacy as it was then established in Scotland, and would not declare it Unlawful. From all which, I leave to the world to judge, if Presbyterian party did not meet with opposition, with very great opposition, at its first appearances in Scotland: Neither was this all.
As this General Assembly did thus stand its ground, and appeared for Imparity, so it continued of the same sentiments and Resolutions with former Assemblies, in the Matter of the Churches Patrimony; For, By it, it was resolved also, That they might proceed against unjust possessors of the Patrimony of the Church, in respect of the Notorious Scandal, not only by Doctrine and Admonition, but with the Censures of the Church, and that the Patrimony of the Church, whereupon the Church, the Poor and the Schools should be maintained, was ex jure divino. So 'tis in the MS. and so Petrie hath it: (s) Well! Did the Parity-men gain no ground in this Assembly? Yes, they did: Two things they obtained, which were very useful for them afterwards. They obtained

1. And Act to be made That the Bishops should be obliged to take the charge of particular Congregations. 'Tis true, the Assembly could not get this refused after they had approved and affirmed the above-mentioned Articles. For, it was fairly deducible both from the second and third: But then, it is plain, this Act did militate nothing against the Essentials of Episcopacy: It was highly consistent with Imparity amongst the Governors of the Church: and the Articles evidently import as much: However, as I said, this proved very serviceable to the Melvilian Party, afterwards, as we shall hear. But this was not the worst of it: For

2. The
2. The Earl of Morton, then, Regent (whatever the Presbyterian Historians talk of his being so much for Episcopacy) made a very ill-favoured, as well as a very fatal step in the time of this Assembly: Take it in Spotswode words, (c) The Regent hearing how (c) Spotswood the Church had proceeded, and taking ill the 276. Deposition of Master James Patton Bishop of Dunkeld, who was, in the former Assembly, deprived for Dilapidation of his benefice, sent to require of them (this Assembly met in April 1576) whether they would stand to the Policy agreed unto at Leith? And if not, to desire them to settle upon some form of Government at which they would abide.

The Champions for Parity had fairly met with a second repulse from this Assembly, as I have discoursed, and if all concerned had acted their parts, as they might and ought to have done, and as the cause required, 'tis highly credible, that Mother of confusion might have been quite crush't and stifled for ever: But that was not done; The Prelates themselves were negligent and un-active, as Spotswode intimates, (u) and here, (u) Spotswood the Regent made this proposition. A proposition, than which, none could be made more surprizingly obliging and acceptable to the Presbyterian Party. All things considered, it was the very thing, the common principles of conduct might have taught them to have askt, next, if they had had things for the asking; For what can fall out more luckily for those who have a mind to

Q 4 innovate,
innovate, than to have the old foundations shaken, and leave allowed to erect new Models? So ill-favoured (I say) was this step, which, at this time, was made by Morton, who, by the exigencies of his station, was bound to have guarded against all innovations, especially such as had so natural a tendency to disturb the publick peace; and therefore I must ask my Readers allowance to make a little digression, if it may be called a digression, and discourse this Question, Whether it may not be thought probable that Morton made this proposition Deliberately, and from an Intention to Cherish the Presbyterian Party, and encourage their humor for innovating, and confounding the Peace of the Church?

This, perhaps, at first sight, may seem a bold Question, as not only being New, but apparently Crossing the received accounts of our Presbyterian Historians; But if I can make the affirmative very probable (if not evident) I am apt to think, it may bring no small accessions of light to the present subject I am insisting on, viz. how Presbyterianism was first introduced into Scotland? I will therefore lay down my Reasons for it, that the world may judge of them; and

1. That which I have already descoursed, seems to be a very fair Argument that Morton made this proposition, intentionally, to give scope and slackened Reins to the Presbyterian Party; For if he had not made it;
if he had resolved to stand by the Agreement at Leith; if he had been serious for the Established Government and Peace of the Church; it had been easy for him to have suppressed all Melvil's Projects for innovation. He had visibly, the major part of this Assembly, of his side, if that had been his Aim; No appearance that the Body of the People was then infected with the principles of Parity. The Nobility were generally for the old constitution, as is evident from no less Authority than Melvil's own, in his Letter to Beza cited before, in which he tells him, He and his Party had many of the Peers against them; (v) where, then, was there (v) Per. the least difficulty of Crushing the Coccatrice 401. in the Egg, if he had had a mind for it? Besides, how inconsistent was the making of this proposition with the Integrity and Honesty of a Regent? The King was, then, a Minor; The Nation had but just, then, emerged out of a vast Ocean of civil broys and troubles, which had long harassed it, and kept it in confusion; nothing more improper for it than to be involved again, instantly, in jars and discords; So that if he had no such Plot, as I am endeavouring to make probable he had, he was, certainly, very unfortunate in granting such a Liberty; For, considering all things, it looks so very like a Plot, that it cannot but be very hard to persuade a thinking man that there was none. Especially if it be considered
2. That he was a Man, who had *latitude* enough, to do ill things, if he thought them subservient to his *interest*. He was wretchedly *Covetous*, as all *Historians* agree: And that vice alone disposes a Man for the worst things. He hath observed little of the affairs of the world, and the extravagances of Mankind, who has not observed *Avarice* and a *sordid* temper to have put Men on the most abominable courses: who hath not observed, who hath not *seen*, that Men have sold Religion, Honour, Con-

ience, Loyalty, Faith, Friendship, every thing that's sacred, for Money? Now by making this proposition, He projected a very fair opportunity for gratifying this his *predominating appetite*. He had so anxiously covered the *Emoluments* of the *Arch-Bishoprick* of *St. Andrews* in the year 1571 (as Sir *James Melvil* tells us in his *Memoirs*) that meeting with a *repulse*, he forsook the Court, and was so much discontented, that he would not return to it, till *Randolf* the *English* Ambassadour persuaded *Lennox*, then Regent, to give it to him; Promising that the *Queen* of *England* should recom-
pence it to him with greater advantage. How much of that *Bishoprick* he had con-
tinued still to possess, after the *Agreement at Leith*, and *Douglas's* advancement to that *Arch-Bishoprick*, I cannot tell; But it is not to be doubted, whatever it was, it sharpened his *stomack* for more of the Churches *Revenues*; and now, the juncture made
made wonderfully for him; For, as he had found by experience, and many Acts of Assemblies, &c. That the Church, careful of her interests, and watchful over her Patrimony, was no ways inclined to sit still and suffer her self to be cheated, and plundered, according to his hungry inclinations; but was making, and like to continue to make vigorous opposition to all such sacrilegious purposes, so long as she continued united, and settled on the foot on which she then stood, So he found, that, now, Contention was arising within her own Bowels, and a Party was appearing zealous for innovations, and her peace and unanimity were like to be broken and divided; and what more proper for him, in these circumstances, than to lay the reins on their necks, and cast a further bone of Contention amongst them? He knew full well what it was to fish in troubled waters, as Sir James Melville observes of him, and so 'tis more than probable he would not neglect such an opportunity, still so much the more, if it be considered,

3. That whatever professions he might have made, in former times, of good affection to Episcopal Government, yet there is little reason to think that his Conscience was interested in the matter; For besides that covetous, selfish, subtle men, such as he was, use not to allow themselves to stand too precisely upon all the Dictates of a Nice and tender Conscience; The Divine Right
Right of Episcopacy, (the true fund for making it matter of Conscience) in these times was not much asserted or thought on: That was not, till several years afterwards, when the Controversies about the Government of the Church came to be sifted more narrowly: It is commonly acknowledged that the main Argument which prevailed with him to appear for Episcopacy, was its aptitude for being part of a fund for a good Correspondence with England. Spotswood tells us, (y) that one of the Injunctions which he got when he was made Regent, was, That he should be careful to entertain the Amity contracted with the Queen of England. And Calderwood faith thus expressly of him, (z) His great intention was to bring in conformity with England, in the Church Government, without which, he thought, he could not Govern the Country to his Fantaite, or, that, Agreement could stand long between the two Countreys. And again, (a) He pressed his own injunctions and Conformity with England. Now this being the great motive that made him so much inclined, at any time, for Episcopal Government; It is to be considered,

4. That, however prevalent this might be with him, when, first, he was advanced to the Regency, civil Dissentions raging then, and the Party, of which he was the Head, being unable to subsist, unless supported by England; Yet now, that all these Dissentions were ended, and the Countrey quieted, and things brought to some appearance
rance of a durable settlement; His Dependence on England might prompt him to alter his scheme, and incline him to give scope to the Presbyterian wildfire in Scotland. To set this presumption in its due light, Two things are to be a little further enquired into.

1. If it is probable that Queen Elizabeth was willing that the Presbyterian humor should be Encouraged in Scotland?

2. If Morton depended so much on her, as to make it feasible that he might be subservient to her Designs, in this Politick? As for the

First, this is certain, it was still one of Queen Elizabeth's great cares to Encourage confusions in Scotland. She knew her own Title was Questionable, as I have observed before; and tho' that had not been, yet, without Question the Scottish blood had the next best Title to the English Crown: and as 'tis Natural to most People to worship the rising Sun, especially when he looks Bright and Glorious; when he has no Clouds about him; I mean, the Apparent Heir of a Throne, when he is in a prosperous and flourishing condition; So, 'tis as Natural for the Regnant Prince to be jealous of him. Therefore, I say Queen Elizabeth, for her own security, did still what she could to Kindle wildfire in Scotland, and keep it burning, when it was Kindled. Thus, in the year 1560. She assisted the Scottish subjects against their Native Sovereign (her jealousied Competitrix)
petitrix) both with Men and Money; as I have told before: And Anno 1565. She countenanced the Scottish Lords who began to raise tumults about the Scottish Queens Marriage with the Lord Darnley; She furnished them with money, and harboured them when they were forced to flee for it. And how long did She foment our Civil wars after they brake out Anno 1567? What dubious Responces did She give, all the time She Vsmpir’d it, between the Queen of Scotland and those who appeared for her Son? And is it not very well known that She had a hand in the Road of Ruthven 1582, and in all our Scottish seditions, Generally? Sir James Melvil in his Memoirs gives us enough of her Practices that way: He lived in these times, and was acquainted with intrigues; and he tells us, (b) "That Randolf came with Lennox, (when he came to Scotland, to be Regent, after Murray’s death) to stay here as English Resident: That this Randolf’s great employment was to foster discords, and increase Divisions among the Scots, particularly, 

"That he used Craft with the Ministers, (c) offering Gold to such of them as he thought could be prevail’d with to accept his offer: ’Tis true he adds, But such as were honest refused his gifts: But this says not that none took them; and who knows but the most Fiery might have been foremost at receiving? It hath been so, since; Even when it was the Price of the best blood in Britain. But to go on; Sir James tells further (d) that "

---

(b) Mel. Mem. 135
(c) Ibid. 109
(d) Ibid. 113
Morton and Randolf contrived the Plot of
keeping the Parliament at Stirling 1571. to
forefault all the Queens Lords, thereby
to crush all hopes of Agreement: That he
was so much hated in Scotland for being
such ane Incendiary, that he was forced to
return to England; Mr. Henry Killegrew suc-
ceeding in his stead, in Scotland; (e) that (e) ibid.
this Killegrew, at a private meeting told 115.
himself plainly, (f) that he was come to (f) ibid.
Scotland with a Commission, contrary to 116.
his inclinations, which was to encourage
Faction, &c. Thus practiced Queen El-
izabeth, and such were her Arts and influ-
ences in Scotland, before she had the oppor-
tunity of improving the Presbyterian humour
to her purposes: And can it be imagined she
would not encourage it when once it got
footing? Certainly she understood it, bet-
ter than so: The Sett had set up a Presbytery
at Wandsworth in Surrey in the year 1572,
four years before Morton made this Proposi-
tion, seven years before a Presbytery was so
much as heard of in Scotland; No doubt she
knew the Spirit well enough, and how apt
and well suited, it was for keeping a State
in disorder and trouble. Nay, I have heard
from knowing Persons, that to this very
day, the Treasury Books of England (if I
remember right, sure I am, some English
record or other) bear the Names of such
Scottish Noblemen and Ministers, as were that
Queens Pensioners; and what allowances they
got for their Services, in fostering and cher-
ishing
tisling seditions and confusions in their Native Countrey; From this sample, I think, it is easy to collect at least, that it is highly probable that Queen Elizabeth was very willing that the Presbyterian humour should be encouraged in Scotland. Let us try

2. If Morton depended so much on her, as may make it credible that he was subservient to her Designs in this Politick? And here the work is easy; For he was her very Creature: he stood by her, and he stood for her! Randolf and he were still in one bottom, (g) The whole Countrey was abused by Randolf and Morton. Morton and Randolf contrived the Parliament 1571. Mentioned before. When Lennox the Regent was killed, Randolf was earnest to have Morton succeed him, (b) Randolf had no Credit but with Morton, (i) Killegrew told Sir James Melvil at the Private Meeting, mentioned before, (k) That the Queen of England and her Council built their course, neither on the late Regent Lennox, nor the present Mar, but entirely on the Earl of Morton, as only true to their interests. Morton after Mar's death was made Regent, England helping it with all their Might. (l) And again in that same page, Sir James tells that those who were in the Castle of Edinburgh, and stood for Queen Mary's Title, were so sensible of all this, that when Morton sent the same Sir James to propose one accommodation to them, He found it very hard to bring on one Agreement between them and Morton, for the evil opinion that was then conceived of him, and the

(g) Ibid. 110.
(h) Ibid. 115.
(i) Ibid. 116.
(k) P. 116.
(l) Ibid. 118.
hurtful marks they supposed, by proofs and appearances, that he would shoot at, being by Nature Covetous, and too great with England. And to make all this plainer, yet, Sir James tells us that Morton entertain'd a Secret Grudge against his Pupil, the Young King. He was ever jealous that the King would be his Ruine. (m) M.

And, England gave greater Assistance to Morton, than to any former Regents, for they believed he aimed at the same mark, with themselves; viz. to intrigue the Kings affairs, out of old jealousies between the Stuarts and the Douglases. (n) Now,

Let all these things be laid together, and then let the judicious consider if it is not more than probable, That as England had a main hand in the advancement of our Reformation, so it was not wanting to contribute for the encouragement of Presbytery also; and that Morton playing England's game, which was so much interwoven with his own, made this ill favoured Proposition to this Gen. Ass. But however this was, whether he had such a Plot or not; It is clear that his making this proposition, had all the effects he could have projected by being on such a Plot. For no sooner had he made this Proposition than it was greedily entertain'd; It answered the Melvilian wishes; and it was easy for them to find colourable Topicks for obtaining the consent of the rest of the Assembly; For most part of them were ready to acknowledge that there were Defects, and things to be mended in the Agreement
at Leith: And it had been received by the General Assembly in August 1572, for ane Interim only: The revising of that Agreement, might end some Controversies; and the Regent having made this Proposition, it was not to be doubted, but he would Ratify what they should Unanimously agree to, &c. These and the like Arguments, I say, might, 'tis clear, some Arguments did) prevail with the Assembly to entertain the Proposition: For

A commission was forthwith drawn to nineteen or twenty Persons, to Compose a Second Book of Discipline; (c) a step by which at that time the Presbyterian got a wonderful advantage over the other Party; For not only were Melvil and Lawson the two first Rate Presbyterians nominated amongst these Commissioners; But they had their business much premeditated; They had spent much thinking about it; and it is not to be doubted, they had Mr. Beza bespoken to provide them with all the Assistance, he and his Colleagues, at Geneva, could afford them: Whereas the rest were Generally very ignorant in Controversies of that Nature: They had all alongst, before that, employed themselves mainly in the Popish Controversies; and had not troubled their heads much about the Niceties of Government; They had taken the Ancient Government, so far, at least, as it subsisted by imparity, upon trust, as they found, it had been Practiced in all ages of the Church; perceiving
ving a great deal of Order and Beauty in it; and nothing that naturally tended to have a bad influence, on either the principles or the life of serious Christianity: And with that they were satisfied: Indeed even the best of them seem to have had very little skill in the true fountains whence the solid subsistence of the Episcopal Order was to be derived; The Scriptures I mean, not as Glossed by the Private Spirit of every Modern Novelist, but as interpreted and understood by the First ages; as sensed by the constant and universal practice, of Genuine, Primitive and Catholic Antiquity.

This charge of Ignorance, in the Controversies about the Government of the Church, which I have brought against the Scottish Clergy, in these times, will certainly leave a blot upon my self, if I cannot prove it: But if I can prove it, it is clear, it is of considerable importance in the present disquisition, and helps much for coming, by a just comprehension, to understand how Presbytery was introduced into Scotland. And therefore I must again beg my Readers patience, till I adduce some evidences for it. And

First, The truth of this charge may be obviously collected from the whole train of their proceedings, and management, about the Government of the Church, from the very first Establishment of the Reformation: For however they Established a Government which clearly subsisted by imparity, as
I have fully proven, and which was all I still aim'd at, yet, it is easy to Discover they were very far from keeping Closely by the Principles and Measures of the primitive constitution of Church-Government. This is so very apparent to any who Reads the Histories of these times, and is so visible in the Deduction I have made, that I shall insist no longer on it.

Secondly, The truth of my charge may further appear, from the Instance of Adamson, advanced, this year 1576, to the Archbishoprick of St. Andrews. That Nature had furnished him with a good flock, and he was a smart man, and cultivated beyond the ordinary size, by many parts of good Literature, is not denied by the Presbyterian Historians themselves; They never attempt to represent him as a Fool or a Dunce, tho' they are very eager to have him a Man of Tricks and Latitude. Now this Prelates ignorance in true Antiquity is Remarkably visible in his subscribing to these Propositions (Anno 1580, if we may believe Calderwood), The Power and Authority of all Pastors is equal, and alike great, amongst themselves. The Name Bishop, is Relative to the Flock, and not to the Eldership; For he is Bishop of his Flock, and not of other Pastors or fellow Elders; As for the Preeminence that one beareth over the rest, it is the Invention of Man, and not the Institution of Holy Writ. That the ordaining and appointing of Pastors which is also called the laying on of hands, appertaineth not to one Bishop only,
only, so being, Lawful Election pass before; but to those of the same Province or Presbytery, and with the like Jurisdiction and Authority, Minister at their Kirks. That in the Council of Nice for eschewing of private ordaining of Ministers, it was statuted, that no Pastor should be appointed without the consent of him, who dwelt or remained in the Chief and Principal City of the Province, which they called the Metropolitan City. That after, in the latter Councils, it was statuted, (that things might proceed more solemnly and with greater Authority) that the laying on of hands upon Pastors, after Lawful Election, should be by the Metropolitan, or Bishop of the Chief and principal Town, the rest of the Bishops of the Province voting there-to; in which thing, there was no other Prerogative, but only that of the Town, which, for that cause, was thought most meet both for the convening of the Council, and Ordaining of Pastors with common Consent and Authority. That the Estate of the Church was corrupt, when the name, Bishop, which before, was common to the rest of the Pastors of the Province, began, without the Authority of Gods Word and ancient Custome of the Kirk to be attributed to one. That the power of appointing and ordaining Ministers, and Ruling of Kirks with the whole procuration of Ecclesiastical Discipline, was, now, only, devolved to one Metropolitan; The other Pastors no ways challenging their Right and Privilege therein, of very slothfulness, on the one part; And the Devil, on the other, going about, craftily, to lay the ground of the Papistical Supremacy.

From these and such other Propositions,
sign'd by him, at that time, it may be judged, I say, if this Prelate did not betray a very profound ignorance in true Ecclesiastical Antiquity? Ane Arrant Presbyterian could not have said, could not have wished more. Indeed, 'tis more than probable (as perchance may appear by and by) that these Propositions were taken out, (either formally, or by collection) of Mr. Beza's Book DeTriplici Episcopatu. Now if Adamson was so little seen in such matters, what may we judge of the rest? But this is not all, For Thirdly, There cannot be a greater Evidence of the deplorable unskilfulness of the Clergy, in these times, in the ancient records of the Church, than their suffering Melvil and his Party to obtrude upon them, The Second Book of Discipline; A split new Democratical Sytteme; a very Farce of Novelties never heard of before in the Christian Church. For instance; What else is the confounding of the Offices of Bishops and Presbyterers? (q) The making Doctors or Professors of Divinity in Colledges and Universities a distinct Office, and, of Divine Institution? (r) The setting up of Lay-Elders, as Governours of the Church, Jure Divino? Making them Judges of mens Qualifications to be admitted to the Sacrament? Visitors of the Sick, &c. (s) Making the Colleges of Presbyters, in Cities, in the primitive times, Lay Eldership? (t) Prohibiting Appeals from Scottish General Assemblies to any Judge Civil or Ecclesiastick? (v) and by consequence to Oecumenick Councils, Are not these Ancient and
and Catholick Aflertions? What footsteps of these things in true Antiquity? How easily had it been for men skilled in the Constitution, Government and Discipline of the Primitive Church to have laid open, to the Conviction of all sober Men, the novelty, the vanity, the inexpediency, the impoliticallness, the uncatolicalness of most, if not all, of these Propositions? If any further doubt could remain concerning the little skill, the Clergy of Scotland, in these times, had, in these matters, it might be further Demonstrated.

Forthwith, from this plain matter of Fact, viz. that that Second Book of Discipline, in many points, is taken word for word from Mr. Beza's Answers to the Questions proposed to him, by The Lord Glamis, then Chancellor of Scotland. A fair Evidence that our Clergy, at that time, have not been very well seen in Ecclesiastical Politicks; Otherwise, it is not to be thought they would have been so imposed on, by a single stranger Divine, who visibly aimed at the propagation of the Scheme, which by chance, had got footing in the Church where he lived. His Translation De Triplici Episcopatu, written of purpose for the advancement of Presbyterianism in Scotland, carries visibly in its whole train, that its design was to draw our Clergy from off the Ancient Polity of the Church; and his Answers to the Six Questions proposed to him, (as I said) by Glamis, contain'd the New Scheme, he advised them to. Now,
let us taste a little of his skill in the Constitution and Government of the Ancient Church, or, if you please, of his accounts of her Policy. I take his Book as I find it amongst Saravia's works.

He is Positive for the Divine Right of Ruling Elders. (a) He affirms that Bishops arrogated to themselves, the power of Ordination, without God's allowance. (b) That the Chief foundation of all Ecclesiastical Functions, is; Popular Election; that this Election, and not Ordination, or Imposition of hands makes Pastors or Bishops. That Imposition of hands does no more, than put them in possession of their Ministry, (in the exercise of it, as I take it) the power whereof they have from that Election; That, by consequence, 'tis more proper to say that the Fathers of the Church are Created by the Holy Ghost, and the suffrages of their Children, than by the Bishops.

(c) That Saint Paul in his first Epistle to the Corinthians, in which he expressly writes against, and condemns the Schism which then prevailed, there, as foreseeing that Episcopacy might readily be deem'd a remedy against so great an evil, join'd Sothis of himself in the Inscription of the Epistle, that by his own example he might teach how much that Princely was to be avoided in Ecclesiastical Conventions, seeing the Apostles themselves, who are owned to have been, next to Christ, first, in order, and supreme, in degree, did yet Exercise their power by the Rules of Parity.

(d) Who will not, at first sight, think this a pretty odd fetch? But to go on, he further affirms, (e) That Episcopacy is so far from being
being a proper remedy against Schism, that it has produced many Grievous Schisms, which had never been, but for that Humane Invention. That the Papacy was the fruit of Episcopacy. (f) That the Council of Nice by making that Canon about the Aρχαία έκδον, that the Ancient customs should continue, &c. cleared the way for the Roman Papacy, which was then advancing apace; And founded a Throne for that Whore that sits upon the seven Mountains. (g) That the Primitive Churches were in a flourishing condition so long as their Governor continued to Act in Parity; And had not yielded to Prelacy. (h) And yet he had granted before, (i) That humane Episcopacy, as he calls it, was in vogue, in Ignatius his time, &c. So that I think they could not flourish much, having so short a time to flourish in.

These few, of many such learned Propositions, I have collected out of that Book, which was so successful, at that time, in furthering and advancing the Presbyterian Principles, in Scotland; And could they be a learned Clergy? Could they be great Masters at Antiquity and Ecclesiastical History, who swallowed down these Propositions, or were imposed on, by the Book that contain’d them? 'Tis true this Book came not to Scotland till the end of the year 1577, or the beginning of 1578. But I thought it pardonable to anticipate so far, as, now, to give this account of it, considering how proper it was for my present purpose. We shall have occasion to take further notice of it afterward. Thus,
Thus, I think, I have made it appear how advantageous Morton's Proposition was to the Presbyterian party: They had occasion, by it, to fall upon forming a New Scheme of Church Government and Polity; They were as well prepared, as they could be for such a nick; and they had a set of people to deal with, who might easily be worsted in these Controversies. However it seems, the common principles of Politicks, which God and Nature have made, if not inseparable parts, at least, ordinary concomitants of sound and solid reason, did sometimes make their appearances amongst them; For, that there have been Disputations and Contests, and that some, at least, of the many propositions, contained in the Second Book of Discipline, have been debated and tossed, is evident from the many Conferences, were about it, and the long time was spent before it was perfected and got its finishing stroke from a General Assembly, as we shall find, in our progress. Proceed we now in our deduction.

Tho' the Presbyterian Faction had gain'd this advantage in the Assembly 1576, that they had allowance to draw a new Scheme of Polity, to which they could not but apply themselves very cheerfully; yet, it seems, they were so much humbled by the Repulses they had got, as to the main Question, viz. the Lawfulness of Episcopacy, that they thought it not expedient to try the next Assembly with it, directly, as they had
had done, unsuccessfully, twice before; But to wait a little, till their party should be stronger; and, in the mean time, to content themselves with such indirect blows as they could conveniently give it; such, I say, their deliberations seem to have been, at the next Assembly which was holden at Edinburgh, Octob. 24. 1576. For not so much as one word, in that Assembly concerning the Lawfulness or Unlawfulness of Prelacy, either, Simply, and in itself; Or, Complexely, as, then, in use in Scotland. 'Tis true,

Certain brethren, says the MS. some brethren, says Calderwood; some, says Petrie, (k) (without Question, the Melvilians) proposed that, now, that Mr. Patrick Adamson was nominated for the Archbishopsrick of St. Pet. 388.

Andrews, He might be tried as to his sufficiency for such a station, according to an Act, made in March 1575. But it seems the major part of the Assembly have not been for it, for it was not done, as we shall find afterward. Nay, another Act was fairly dispensed with by this Assembly, in favour of Boyd, Archbishop of Glasgow: For, being required to give his answer, if he would take the Charge of a particular Flock, according to the Act made in April before? He Answered, That he had entered to his Bishoprick according to the Agreement at Leith, which was to stand in force, during the Kings Minority, or till a Parliament should determine otherwise: That he had given his Oath to the Kings Majesty in things appertaining to his Highness: That
That he was afraid he might incur the Guilt of Perjury, and be called in question, by the King, for changing a member of State, if he should change any thing belonging to the Order, Manner, Privileges, or Power of his Bishoprick: That therefore he could not bind himself to a particular Flock, nor pre judge the power of Jurisdiction, which he had received with his Bishoprick, &c. Thus he answered, I say, and the Assembly, at that time, satisfied themselves, so far, with this answer, that they pressed him no further, but referred the matter to the next Assembly, as even both Caldenwood and Petrie acknowledge. (l) A fair evidence, that in this Assembly, the Presbyterian party was the weaker. However,

One indirect step they gain’d in this Assembly also. By the First Book of Discipline, "Head 9. (m) It was appointed that the Country Ministers and Readers should meet, upon a certain day of the week in such Towns, within six miles distance, as had Schools, and to which there was repair of Learned men, to exercise themselves in the Interpretation of Scripture, in imitation of the practice in use among the Corinthians, mentioned 1 Cor. 14: 29. These Meetings, it seems, had been much neglected and disfrequented in most places. It was therefore enacted by this Assembly, That all Ministers within eight miles, &c. should resort to the place of exercise, each day of exercise, &c. This, (n) I say, was useful for the Presbyterian designs; For
For these Meetings were afterwards turn'd into Presbyteries, as we shall find when we come to the year 1579. And so 'tis very like, the motion, for reviving them, was made by those of the Faction; For no man can deny that they have still had enough of Draught in their Politics.

The next Assembly was held on April 1. Anno 1577. No direct progress made, now, neither, as to the main Question: And only these indirect ones: 1. The Archbishop of Glasgow was obliged to take the charge of a particular Flock; if we may believe Calderwood, (o) but neither the MS. nor Petrie (o) Cald. hath it. 2. The Archbishop of St. Andrews 76. "being absent; full power was given to M. Robert Pont, M. James Lawson, David Ferguson, and the Superintendent of Lothian, conjunctly; To cite him before them, against such day or days as they should think good; to try and examine his entry and proceeding, &c. with power also to summon the Chapter of St. Andrews, or so many of that Chapter as they should judge expedient, and the Ordainers or Inaugurers of the said Archbishop (observe here, the Bishops, in these times were Ordained or Inaugurated) as they should find good, for the better tryal of the premises: And in the mean time, to charge him of further visitation, till he should be admitted by the Church.

"(p) MS. Cald. 76.

Here, indeed, the Melvilians obtain'd in
in both Instances, that which was refused them by the last Assembly: However, nothing done Directly (as I said) against the Episcopal Office: On the contrary, Adamson, it seems, might exercise it, when admitted by the Assembly.

May I not reckon the Fast appointed by this Assembly, as a third step gained by our Parity-men? A successful Establishment of perfect Order and Polity in the Kirk, was one of the reasons for it. (q) And ever since it hath been one of the Politicks of the Sect to be Mighty for Fasts, when they had extraordinary projects in their heads; and then, if these Projects (however wicked, nay tho' the very wickedness which the Scripture makes as bad as witchcraft) succeeded; To entitle them to Gods Grace, and make the success, the Comfortable Return of their pious Humiliations, and sincere Devotions.

I find also that Commissioners were sent by this Assembly to the Earl of Morton to acquaint him that they were busy about the matter and argument of the Polity; and that his Grace should receive Advertisement of their further proceedings; and that these Commissioners, having returned from him, to the Assembly, reported, That His Grace liked well of their travels and labours, in that matter; and required expedition and haste; Promising, that when the particulars should be given in to him, they should receive a good Answer. (r) So Calderwood and the MS. From
From which, two things may be observed: the First, is, a further Confirmation of the suspicion I insisted on before, viz. That Morton was truly a Friend to the Innovators. The second, that the Second Book of Discipline had hitherto gone on but very slowly: Why else would his Grace have so earnestly required Expedition and hasty Oufred (as the MS. words it, i. e. Dispatch) and promised them a good answer when the particulars should be given in to him? The truth is, there was one good reason for their proceeding so leisurely in the matter of the Book: Beza's Answer to Glamis his Letter was not yet returned.

Thus two General Assemblies passed, without so much as offering at a plain, a direct Trust against Imparity: Nay, it seems matters were not come to a sufficient Maturity for that, even against the next Assembly.

It was holden at Edinburgh, Octob. 25. 1577. And not so much as one word in the MS. Calderwood or Petrie, relating either directly or indirectly to the main Question. But two things happened a little after this Assembly, which animated Melvil and his Party to purpose.

One was, Morton’s quitting the Regency: For, whatever services he had done them, he was so obscure and Fetching in his measures, and so little to be trusted, that they could not rely much upon him: And now that he had demitted, they had a fair prospect of
of playing their game to better purpose than ever: They were in possession of the Allowance he had granted them to draw a New Scheme of Policy; They had a Young King who had not yet arrived at the twelfth year of his Age, to deal with; By consequence they were like to have a divided Court and a Factions Nobility; and they needed not doubt, if there were two Factions in the Kingdom, that one of them would be sure to Court them, and undertake to promote their Interests.

The other encouragement, which did them every whit as good service, was Beza's Book, De Triplici Episcopatu, Divino, Humano, & Satanico, with his Answers to the Lord Glàmis his Questions, which about this time was brought to Scotland: as is clear from Calderwood. (s) Beza, it seems, put to it, to Defend the Constitution of the Church of Geneva had employ'd his wit and parts (which certainly were not contemptible) in patching together such a Scheme of principles, as he thought, might be defended: That's a method most men take too frequently, First, to resolve upon a Conclusion, and then, to stretch their inventions and expend their pains for finding Colours and plausibilities to set it off with. Beza, therefore, I say, having been thus at pains to digest his thoughts the best way he could on this subject; and withal being possibly, not a little elevated, That the Lord High Chancellor of a Foreign Kingdom, should
should Consult him, and ask his Advice concerning a point of so great importance as the constitution of the Government of a National Church; Thought it not enough, it seems, to return an Answer to his Lordships Questions, and therein give him a Scheme; which was very easy for him to do, considering, he needed be at little more pains, than to transcribe the Genevian Establishment; But he applied himself to the main Controversie which had been started by his Disciple, Melvil, in Scotland, (and 'tis scarcely to be doubted that it was done at his instigation) and wrote this his Book, wherein, tho' he asserted not the absolute Unlawfulness of that which he called Humane Episcopacy (he had not borrowed enough for that, as we have seen already), (t) yet he made it (t) In the wonderfully dangerous, as being so naturally apt to Degenerate into the Devilish, the Satanical Episcopacy. This Book, I say, came to Scotland, about this time, viz. either in the end of 1577, or the beginning of 1578. and (tho' I have already given a Specimen of it) who now could hold up his head to plead for Prelacy? Here was a Book written by the Famous Mr. Beza, the Successor of the great Mr. Calvin; the present great Luminary of the Church of Geneva; our Elder Sister Church; the Best Reformed Church in Christendom; Who would not be convinced now that Parity ought to be Established and Popish Prelacy abolished? And, indeed, it seems, this Book came, reasonable.
bly, to help the good new cause (for it behooved to take some time before it could merit the name of the good old one) for, we have already seen how slowly and weakly it advanced before the Book came: But now we shall find it gathering strength apace, and advancing with a witness. Nay, at the very next Assembly it was in a pretty flourishing condition.

This next Assember, Apr. 24. Anno 1578. And Mr. Andrew Melville was chosen Moderator; the Prince of the Sect had the happiness to be the Profeś of the Assembly, and presently the work was set a going. Amongst the first things done in this Assember, it was enacted, That Bishops and all others bearing Ecclesiastical Function, should be called by their own names, or Brethren, in all time coming. (u) No more Lord Bishops! and it was but consequential to the great Argument, which was, then, and, ever since, hath been in the mouths of all the party, The Lords of the Gentiles, &c. Matt. 20. 25. Luke 22. 25. This was a step worthy of Mr. Andrew's Humility, which was not like other mens Humility's, consisting in Humbling themselves, but of a new species of its own, consisting in Humbling of his Superiors. Indeed, after this, he still treated his own Ordinary the Archbishop of Glasgow, in publick, according to this Canon; Tho' when he was at his Grace's table, where he got better entertainment than his own Commons (for he was, then, in the College of Glasgow) he could give him all his Titles of
of Dignity and Honour. \((v)\) But; \((v)\) Spot.

Another more important Act was made, by this Assembly; Take it, word for word from Calderwood who agrees exactly with both the MS. and Pet. \((v)\) Forasmuch as there \((w)\) Call is great corruption in the State of Bishops, as \((w)\) they are presently set up, in this Realm, whereunto the Assembly would provide some stay, in time coming, so far as they may, to the effect that farther corruption may be bridled; The Assembly hath concluded, that no Bishop shall be Elected or Admitted before the next General Assembly; Discharging all Ministers and Chapters to proceed any ways, to the Election of the said Bishops, in the mean time, under the pain of perpetual Deprivation; And that this matter, be proposed first in the next Assembly, to be consulted what farther Order shall be taken therein.

Here was ground gain'd indeed; However, this was but preparatory still; Nothing, yet, concluded concerning the Unlawfulness of the Office; It was consistent with this Act that Episcopacy should have continued, its corruptions being removed. Neither are we as yet, told what these corruptions were; It seems, even the Presbyterians themselves, tho' in a fair condition, now, to be the prevailing party, had not yet agreed about them. Indeed another Assembly must be over, before we can come by them. Leaving them, therefore till we come at them; proceed we with this present Assembly.

Another Fast was appointed by it; The S 2 Nations
Nation, it seems, was not yet sufficiently disposed for Presbytery: Rubs and difficulties were still cast in the way; and the good cause was deplorably retarded. So 'tis fairly imported in the Act for this Fast: The corruption of all Estates: Coldness in a great part of the Professors: That God would put it in the Kings heart and the hearts of the Estates of Parliament, to Establish such a Policy and Discipline in the Kirk, as is craved in the word of God, &c. These are amongst the prime Reasons in the narrative of this Act for Fasting.

(x) MS. Pet. 394. Cald. 81.

Indeed, all this time the Book of Discipline was only informing; It had not yet got the Assemblies Approbation.

The next General Assembly met at Stirling, June 11. this same year, about six weeks or so, after the Dissolution of the former: But the Parliament was to sit; and it was needful the Assembly should sit, before, to order Ecclesiastick business for it. And now, it seems there was little struggling; For the Assembly, all in one voice (as it is in MS. Calderwood and Petrie, (y) concluded, That the Act of the last Assembly, discharging the Election of Bishops, &c. should be extended to all time coming: And here Petrie stops: But the MS. and Calderwood add, ay and while, the corruptions of the Estate of Bishops, be, all utterly, taken away. And they ordained, That all Bishops already Elected should submit themselves to the Gen. Ass. Concerning the Reformation of the Corruptions of that Estate of Bishops, in their Persons; Which, if they refused to do, after Admonition, that
that they should be proceeded against to Excommunion. This Assembly, as I said on the 11th of June, and indeed it seems the weather has been warm enough: Yet neither, now, did they adventure again upon the Main Question, nor enumerate the Corruptions of the Estate of Bishops.

By this Assembly, a Commission was also granted to certain Persons to attend the Parliament, and Petition that the Book of Discipline might be Ratified; Tho' all the Articles were not, as yet, agreed to. A pretty odd overture, to desire the Parliament to Ratify what they themselves had not perfectly Concerted.

The next Assembly met at Edinburgh, Octob. 24. of that same year 1578. And it was but reasonable to have three Assemblies in six Months, when the Church was so big with Presbytery. And, now, the Corruptions, so frequently talk't of before, were enumerated; and the Bishops were required to Reform them in their Persons. They were required, 1. To be Ministers or Pastors of one Flock. 2. To usurp no Criminal Jurisdiction. 3. Not to vote in Parliament in Name of the Kirk, without Commission from the General Assembly. 4. Not to take up, for maintaining their Ambition and Riotousness, the Emoluments of the Kirk, which ought to sustain many Pastors, the Schools, and the Poor; But to be content with reasonable livings, according to their Office. 5. Not to claim the Titles of Temporal Lords, nor usurp Civil Jurisdiction, whereby, they might be
Abstracted from their Office. 6. Not to Empive
it over particular Elderships, but be subject to
the same: So the MS. Calderwood and Petrie
have it, tho’ Spotswood has the word, Presby-
teries; (z) Which I take notice of, be-
cause the unwary Reader, when he reads,
Presbyteries, in Spotswood, may take them for
these Ecclesiastical Judicatories which now
are so denominated, whereas there were
none such as yet in the Nation. 7. Not to
usurp the Power of the Pastors (says the MS.)
nor take upon them to visit any Bounds not com-
mitted to them by the Church. 8. And laftly,
If any more Corruptions should, afterward, be
found in the Estate of Bishops, to consent to have
them Reform’d. These were the Corruptions:
and particularly at that fame very time, the
two Archbishops were required to Reform them
in their Persons.

What Adamson, Archbishop of St. Andrews
did, or said, on this occafion, I know
not; But, it seems he submitted not: For
I find him, again, required to do it by the
next Assembly. And that it was particu-
larly laid to his charge that he had oppofed
the Ratification of the Book in Parliament. But,
Boyd Archbishop of Glasgow did certainly
behave at this Assembly like a Person of
great worth and a Man of Courage, suitable
to his Character, giving a brave and refolute
Answer: You may fee it in Spot. Cald. and
Pet. (a) I have not leisure to transcribe it:
But it pleased not the, now, too much
Presbyterian Assembly; and no wonder,
The next Assembly was held at Edinburgh, in July, Anno 1579. "The King "sent a Letter to them, whereby he signified his displeasure of their former proceedings, "and fairly advised them to shew more "temper, and proceed more deliberately. Calderwood calls it an Harsh Letter: It is to be seen, word for word, both in him and Petrie. (b) But what had they to do with the Kings of this World, especially such Babie 86. Kings as King James was, then; they, 1 Pet. 392. say, who had now the Government of Christ's Kingdom to settle? However, no more was done against Prelacy, at this time, than had been ordered formerly. Indeed there was little more to be done, but to declare the Office abolished; But that, it seems they were not yet ripe for; Perchance the Corruptions mentioned before had proved a little choking, and peoples stomachs could not be, so soon, disposed, for another dish of such strong meat in an instant; so, that was reserved till the next Assembly. Nevertheless,

In the mean time take we Notice of one thing which we never heard of before; which started up in this Assembly; and which must not be forgotten. It was proposed by the Synod of Lothian (faith Calderwood, (c) That a General Order might be taken for Ereling of Presbyteries in places where publick 88. Exercise was used, until the Polity of the Church might be Established by Law. And it was An- S 4 answered
wered by the Assembly, That the exercise was a Presbytery, (d)

A Presbytery turned afterwards, and, now, is, one of the most specific, essential and indispensable parts of the Presbyterian constitution. Provincial Synods can sit only twice in the year, General Assemblies, only once, according to the Constitution. 'Tis true, 'tis allowed to the King to Convocate one extraordinarily, & pro re natā as they call it: And the Kirk claims to have such a power too, as she sees occasion. But then 'tis as true, that Kings have been so disgusted at such meetings that they have hindered General Assemblies to meet for many years; So that their meetings are uncertain; and in innumerable cases, there should be too long a Surcease of Ecclesiastical Justice, if Causes should wait, either on them, or Provincial Synods. The Commission of the General Assembly, as they call it, is but an accidental thing: The sudden dissolution of a General Assembly can disappoint its very being; as just now there is none, nor has been, since the last Assembly, which was so surprizingly dissolved in February 1692. When there is such a Court, it commonly sits but once in three Months; and it meddles not with every matter; Besides, many of themselves do not love it; and look on it as an error in the Cus tome of the Kirk, for it was never made part of the Constitution by any Canon of the Kirk nor Act of Parliament. But

A Pres
A Presbytery is a Constant Current Court; They may meet when they will; Sit while they will; adjourn whither, when, how long, how short time sooner, they will. They have all the substantial Power of Government and Discipline; They have really a Legislative Power; They can make Acts to bind themselves and all those, who live within their Jurisdiction; and they have a very large Doce of Executive power; They can Examine, Ordain, Admit, Suspend, Depose, Ministers; They can Cite, Judge, Absolve, Condemn, Excommunicate whatsoever Criminals. The Supreme power of the Church, under Christ is Radically and Originally in them; It is in General Assemblies, themselves, Derivatively, only, and as they Represent all the Presbyteries in the Nation; and, if I mistake not, if a General Assembly should Enact any thing, and the greater part of the Presbyteries of the Nation, should Reprobate it, it would not be binding; and yet how necessary, how useful, how powerful so ever, these Courts are, tho' they are essential parts of the constitution; tho' they may be really said to be that which Specifies Presbyterian Government; This Time, this seventh or eighth or tenth of July, Anno 1579, was the first time they were heard of, in Scotland.

That which was called the Exercise be- fore, was nothing like a Court; had no imaginable Jurisdiction; Could neither Injoy Pennance to the smallest Offender, nor Absolve him from it; It could exert no Acts of Authority:
It had not so much Power as the meanest Kirk-session: It was nothing like a Presbytery: and, however it was said, in this Assembly, That the Exercise was a Presbytery, yet, that saying (as omnipotent as a Presbyterian Assembly is) did not make it one. That was not a passive proposition. There were no Presbyteries erected at this time: The first that was erected, was the Presbytery of Edenburg: And if we may believe Calderwood himself, (c) That Presbytery was not erected till the thirtieth day of May 1581. more time was run before the rest were erected: They were not agreed to by the King till the year 1586. They were not Ratified by Parliament till the year 1592.

And now let the Impartial Reader judge if it is probable that our Reformers, who never thought on Presbyteries, were of the present Presbyterian principles? Were they Presbyterians who never understood, never thought of, never dream'd of that, which is so essential to the constitution of a Church, by Divine Institution, according to the present Presbyterian principles?

But doth not G. R. in his First Vindication of the Church of Scotland, in Answer to the First Question, § 8. tell us that the Real Exercise of Presbytery in all its meetings, lesser and greater, continued and was allowed in the year 1572, &c. True, he faith so: But no Man but himself ever said so: But I know the Natural History of this Ignorant blunder; His Historian Calderwood had said that the Kirk
Kirk of Scotland ever since the beginning, had four sorts of Assemblies, (f) and this was (f) Cald. enough for G. R. For what other could these four sorts of Assemblies be, than Kirk-Sessions, Presbyteries, Provincial Synods, and General Assemblies? But if he had, with the least degree of any thing like attention read four or five lines further, he might have seen that Calderwood himself was far from having the braw to assert that Presbyteries were, then, in being: For having said there were four sorts of Assemblies from the beginning, he goes on to particularize them, thus, "National, which were commonly called General Assemblies; Provincial, which were commonly called by the General Name of Synods; Weekly Meetings of Ministers and Readers for interpretation of the Scripture, whereunto succeeded Presbyteries, that is, Meetings of many Ministers and Elders for the Exercise of Discipline; and the Eldership of every Parish, which others call a Presbytery. In which account, it is evident, that he doth not call these weekly Meetings for interpretation of the Scriptures, Presbyteries; But says, that Presbyteries succeeded to these weekly Meetings; and he gives quite different Descriptions of these weekly Meetings and Presbyteries; making the weekly Meetings to have been of Ministers and Elders for the interpretation of Scripture; and Presbyteries to have been (as they still are) Meetings of many Ministers and Elders, for the Exercise of Discipline. 'Tis true, he might
might have, as well, said, that Presbyteries succeeded to the Meeting of the Four Kings against the Five, or of the Five against the Four, mentioned in the 14th Chapter of the Book of Genesis; For the Meetings of these Kings were before our Presbyteries, I think, in order of time: And these Meetings of these Kings were as much like our present Presbyteries, as those Meetings were, which were appointed at the Reformation for the interpretation of Scripture; So that even Calderwood himself was but trifling when he said so: But trifling is one thing, and impudent founding of false History upon another Mans trifling, is another. But enough of this Author at present; we shall have further occasions of meeting with him.

This Assembly was also earnest with the King that the Book of Policy might be farther considered; and that farther Conference might be had about it; That the Heads, not agreed about, might be compromised, some way or other. (g) But the King, it seems, listened not; For they were at it again, in their next Assembly. And now that I have so frequently mentioned this Second Book of Discipline, and shall not have occasion to proceed much further in this wearisome Deduction; Before I leave it, I shall only say this much more about it.

As much stress as the Presbyterian party laid on it, afterwards, and continue, still, to lay on it; as if it were so very exact a Systeme of Ecclesiastical Polity; yet, at the begin-
beginning, the Compilers of it, had no such Confident sentiments about it; For, if we may believe Spotwood, (b) and here, (b) Spot in he is not contradicted by any Presbyte-
rian Historian) when Master David Lindesay, Mr. James Lawson and Mr. Robert Pont, were sent by the Assembly to present it to the Regent, Morton, in the end of the year 1577. They intreated his Grace to receive the Articles presented to him, and if any of them did seem not agreeable to reason, to vouchsafe Audience to the Brethren, whom the Assembly had named to attend. Not, that they thought it a work complete, to which nothing might be added, or from which nothing might be diminished; for, as God should reveal further unto them, they should be willing to help and renew the same. Now, upon this Testimony, I found this Question: Whither the Compilers of the Second Book of Discipline, could, in reason, have been earnest that this Book, which they acknowledged not to be a work so complete, as that nothing could be added to it or taken from it, should have been confirmed by ane Oath, and sworn to, as ane Unalterable Rule of Policy? Are they not injurious to them who make them capable of such a bare faced absurdity? Indeed whatever our present Presbyterians say, and with how great assurance forever, they talk to this purpose, this is a Demonstration, that the compilers of it, never intended, nay could not intend, that it should be sworn to in the Negative Confession. That it was not sworn to
to in that Confession, I think, I could prove with as much evidence as the nature of the thing is capable of, if it were needful to my present purpose: But not being that, I shall only give this further Demonstration, which comes in here naturally enough, now, that we have mentioned this Book so often. The Negative Confession was sworn to and subscribed by the King and his Council upon the 28. of January 1589. (i) Upon the second of March thereafter the King gave out a Proclamation, ordering all the subjects to subscribe it. (k) But the King had never approved, never owned, but on the contrary, had constantly rejected the Second Book of Discipline: Nay it was not Ratified, got not its finishing stroke from the General Assembly itself, till towards the end of April in that year 1581. By necessary consequence, I think, it was not sworn to in the Negative Confession. And thus I leave it. Proceed we now to the next Assembly.

It met at Dundee upon the twelfth of July 1580, full twenty years after the Reformation; For the Parliament which Established the Reformation, (as the Presbyterian Historians are earnest to have it) had its first Meeting on the tenth of July 1560. This, this was the Assembly, which, after so many fencings and stragglings, gave the deadly Thrust to Episcopacy. I shall transcribe its Act word for word from Calderwood, who has exactly enough taken it from the MS. and both Spotswod and Petrie agree, (l) It is this,
Forasmuch as the Office of a Bishop, as it is now used and commonly taken within this Realm, hath no sure Warrant, Authority nor good Ground out of the Book and Scriptures of God, but is brought in by the Folly and Corruptions of mens invention, to the great overthrow of the true Kirk of God, The whole Assembly, in one voice, after Liberty given to all men to Reason in the matter, none opposing themselves in defence of the said pretended Office, Findeth and Declareth the same pretended Office, Used and Termed as is above said, Unlawful in the self, as having neither Fundament, Ground nor Warrant in the word of God; And Ordaineth, that all such Persons as brook, or hereafter shall brook the said Office, be charged simpliciter to dimit, quite, and leave off, the Samine, as ane Office whereunto they are not called by God; and ficklike to desist and cease from preaching, Ministration of the Sacraments, or using, any way, the Office of Pastors, while they receive, de novo, Admission from the General Assembly, under the pain of Excommunication to be used against them; Wherein, if they be found Disobedient, or Contraveen this Act in any point, The sentence of Excommunication, after due admonition, to be execute against them. This is the Act.

Perhaps it were no very great difficulty to impugn the Infallibility of this true blue Assembly, and to expose the boldness, the folly, the iniquity, the preposterous zeal, which are conspicuous in this Act; Nay, yet, after all this, to shew, that the Zealots for Party had not arrived at that height of Effrontery, as to Condemn Prelacy, as simply and
and in itself Unlawful: But, by this time, I think, I have performed my promise, and made it appear that it was no easy task to Abolish Episcopacy and Introduce Presbytery; to turn down Prelacy, and set up Parity in the Government of the Church, when it was first attempted, in Scotland: And therefore I shall stop here, and bring this long Disquisition upon the Second Enquiry to a Conclusion; after I have Recapitulated and represented in one intire view, what I have at so great length deduced.

I have made it appear, I think, That no such Article was believed, professed or maintained by the body of any Reformed or Reforming Church, or by any Eminent and Famous Divine in any Reformed or Reforming Church, while our Church was a Reforming; No such Article, I say, as that, of the Divine and indispensable Institution of Parity, and the Unlawfulness of Prelacy or Imparity amongst the Governors of the Church: I have made it appear that there is no reason to believe that our Reformers were more prying in such matters than the Reformers of other Churches: I have made it appear that there is not so much as a syllable, a shew, a Shadow of ane Indication, That any of those who Merited the Name of our Reformers, entertain'd any such Principle, or maintain'd any such Article: I have made it appear that our Reformation was carryed on, much, very much, by the Influences, and upon the principles
principles of the English Reformers, amongst whom that principle of parity had no imaginable footing: These are, at least, great presumptions of the Credibility of this, that our Reformers maintained no such principle.

Agreeably to these presumptions, I have made it appear that our Reformers proceeded de facto upon the principles of Imparity: They formed their petitions for the Reformation of our Church, according to these principles: The first Scheme of Church Government, they erected, was Established upon these principles: Our Superintendents were notoriously and undeniably Prelates: The next Establishment, in which the Prelates resumed the old Names and Titles of Archbishops and Bishops, was the same for substance, with the first: At least, they did not differ as to the point of Imparity: I have made it appear that this second Establishment was agreed to, by the Church, unanimously, and submitted to calmly and peaceably; and that it was received as ane Establishment which was intended to continue in the Church: At least, no objections made against it, no appearances, in opposition to it, no indications of its being accepted, only for ane Interim upon the account of Imparity's being in its constitution: I have made it appear that Imparity was received, practised, owned and submitted to, and that Prelates were suitably honoured and dutifully obeyed, without reluctance, and
and without interruption, for full fifteen years after the Reformation, and I have made it appear, that, after it was called in Question, its Adversaries found many Repulses, and mighty difficulties, and spent much travel, and much time, no less than full five years, before they could get it Abolished; and if the Deduction I have made puts not this beyond all doubt, it may be further confirmed by the Testimonies of two very intelligent Authors; The first is that ingenious and judicious Author who wrote the accurate piece, called Episcopacy not Abjured in Scotland, published Anno 1640. (m) p. 97. Who affirms positively, (m) "That it was by Reason of opposition made to the "Presbyterians, by many wise, learned and "Godly Brethren, who stood, firmly for "the Ancient Discipline of the Church, "that Episcopacy was so long a condemn- "ing. It appears from his Elaborate work that he was an ingenious as well as an Ingenious Person, and living then, and having been at so much pains to inform himself concerning not only the Transactions, but the Intrigues of former times, it is to be presumed, he did not affirm such a proposition without sufficient ground: But whatever doubt may be raised about his Credit and Authority; Sure I am, my other witnesses is unexceptionable. He is King James the Sixth of Scotland, and the First of England; This Great and Wise Prince lived in these times in which Presbytery was first introduced;
duced; and I think it is scarcely to be Questioned, That he understood, and could give a just account of, what passed, then; as well as any man, then, living; and he in his Basilion Doron, (n) affirms plainly, That the Learned, Grave and Honest Men of the Ministry, were ever ashamed of, and of fended with, the Temerity and Presumption of the Democratic and Presbyterian party. All these things, I say, I think, I have made appear sufficiently; and so I am not afraid to leave it to the world to judge, Whither our Reformers were of the present Presbyterian principles?

Only one thing more, before I proceed to the next Enquiry. Our Presbyterian Brethren, Calderwood, Petrie and G. R. (as I have already observed) are very earnest and careful to have their Readers advert, that when Episcopacy was Established by the Agreement at Leith, Anno 1571, the Bishops were to have no more Power, than the Superintendents had before; and, indeed it is true, they had no more, as I have already acknowledged; But I would advise our Brethren to be more Cautious in insisting on such a dangerous point, or Glorying in such a Discovery, hereafter; For thus I Argue.

The Episcopacy Agreed to at Leith, Anno 1572, as to its Essentials, its Power and Authority, was the same with the Superintendency Established at the Reformation, Anno 1560. But the General Assembly helden
holden at Dundee, Anno 1580. Condemned the Power and Authority of the Episcopacy, Agreed to at Leith, Anno 1572. Ergo they condemn the Power and Authority of the Superintendency Established by our Reformers, Anno 1560. Ergo, the Assembly 1580. not only forsook, but Condemned the principles of our Reformers: But if this Reasoning holds; I think our present Presbyterian Brethren have no Reason to Claim the Title of Successors to our Reformers: They must not ascend so high as the year 1560. They must stand at the year 1580; For, if I mistake not, the Laws of Heraldry will not allow them to call themselves the True Posterity of those whom they Condemn, and whose principles they Declare Erroneous. In such Moral Cognations, I take Oneness of principle to be the foundation of the Relation, as Oneness of Blood, is in Physical Cognations. Let them not, therefore, go farther up than the year 1580. Let them date the Reformation from this Assembly at Dundee, and Own Master Andrew Melvil and John Durie, &c. for their First Parents. When they have fixed there, I shall, per-chance, allow them to affirm that the Church of Scotland was Reformed (in their fence of Reformation) by Presbyters, that is Presbyterians. Proceed we now to
The Third Enquiry.

Whether Prelacy, and the Superiority of any Office, in the Church, above Presbyters, was a great and insupportable Grievance, and trouble to this Nation, and contrary to the inclinations of the Generality of the People, EVER since the Reformation?

Considering what hath been Discoursed, so fully on the former Enquiry, this may be very soon dispatched: For, If Prelacy, and the Superiority of other Officers in the Church, above Presbyters, was so unanimously consented to, and Established at the Reformation; If it continued to be Owned, Revered, and Submitted to, by Pastors and People, without interruption, without being ever called in Question for full fifteen years after the Reformation; If, after it was called in Question, its Adversaries found it so hard a task to subvert it, that they spent five years more, before they could get it subverted and declared Unlawful, even, as it was, then, in Scotland; If these things are true, (I say) I think it is not very Credible, that it was a great and insupportable Grievance and trouble to this Nation, and contrary to the Inclinations of the Generality.
of the People EVER since the Reformation. This Collection I take to be as clear a Demonstration as the subject is capable of. But beside this, we have the clear and consentient Testimonies of Historians to this purpose.

(a) Pet. ad Pet. Anno 1576. Petrie (a) delivers it thus, Mercy and Truth, Righteousness and Peace, had never, since Christ's coming in the Flesh, a more Glorious Meeting and Amiable Embracing, on Earth; Even so, that the Church of Scotland justly obtained, a Name amongst the Chief Churches and Kingdoms of the world—The hottest Persecutions had not greater Purity; Themost Halcyon times had not more Prosperity and Peace; The best Reformed Churches, in other places, scarcely Parallel'd their Liberty and Unity.

(b) Spot. Spot. Spot. (b) thus, The Superintendents were in such Respect with all Men, as, notwithstanding the Disensions that were in the Country, no Exception was taken at their proceedings, by any of the parties; But all concurred in the Maintainance of Religion; And in the Treaties of Peace made, That was ever one of the Articles: such a Reverence was, in those times, carried to the Church; The very form of Government purchasing them Respect.

I might also cite Beza himself to this purpose, in his Letter to John Knox, dated, Geneva, April 12. 1572: wherein he Congratulates heartily the happy and United State of the Church of Scotland. Perhaps it might be no difficult task to adduce more Testimonies: But the truth is, no man can Read
Read the Histories and Monuments of these times without being convinced that this is true; and that there cannot be a faller proposition, than, That Prelacy was such a Grievance, then, or, so contrary to the Inclinations of the Generality of the People.

Further, even in succeeding times, even after it was Condemned by that Assembly 1580, it cannot be proven that it was such a Grievance to the Nation. 'Tis true indeed, some Hot-headed Presbyterian Preachers endeavoured, all they could; to possess the People with an opinion of its Antichristianism, forsooth, and that it was a Brat of the Whore, a Limb of Popery, and what not? But all this time, no account of the Inclinations of the Generality of the People against it. On the contrary, nothing more evident, in History, even Calderwoods History, than that there was no such thing. Is it not obviously observable, even in that History, that after the Civil Government took some 12 or 14 of the most forward of these Brethren, who kept the pretended Assembly, at Aberdeen, Anno 1605, a little Roundly to Task, and some 6 or 8 more were called by the King, to attend his will, at London, all things went very peaceably in Scotland? Was not Episcopacy restored by the General Assembly at Glasgow, Anno 1610, with very great Unanimity? Of more than an hundred and seventy voices, there were only five Negative and seven, Non-liquet. Nay Calderwood himself hath recorded that even T 4
these Ministers, who went to London, after their return, submitted peaceably to the, then, Established Prelacy. And there are few things more observable in his Book, than his Grudge, that there should have been such a General Defection from the good Cause. Indeed I have not observed, no not in his History, that there were six in all the Kingdom, who, from the Establishment of Episcopacy, Anno 1610, did not attend, at Synods, and submit to their Ordinaries; I donot remember any except two, Calderwood himself, and one Johnston at Ancrum; and even these two pretended other Reasons than Scruple of Conscience for their withdrawing.

It is further observable that the Stirs which were made, after the Assembly, at Perth, Anno 1618, were not pretended to be upon the account of Episcopacy; Those of the Gang, could not prevail, it seems, with the Generality of the People to tumultuate on that account. All that was pretended were the Perth Articles: Neither did the Humour against these Articles prevail much, or far, all the time King James lived, nor for the first twelve years of King Charles, his Son and Successor; It fell asleep, as it were, till the Clamours against the Liturgy and Book of Canons, awakened it Anno 1637: And all that time, I mean, from the year 1610, that Episcopacy was restored, till the year 1637, that the Covenanting work was set on foot. Prelacy was so far from being a great and insupportable Grievance and Trouble to this Nation,
and contrary to the Inclinations of the Generality of the People; that, on the contrary, it was not only Generally submitted to, but, in very good esteem. Indeed, it is certain, the Nation had never more Peace, more concord, more plenty, more profound quiet and prosperity, than in that Interval. Let no man reckon of these things as naked Affertions: I can prove them; And hereby I undertake (with Gods allowance and assistance) to prove all I have said, and more, if I shall be put to it. But I think my cause requires not that it should be done at present. Nay further yet, I don't think it were an insuperable task, if I should undertake to maintain, that, when the Covenanting Politick was set on foot, Anno 1637. Prelacy was no such Grievance to the Nation. This I am sure of, it was not the Contrariety of the Generality of the Peoples Inclinations to Prelacy that first gave life and motion to that Monstrous Confederation. Sure I am, it was pretty far advanced, before the Leading Confederates offered to fix on Prelacy, as one of their Reasons for it: So very sure, that it is easy to make it appear, that they were afraid of nothing more, than that the Generality of the People should smell it out, that they had designs to overturn Episcopacy. How often did they Protest to the Marquis of Hamilton, then, the Kings Commissioner, that their meaning was not to Abolish Episcopal Government? (c) How frank were they to tell
tell those, whom they were earnest to Ca-
jole into their Covenant, that they might
very well swear it, without prejudice to
Episcopacy? (d) Nay how forward were the
Presbyterian Ministers themselves to propagate
this pretence? When the Doctors of Aberdeen
told the Three, who were sent to, that City
to procure subscriptions, that they could
not swear the Covenant because Episcopacy
was abjured in it. Are not these Hendersons
and Dicksons very words, in their Answer to
the fourth Reply, You will have all the Covenan-
ters, against their intention, and whether they
will or not, to disallow and condemn the Articles
of Perth, and Episcopal Government; — But
it is known, to many hundreds, that the words
were purposely conceived, for satisfaction of such
as were of your judgment, that we might all
join in one Heart and Covenant? Many more
things might be readily adduced to prove
this more fully: But 'tis needless, for what
can be more fairly colligible from any thing,
than it is from this Specimen, that it was
their fear, that they might miss of their
mark, and not get the people to join with
them, in their Covenant, if it should be so
soon discovered, that they aim d at the over-
throw of Episcopacy.

'Tis true indeed, after they had, by such
disingenuous and Jesuitish Fetches, gain'd
numbers to their party, and got many well-
meaning Ministers and People engaged in
their Rebellious and Schismatical Confederacy,
they took off the Mask; and condemned
Epis-
Episcopacy in their pack't Assembly, Anno 1638; declaring with more than Jesuitish impudence, that, (notwithstanding of their protestations so frequently and publickly made to the contrary) it was abjured in their Covenant. And yet I dare advance this Paradox, that, even then, it was not ane Insupportable Grievance to the Presbyterians themselves, far less to the whole Nation: I own this to be a Paradox, and therefore I must ask my Reader's allowance to give my Reason for which I have dared to advance it. It is this.

Considering how much Prelacy affects the Church as a Society; Of how great consequence it is in the Concerns of the Church; whatever it is in itself, it cannot, in Reason, be called ane Insupportable Grievance to such as are satisfied, they can live safely and without sin, in the Communion of that Church, where it prevails. If such can call it a Grievance at all, I think they cannot justly call it more than a Supportable Grievance: I think it cannot be justly called ane Insupportable Grievance, till it can justify, and, by consequence, Necessitate a Separation from that Church which has it in its Constitution. How can that be called ane Insupportable Grievance, especially in Church matters, where Grievance and Corruption, (if I take them right, must be terms very much equivalent) to those who can safely support it? i. e. Live under it without sin, and with a safe Conscience, continue in the Churches Communion while
while it is in the Churches Government? How can that be called insupportable, which is not of such Malignity in a Church as to make her Communion sinful? How can that be called insupportable in Ecclesiastical concerns or Religious matters, to those who are persuaded they may bear it, or with it, without disturbing their inward Peace, or endangering their Eternal Interests? Now, such, in these times, were all the Presbyterians; at least, Generally, in the Nation; They did not think upon Breaking the Communion of the Church; upon separating from the solemn Assemblies under Prelacy, and setting up Presbyterian Altars in opposition to the Episcopal Altars: They still kept up one Communion in the Nation: They did not refuse to join in the Publick Ordinances; the Solemn worship of God and the Sacraments, with their Prelatick Brethren: all this is so well known, that none, I think, will call it in Question. Indeed that Height of Antipathy to Prelacy had not prevailed amongst the party, no, not when Episcopacy had its fetters struck off, Anno 1662, for then, and for some years after, the Presbyterians generally, both Pastors and People kept the Unity of the Church, and joined with the Conformists in the publick Ordinances: And I believe there are hundreds of thousands in Scotland who remember very well how short a time it is since they betook themselves to Conventicles, and turn'd avowed Schismatics.
I confess the reasoning I have just now insisted on cannot militate so partly against such: For if they had reason to separate, they had the same reason to call Prelacy an insupportable grievance; No more and no other: But I cannot see how the force of it can be well avoided by them, in respect of their predeceivers, who had not the boldness to separate upon the account of Prelacy.

But it may be said that those Presbyterians who lived Anno 1637. and downward, shook off Prelacy, and would bear it no longer; and was it not, then, an insupportable grievance to them? True, indeed, for removing the pretended corruptions of Prelacy, they then, ventured upon the; really, horrid sin of rebellion against their prince; they embroyled three flourishing kingdoms; they brake down the beautiful and ancient structures of government both in church and state; they shed oceans of Christian blood, and made the nations welter in gore; they gave up themselves to all the wildnesses of rage and fury; they gloried in treason and treachery, in oppression and murther, in fierceness and unbridled tyranny; they drench'd innumerable mislead souls, in the crimson guilt, of schism and sedition, of rebellion and faction, of perfidy and perjury: In short, they opened the way to such an inundation of hypocrisy, and irreligion, of confusions, and calamities, as cannot easily
easily be Paralleled, in History; And for all these things they pretended their Antipathies to Prelacy; and yet, after all this, I am where I was; Considering their aforesaid principles and practices as to the Unity of the Church, they could not call it ane Insupportable Grievance; They did not truly find it such; Had they really and sincerely, in true Christian simplicity and sobriety, found or felt it such, they would, no doubt, have looked on it, as a forcible ground, for separating from the Communion, in which it prevailed; as the Protestants, in Germany, found their Centum Gravamina, for separating from the Church of Rome. To have made it that, indeed, and, then, to have suffered patiently, if they had been persecuted for it, without turning to the Antichristian course of Armed Resistance, had had some colour of ane Argument that they deem'd it ane insupportable Grievance; But the Fiercest fighting against it, so long as they could allow themselves to live in the Communion which own'd it, can never infer that it was, to them, ane insupportable Grievance; at most, if it was, it was, to wanton humour and wildfire, only, and not to Confidence, and real Christian Conviction. And so I leave this Argument.

I could easily insist more largely on this Enquiry, but, to avoid tediousness, I shall advance only one thing more; It is a Challenge to my Presbyterian Brethren, to produce but one publick deed, one solemn or considerable
rable Appearance of the Nation, taken either Collectively or Representatively, which by any tolerable construction or interpretation, can import that Prelacy or the superiority of any Office in the Church above Presbyters, was a great and insupportable Grievance and trouble to this Nation, and contrary to the Inclinations of the Generality of the People, for full thirty years after the Reformation.

The Learned G. R. thought he had found one, indeed, it seems, for he introduced it very briskly, in his first Vindication of the Church of Scotland, in Answer to the first Question, § 9. hear him. It is Evident (says he) that Episcopal Jurisdiction over the Protestants was condemned by Law, in that same Parliament, 1567, wherein the Protestant Religion was Established. What? No less than Evident! Let us try this Parliamentary condemnation. It is there Statute and Ordain'd, That no other Jurisdiction Ecclesiastical be acknowledged within this Realm, than that which is, and shall be, within this same Kirk, Established presently, or which floweth therefrom, concerning Preaching the word, Correcting of manners, administration of Sacraments. So he: No Man who knows this Author and his way of writing will readily think it was ill manners to examine whither he cited right; I turn'd over, therefore, all the Acts of that Parliament which are in Print (and I think his citation shall scarcely be found amongst the unprinted ones) but could not find this citation of our Author's. What was next
to be done? I knew that full well; I turn'd
to the 43. page of his Historian, Calderwood,
and there I found it word for word. Well!
But is there no such Period to be found in

'Tis true, there is an Act, the sixth in
number; Intituled, Anent the true and Holy
Kirk, and of them that are declared to be of the
same; which Act I find insinced on by the
Covenanters, Anno 1638. in their Answer to
the Marquis of Hamilton's Declaration, at
Edinburgh, in December, that year, (as is
(e)p. 352. to be seen in the large Declaration,) (e) as
condemning Episcopacy. 'Tis very proba-
bly this might be the Act Calderwood
thought he abridged in these words, bor-
rowed from him by G. R. I shall set it
down, word for word, that the world
may judge if Episcopacy is Condemned
by it.

Forasmuch as the Ministers of the blessed
Evangel of Jesus Christ, whom God of his mercy
hath now raised up amongst us, or hereafter shall
raise, Agreeing with them who now live, in
Doctrine, and Administration of the Sacraments,
(as, in the Reformed Kirks of this Realm, they
are publickly Administrate) according to the Con-
feffion of Faith; Our Sovereign Lord, with ad-
vice of My Lord Regent, and three Estates of
this present Parliament, has declared, and de-
clares, the aforesaid Persons, to be the only true,
and Holy Kirk, of Jesus Christ, within this
Realm; And Decerns and Declares, that all
and
and sundrie, who, either, gainsay the word of
the Evangel, received and approved, as the
Heads of the Confession of Faith Professed in Par-
liament, before, in the year of God 1560. years;
As also specified in the Acts of this Parliament,
more particularly doth express, and now Ratified
and approved in this present Parliament; Or that
refuses the Participation of the Holy Sacraments,
as they are now Ministrated, to be no Members
of the said Kirk within this Realm, presently
Professed, so long as they keep themselves,
so divided, from the Society of Christ's Body.
This is the Act: Now, here, not one
word of Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction, either
Foreign or Domestic; Not one word of any
Jurisdiction within this Realm, or in the
Kirk within this Realm, or that should
ever flow from the said Kirk; Not one word
of Correcting of Manners: From which it is
evident that, if this was the Act, Calder-
wood aim'd at, he gave the world a very odd
abridgement of it: And G. R. should con-
sider things, a little better, and not take
them upon trust, to found Arguments on
them so Ridiculously.

But doth not this Act condemn Episcopa-
cy? Let the world judge if it doth; what can
be more plain, than that all this Act aims
at is only to Define that Church, which,
then, was to have the legal Establishment,
and the countenance of the Civil Authori-
ty? This Church, it Defines to be, that
Society of Pastors and People which pro-
fessed the Doctrine of the Evangel, &c. according
according to the Confession of Faith then Established: 'Tis plain, I say, this is all, that Act aims at: Not one word of Jurisdiction or Discipline, of Government or Polity, of Episcopacy or Presbytery, of Prelacy or Parity, of Equality or Inequality amongst the Governors of the Church: Whatever the Form of Government was, then, in the Church, or whatever it might be, afterwards, was all one to this Act, so long as Pastors (whither Acting in Parity or Imparity) and People, kept by the same Rule of Faith, and the same manner of administering the Sacraments. What is there here like a Condemnation of Episcopall Jurisdiction? Is this the way of Parliamentary Condemnations, to Condemn an Office, or an Order, or a Jurisdiction, (call it as you will) without either naming it, or describing it, in terms so circumstantiated as the world might understand, by them, that it was meant? To Condemn a thing, especially a thing of so great importance, without so much as repealing any one, of many Acts which Established or Ratified it, before? Surely, if this Act Condemned Episcopacy, this Parliament happened upon a New Stile, a Singular Stile, a Stile never used before, never used since. Besides,

If this was the Act G. R. intended, I would earnestly desire him to name but any one Man, who lived in these times, and understood Episcopacy to have been Condemned by this Act. How blind was Master Andrew Melvill?
How blind was all the Presbyterian Fraternity, that, all the five years, they were fighting against Prelacy, could never hit on this Act, and prove that it ought to be no longer tolerated, seeing it was against any Act of Parliament? Were they so little careful of Acts of Parliament, that they would not have been at pains to cite them for their purpose? Mr. Andrew Melvil in his so often mentioned Letter to Beza, dated November 13, 1579, writes thus: We have not ceased, these five years, to fight against Pseudepiscopacy (many of the Nobility resisting us) and to press the severity of Discipline—We have many of the Peers against us: For they allege if Pseudepiscopacy be taken away, one of the Estates is pulled down, &c. Now, how easily had it been for him to have stopp the mouths of these Peers, by telling them that it was taken away already by this Act of Parliament? What a dunce was the L. Glamis Chancellor of Scotland, (by consequence, one, obliged by his station, to understand something, I think, of the Laws of the Nation) and all those whom he consulted about the Letter he wrote to the same Beza, that neither he, nor they knew any thing of this Act of Parliament, but told the Gentleman bluntly, that Episcopacy subsisted by Law; That the Pre-Leges Regni longo usu & inverterata confuetudine Receptæ, ut quotes de rebus ad Reipublce salutem pertinentibus in publicis Regni Comitatis agitur, nihil sine Episcopis constiuit poeæf, quum ipsi tertium Ordinem & Regni Statum efficiunt quem aut mutare, aut prosfus tollere, Reipublce admodum effet periculosum.
lates made one of the three Estates; that nothing could be done, in Parliament without them; and that the Legal Establishment of the Order, and its, lying so very near the foundation of the Civil Constitution, made it extremely dangerous to alter it, far more to abolish it? But what needs more? Let the Reader cast back his eyes on the Articles agreed on betwixt the Church and the Nobility and Barons in July 1567, that same year, by which it was provided that all the Popish Bishops should be deprived, and that Superintendents should succeed in their places. And then let him consider if it be probable that Episcopal was Condemned by this Act of Parliament.

But G. R. continues: I hope (says he) none will affirm that Prelatical Jurisdiction then, was, or was soon after, Established in the Protestant Church of Scotland: Was not our Author pretty forward at hoping? Will none affirm it? I do affirm it: and I do affirm that if our Author had but lookt to the very next Act of that Parliament, the seventh in number, nay if he had but cast his eye some ten lines upward in that same 43. page of Calderwoods History, he would have seen the Prelacy of Superintendents, expressly own'd, and supposed in being by an Act of that same Parliament, in the matter of granting Collations upon Presentations: And now I leave it to the world to judge, if G. R. has not been very happy at citing Acts of Parliaments against Prelacy. But,
Being thus engaged with him about Acts of Parliament, I hope it will be a pardonable digression, tho' I give the world another instance of his skill and confidence that way.

The Author of the ten Questions had said (in his Discussion of the first Question) That the Popish Bishops fate, in the Parliament which settled the Reformation: A matter of Fact so distinctly delivered by Knox, Spotiswood and Petrie, (but passed over by Calderwood) that nothing could be more unquestionable: Nay even Leslie himself has it, for he tells us that the three Estates Conveened; (f) and I think, in those days the Ecclesiastical Estate was one, the first, of these three: I think, also, That Estate was Generally Popish. Yet, however plain and indisputable this matter of Fact was, our learned Author could contradict it: Take his Answer in his own words; To what he saith of the Popish Bishops sitting in a Reforming Parliament, I oppose what Leslie Bishop of Ross a Papist hath, de Gest. Scotorum lib. 10. pag. 536. that Concilium a Seclae Nobilibus cum Regina habitum nullo Ecclesiastico admisso, ubi Sanctum, ne quis quod ad Religionem attinet, quicquam novi Molivetur; Ex hac lege (inquit) omne sive Heresios, sive inimicitarum, sive seditionis malum, tanquam ex fonte fluxit. Now, in the first place, I think it might be made a Question, for what Reason our Author changed Leslie words? Might he not have given us the Citation just as it was? Leslie has it thus,
Convenientibus interim undique Seflæ Nobilibus, Concilium, nullo Ecclesiastico viro admissum, Edinburgi, initur. In eo Concilio in primis Sanctum est, ne quis, quod ad Religionem attineret, quicquam novi moliretur: Sed res in eo duntaxat Statu quo erant, cum Regina ipsa in Scotia primum appulisset, integram manerent. Ex hac Lege, tanquam fonte, omne sine hareseos, sine inimicitarum, sine Seditionis malum in Scotia nostra fluxit. Because Leslie was a Papist, must his very Latin be Reformed? If this was it, if, I mistake not, a further Reformation may be needful; for if Leslie was wrong in saying, in eo Concilio, I think our Author has mended it but forrily, by putting, ubi, in its stead; i.e. by making an Adverb of place the Relative to Concilium; And let the Criticks judge whither G.R’s. attinet or Leslie’s, attineret, was most proper: But perhaps the true Reason was, that there was something dark in these words, Sed Res in eo duntaxat Statu quo erant, cum Regina ipsa in Scotia primum appulisset, integram manerent. ’Tis true, indeed this Sentence quite subverts our Authors purpose; for it imports that there had been some certain sort of Establishment of Religion before the Queen came to Scotland, which was not judged fit then to be altered. Now that this Learned man may be no more puzzled with such an obscure piece of History, I will endeavour to help him with a Clue. Be it known to all men therefore, and particularly to G. R. the Learned and renowned Vindi-
Vindic tor of the Church of Scotland, That the Parliament which Established the Re-formation, and in which the Popish Bishops fate, was holden in August 1560; That Queen Mary returned not to Scotland till August 1561. That this Council, which Leslie speaks of, met after the Queens return, as is evident from Leslie's words; and that it was, at most, but a Privy Council; and nothing like a Parliament. Have we not G. R. now, a very accurate Historian? And so I leave him for a little, and proceed to the

Fourth Enquiry.

Whither Prelacy, and the Superiority of any Office, in the Church, above Presbyters, was a great and insupportable Grievance, and Trouble to this Nation, and contrary to the Inclinations of the Generality of the People, when this Article was Established in the Claim of Right?

This Enquiry is about a very recent matter of Fact; the subject will not allow of Metaphysical Arguments; It is not old enough to be determined by the Testimonies of Historians; It cannot be decided by the publick records or Deeds of the Nation; For, if I mistake not, there was never
publick deed, before, founded, mainly, and in express terms, upon the Inclinations of the Generality of the People; and I do not think it necessary, by the Laws of Disputation, that I should be bound by the Authority of a publick deed, which I make the main thing in Question. The Method, therefore, which I shall take for discussing this Enquiry, shall be to give a plain Historical narration of the Rise and Progress of this Controversie, and consider the Arguments made use of, on both sides, leaving it to the Reader to judge whither side can pretend to the greater probability. The Controversie as I take it had its Rise, thus:

The Scottish Presbyterians, reasonably forewarned of the, then, P. of O.'s designs to possess himself of the Crowns of Great Britain and Ireland, against his coming, had adjusted their Methods for advancing their interests, in such a juncture; and getting their beloved Parity Established in the Church; They were no sooner assured that he was in successful circumstances, than they resolved on putting their projects in execution: The first step was, in ane hurry to raise the Rabble, in the Western Counties, against the Episcopal Clergy, thereby, to Confound, and put, all things, in Disorder: The next, it seems, amidst such confusion, to endeavour, by all means, to have themselves elected members for the Meeting of Estates, which was to be at Edinburgh, upon the
the 14th of March 1683. In both steps the success answered their wishes; and it happened that they got, indeed, the prevailing sway in the Meeting: and in gratitude to the Rabble which had done them so surprizing service, they resolved not only to set up Presbytery, but to set it up on this foot, That Prelacy was a great and insupportable Grievance and Trouble to the Nation, and contrary to the Inclinations of the Generality of the People.

If this was not, it, that determined them to set up their Government on this foot; I protest I cannot conjecture what it might be, that did it. Sure I am, there was no other thing done, then, that, with the least shew of probability could be called an Indication of the Inclinations of the People. They could not collect it from any clamours made, at that time, against Prelacy, by the Generality of the People; There were no such clamours in the mouths of the twentieth part of the People. They could not collect it from the Peoples separation from the Episcopal Clergy, during the time of K. 7's toleration; The tenth part of the Nation had not separated. They could not collect it, from any Covetous disposition, they could reasonably imagine, was, in the Generality of the People, to make themselves Rich by possessing themselves of the Revenues of Bishops; They could not but know that 6 or 7000 l. after, was a sorry mortel for so many appetites; and they could not but know, that
that when Prelacy should be abolished, few, and but a very few, could find advantage that way. They could not collect it from any suspicions, the People could possibly entertain that the Bishops or the Episcopal Clergy were inclining to turn Papists; They could not but know that such had very far outdone the Presbyterian Preachers in their appearances against Popery. The Members of that Meeting of Estates had received no instructions from their Respective Electors, either in Counties or Burghs to turn down Prelacy and set up Presbytery; I could name more than one or two, who, if they did not break their trust, did, at least, very much disappoint their Electors, by doing so. There were no Petitions, no Addresses presented to the Meeting, by the People, craving the Eversion of Prelacy, or the Erection of Presbytery. They never so much as once offered at Polling the People about it. Shall I add further? After it was done, they never received thanks from the Generality of the People, for doing it. There was never yet any thing like an Universal Rejoycing amongst the People, that it was done. They durst never yet adventure to require from the Generality of the People, their Approbation of it. And now,

If the Article was thus Established, at first, entirely upon the foot of Rabbling the Episcopal Clergy in the West, I think I might reasonably supercede all further labour about this Controversie; For, not to mention that they were but the Rascally Scum of these Counties,
Counties, where the Rabbling was, who performed it; and that even in these Counties there are great numbers of People, who never reckoned Prelacy a great and insupportable Grievance and Trouble; but lived, and could have, still, lived, peaceably, and contentedly under it, particularly the most part of the Gentry. Not to insist on these things, I say, but granting that all the People in these Counties had been inclined, as is affirmed in the Article; yet, what were they to the whole Nation? Is it reasonable to judge of a whole Kingdom by a corner of it? To call these the sentiments of all the Kingdom, which were only the sentiments of four or five Counties? But left I have mistaken, in fixing on the Performances of the Western Rabble, as the true foot of this part of the Article; I shall proceed further, as I promised.

The Article (however founded) thus framed and published, surprized the Generality of the People; It was thought very odd, not only that Prelacy should have been abolished upon such weak Reasons; But that the Inclinations of the Generality of the People should have been pretended, at all, against it; Considering how sensible, all People were, that they had never been, so much as once, asked how they stood inclined in the matter. It came, therefore, to be very much the subject of common discourse, if it really was so? And many, who pretended to know the Nation, pretty well, were very confident,
fident, it was not so: And began to admire the wisdom of the Meeting of Estates, that they should have asserted a proposition, so very Positively, which was so very Questionable. In short, the noise turn'd so great about it, that it could not be confined within the Kingdom, but it passed the Borders, and spread itself in England, particularly at London. This being perceived, one of the Presbyterian Agents, there, (I know not who he was) fell presently on writing a Book, which he Entitled Plain Dealing, or, A Moderate General Review of the Scottish Prelatical Clergy's, Proceedings in the Latter Reigns. Which was published in August, I think, or September 1689; wherein, having said what he pleased, sense or nonsense, truth or falsehood, as he found it most expedient, for coming at his Conclusion, toward the end he gave his Arguments for his side of our present Controversie. They were these two: Take them in his own words.

1. There being 32 Shires or Counties, and two Stewartries (comprehending the whole body of the Nation) that send their Commissioners or Representatives to Parliaments, and all General Meetings of the Estates or Conventions: Of these 34 Districts or Divisions of the Kingdom, there are 17 entirely Presbyterians; So that where you will find one, there, Episcopally inclined, you'll find 150 Presbyterians: And the other 17 Divisions, where there is one Episcopally inclined, there are two Presbyterians.

2. Make
2. Make but a calculation of the valued Rent of Scotland, computing it to be less or more, or computed, argumentandi gratia to be three Millions, and you will find the Presbyterian He-ritors, whether of the Nobility or Gentry, to be proprietors and possessors of two Millions and more, so that those that are Episcopally inclined cannot have a third of that Kingdom: And as for the Citizens or Burgeses and Commonalty of Scotland, they are all Generally inclined to the Presbyterian Government, except Papists and some Remote wild and Barbarous Highlanders, &c. And all this (he faith) is so true that it can be made appear to a Demonstration.

I am not at leisure to take so much impudent trash to task: Only, he himself, if he knew any thing of Scotland, could not but know that, with the same Moderation, he might have asserted that all Scottish Men were Monsters, and all Scottish Women, at every Birth produced Southerns: And indeed, as he had the hap to stumble on two such Demonstrations, so I believe, to this minute, he may have the happiness to claim them as his property; For I have never heard that any other of his Party (no not G. R. himself) had the hardiness to use them after him. However, so far as I have learned, He was the first Author, who published any thing about this Controversie.

The Presbyterian party having this adventured to Exercise the Press with it, one who intended to undeceive the world concerning some Controversies between the Episco-
palians
paltians and the Presbyterians in Scotland, digested his Book into ten Questions, and made the tenth concerning our present subject: viz. Whither Scotch Presbyterians agreeable to the General Inclinations of the People? Arguing to this purpose, for the Negative: "That the Nobility of the Kingdom (a very few, not above a dozen excepted) had all sworn the Oath commonly called the Test, wherein all Fanatical principles, and Covenant Obligations, were renounced and abjured; That not one of 40 of the Gentry but had sworn it also; And not 50 in all Scotland (out of the West) did, upon the Indulgence (granted by King James, Anno 1687.) forfake their Parish Churches to frequent Meeting-houses; That the Generality of the Commons live in Cities and Market Towns; That all who could be of the Common Council in such Corporations, or were able to follow any ingenious trade, were obliged to take the Test (and had generally done it) That the Clergy stood all for Episcopacy; There being of about a thousand, scarcely twenty Trimmers betwixt the Bishop and the Presbyterian Moderator, which twenty together, with all the Presbyterian Preachers, could not make up the fifth part of such a number as the other side amounted to: That in all the Universities, there were not four Masters, Heads or Fellows, inclined to Presbytery: That the Colleges of Justice and Physick, at Edinburg were so averse from it, that the Generality
of them were ready, last Summer (viz. 1689) to take Arms in defence of their Episcopal Ministers, &c. This Book was published, I think, in the beginning of the year 1690.

What greater Demonstration could any Man desire of the truth of the Negative, if all here alleged was true? And what greater Argument; of the truth of every one, of the Allegations, than the Confession of a right uncourteous Adversary? G. R. I mean, who in Answer to this Book wrote his first Vindication of the Church of Scotland, as it is now by Law Established, as he calls it; Published at London, about the end of the year 1690, and Reprinted at Edinburgh in the beginning of 1691. But did he indeed acknowledge the truth of all the Allegations? Yes, he did it Notoriously.

He yielded to his Adversary all the gang of the Clergy except a few; The Universities, and the College of Justice, at least, as lately stated: He was not so frank to part with the Physicians, indeed, because, if we may take his word for it, There are not a few worthy Men of that Faculty who are far from Inclinations towards Prelacy: But he durst not say, it seems, that either the major part or any thing near the half was for him. He also yielded the Generlity of the Burgesses.

All the dust, he raised, was about the Nobility and Gentry: But what nasty dust it was, let any sensible man consider: As for the Nobility, he granted there were only, a few
a few who took not the Test: But then; he had
three things to say, for them who took it.

1. They who took the Oaths, did not, by that,
show their inclination so much, as what they
thought fit to comply with rather than suffer: But
what were they to suffer if they took not
the Oaths? The loss of their vote in Parlia-
ment, and a small fine, which was seldom, if
at any time, exacted: But if they were
to suffer no more, could their Fears of
such sufferings, force them to take Oaths so
contrary to their inclinations? Abstractive from
the impiety of mocking God, and the wretch-
edness of crossing ones light, which are con-
spicuous, in swearing against mens perswa-
dions, could such sufferings as these incline
any man to swear to support an interest
which he lookt on as so great and insupporta-
ble a Grievance and Trouble to the Nation? But
this is not all; for he added: 2. How many
of these, now, when there is no force on them;
shew, that it was not choice but necessit"y that
led them that way? I know he meant, that
many of these Nobles have now broken
through these Oaths: Let them Answer for
that: But what had he to do, in this case,
with his old friend Necessity? What Necessi-
ty can force a man to do ane ill thing? Besides,
can he prove that it was Choice, and not that
fame kind of Necessity, that led them in the
way they have lately followed? That men
can be for this thing to day, and the con-
trary to morrow, is a great presumption
that they do not much regard either; But
I think
I think it will be a little hard to draw from it, that they look upon the one as a great and insupportable Grievance more than the other. But the best follows: 3. Many who seem to make Conscience of these Bonds, yet show no inclination to the thing they are bound to, except by the constraint that they brought themselves under. After this, what may not our Author make an Argument, that Prelacy is such an ill-like thing, as he would have it? Seeing he has got even them to hate it, who are Conscientiously for it?

Neither is he less pleasant about the Gentry; He acknowledges, they, as generally, took the Test; which was enough for his Adversary, as hath appeared. But how treats he the other Topick, about their not going to the Presbyterian Meetings, when they had King James his Toleration for it? Why? A silly Argument! Why so? Many did so; But did his Adversary lie grossly or calumniate, when he said, that not 50 Gentlemen in all the Kingdom (out of the West) forsook their Parish Churches and went to Conventicles? Our Vindicator durst not say he did; And has he nor made it evident that it was a silly Argument? But, Most other clave to the former way (he means the Episcopal Communion,) Because the Law stood for it, and the Meeting-houses seem’d to be of uncertain continuance. But would they have cleaved to the former way if they had thought it a great and insupportable Grievance and Trouble? Would they have so crossed their inclinations,
Inclinations, as to have Adhered to the Communion of the Episcopal Church, when it was evident the thing was taken out of the Law, and it was not to be put in Execution? Were they so fond or so afraid of a lifeless Law (if I may so call it) that they would needs conform to it, tho' they had no inclination for such conformity? Tho' what they conform'd with, in obedience to that Law, was a great and insupportable Grievance to them? Did our Author and his Party reckon upon these Gentlemen, then, as Presbyterians? And what tho' the Meetings seem'd to be of uncertain continuance? How many of the Presbyterian Party said, in those days, that they thought themselves bound to take the Benefit of the Toleration, tho' it should be but of short continuance? And that they could return to the Church, when it should be retracted? Might not all men have said and done so, if they had been as much Presbyterians? 'Tis true our Author has some other things on this subject in that first Vindication: But I shall consider them afterwards. This was G. R.'s first Essay on this Controversie.

Another Parityman finding, belike, that neither the Plain Dealer nor the Vindicator had gained much credit by their performances, thought it not inconvenient for the service of his Sect to publish a Book, Entitled, A further Vindication of the present Government of the Church of Scotland; And therein to produce his Arguments for Determin-
ing this Controversie: It was Printed in September, I think, in the year 1691. 'Tis true he wrote something like a Gentleman, and spake discreetly of the Episcopal Clergy; He had no scolding in his Book, and was infinitely far from G. R.'s flat Railwhifery: And I think my self obliged to thank him for his civility. But after all this, when he came to his Arguments for proving the point about the Inclinations of the People, I did not think that he much helped the matter. They were these two, (a)

1. Tho' the Bishops were introduced in the year 1662, and did continue till the year 1689. During which time, the far greatest part of all the Ministry in Scotland was brought in, by themselves, and tho' they had obtained a National Synod formed for their own interest, yet they durst never adventure to call it together, So different were they even of these Ministers. And can there be a greater Demonstration (says he) of the General inclination of this Nation against Prelacy? But who sees not how many things are wanting, here, to make a probable Argument, much more, a Demonstration? For who knows not that it was not in the Power of the Bishops, but of the King, to Convocate a National Synod? And who knows not, that Presbyterian National Synods, had committed such extravagances, as might have tempted any King, almost, to have little kindness for National Synods? Again, supposing the Bishops might have obtained one, if they had been for it, but would not ask
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it, was there no other imaginable Reason for their forbearing to ask one, but their Diffidence of the Ministers? One living 24 or 28 years agone might possibly have slip into such a mistake; But for one who wrote only in the year 1691, after it was visible, nay signally remarkable, that of near to a thousand Presbyters, not above twenty had fallen from the Episcopal principles; But all had so generally continued to Profess them, and not only so, but to Profess them amidst so many discouragements, to Profess them and suffer for them; After this, I say, for any man to found a Demonstration for proving that Prelacy is contrary to the inclinations of the People, on the Bishops aversefenss to a National Synod; and to found that aversefenss, on the diffidence they had of the Presbyters, as if they had dreaded, or had ground to dread that the Presbyters would have subverted their order if they had got a National Synod, seems to me a very singular undertaking. Sure I am, if there is any Demonstration here at all, it is that there was no great store of Demonstrations to be had for our Authors main Conclusion. Neither was his other Argument any stronger, which is this:

2. This National aversefion is yet further Demonftrated from this, that albeit Prelacy had all the Statutes that the Bishops could desire on their behalf, and had them put in Execution with the utmost Severity, yet there was ever found a necessity to keep up a standing Army to uphold them, and to suppress the Aversion of the People; And
And notwithstanding thereof there were frequent Insurrections and Rebellions. Now who sees not the weakness of this Demonstration? For who knows not that a small part of a Nation by their notorious Ungovernableness, and their habitual Propensities to Rebel, may oblige the Government to keep up a little standing Army, such as ours in Scotland was, for suppresing them, if, at any time, they should break out into a Rebellion? The party, I think, can have but little credit from such Demonstrations: For this Demonstration must either suppose that none in the Nation are apt to Rebel, except Presbyterians, and they, too, only upon the head of Church Government; Or it can conclude nothing: For if Presbyterians can Rebel upon other Reasons, tho' they make this the main, the specious, the clamourous Pre-text, as, I doubt not, their Democratical principles may incline them to do, upon occasion; Or, if others than sincere Presbyterians can venture on the horrid sin of Rebellion, there is still Reason for the standing Army. Besides, what gain'd they by these their frequent Insurrections and Rebellions? Were they not easily and readily crush't by the rest of the Nation? But if so, I think, if there is any Argument here at all, it concludes another way than our Author design'd it. But it is not worth the while to insist longer on this Argument. Only,

If it is a good one, The Bishops and their Adherents have Reason to thank our Author for shewing them the way, how
they may have their Government restored; For by this way of reasoning they have no more to do but fall upon the Knack of raising frequent Insurrections and Rebellions, against the present Government; And then their work is done: For thus a Demonstration shall befriend them; this, when there is a necessity of keeping up a standing Army to support Presbytery, because of frequent Insurrections and Rebellions, raised on its account; It is a Demonstration that it is a great and insupportable Grievance and Trouble to the Nation, and contrary to the inclinations of the Generality of the People, and therefore it ought to be Abolished. The truth is, such reasonings are not only Sophistical, but dangerous; They are founded upon the principles of Rebellion; and they tend directly and naturally towards Rebellion; And they ought to be noticed by every wise Government: And so I leave this Author.

The next Paper-combat I shall take notice of, was between the Author of the third Letter in the Pamphlet, called ane Account of the present Persecution of the Church in Scotland, &c. published Anno 1690. And G. R. in his Second Vindication published towards the end of the year 1691.

The Epiftler, as G. R. is sometimes pleased to call him, had craved a Poll, deeming it, it seems, the only proper method for coming at a sure account of the inclinations of the generality of the People; and I think he had Reason: For if matters must go by
the inclinations of the People, it is just to ask the People about their inclinations. But would G. R. allow him this Demand, which had so much of plain equity in it? No, His talk (says he) of putting the Matter to the poll I neglect as are impracticable fancy. (b) But who sees not (b) 2d. that this was plain Fear to put it upon such Vind. ad ane Issue; What imaginable impossibility, Lett. 3. or absurdity, or difficulty, or inconvenience could make polling, upon this account, Impracticable? Was it not found practicable enough, in the days of the Covenant, when the veryeist child, if he could write his own Name, was put to it to subscribe it? What should make it more impracticable to poll the Kingdom, for finding the Peoples inclinations, about Episcopacy and Presbytery, than it was to levy Hearth-money from the whole Kingdom? Is it not as practicable to poll the Kingdom about Church Government, as to poll it, for raising the present subsidy, which is imposed by poll? I am apt to believe, the inclinations of the Generality of the People would have been as much satisfied, if polling had been reduced to practice on the one account, as the other. 

That same Epifler, in that same Epiftle, adduced another Argument which was to this purpose: "That in the years 1687 and 1688, when the Schism was in its Elevation, there were but some three or four "Presbyterian Meeting-houses erected on the "North side of the Tay, i.e. in the greater "half of the Kingdom; And these too, "very little frequented or encouraged, and X 4  "that
"that on the South side of that River (except "in the five Associated Shires in the West) the "third man was never engaged in the Schism. This was Matter of Fact: And if true, a solid Demonstration that Prelacy and the Superiority of any Office in the Church, above Presbyters was not, then, a great and insupportable Grievance and Trouble to the Nation, and contrary to the inclinations of the generality of the People: For had it been such, how is it imaginable when there was such an Ample Toleration, such an Absolute and Unperplex'd Liberty, say so much notorious encouragement given by the, then, Government to separate from the Episcopal Communion, that so few should have done it? Who so pleased might, then, have, safely, and without the least prospect of worldly hazard, join'd the Presbyterians: yet scarcely a fifth or a sixth part of the Nation did it. I am not sure that the nature of the thing was capable of a clearer evidence, unless it had been put to the impracticable Fancy. Let us next consider G. R.'s Answers, and judge, by them, if the Epifler was wrong as to the matter of Fact. He hath some two or three: we shall try them severally.

The First, to the purpose, is, If there be many in the Northern parts, who are not for Presbytery, there are as few for the present settlement of the State. To what purpose is the present settlement of the State forced in here? Was the Controversie between him and his Adversary concerned in it, in the least? What impertinent Answering is this? Is there
there so much as one syllable here that Contra-
dicts the Epistles position? But  
2. We affirm (says G. R.) and can make it  
appear not only that there are many in the North,  
who appeared zealously for Presbytery, as was  
evident by the Members of Parliament, who  
came from these parts: Very few of them were  
otherwise inclined, and they made a great figure  
in the Parliament for settling both the State and  
the Church. If one were put to it to examine  
this Answer particularly and minutely, I  
think he might easily make even G. R. him-
s elf wish that he had never meddled with it:  
It were no hard task to give a just account  
how it only happened that there was so much  
as one Northern member (who was not such  
by birth) of the Presbyterian persuasion, in  
the Meeting of Estates: It were as easy to  
represent what Figures some of them made,  
or can readily make, Uncouth Figures, truly:  
All this were very easy, I say, if one were  
put to it: But as it is not seasonable, so it is  
not needful: For 'tis plain, nothing, here, con-
tradicts the Epistles position: Tho' the North-
ern members, of the Presbyterian persuasion,  
had been twice as many as they were, and  
tho' they had made greater figures than can be  
pretended; yet, it may be very true that there  
were so few separatists in the Northern Coun-
ties, as the Epistle affirmed there were.  
And for the respect G. R. owes to his North-
ern Friends and Figure-makers, I would ad-
vise him never again to insist on such a ten-
der point; And so I leave it, and proceed  
to what follows.  
3. There
3. There are very many Ministers in the North (and People that own them) who, tho' they served under Episcopacy, are willing to joyn with the Presbyterians, and whom the Presbyterians are ready to receive when occasion shall be given, and those of the best Qualified among them. How such Ministers as have joyn'd, or are ready to joyn with the Presbyterians, can be called the best Qualified amongst the Episcopal Clergy, so long as integrity of life, constancy in adhering to true Catholick Principles, and hearty abhorrence of Schism, Conscience of the Religion of Oaths, Self-denial, taking up the Cross patiently and cheerfully, and preferring Christian Honour and innocence to worldly conveniences, can be said to be amongst the best Qualifications of a Christian Minister, I cannot understand. I understand as little what ground our Author had, for talking so confidently about these Northern Ministers: Sure I am, he had no sure ground to say so; And I think the transactions of the last General Assembly, and the unsuccessfulness of Mr. Meldrum's Expedition to the North, this Summer, are Demonstrations that he had no ground at all to say so; But whatever be of these things, I desire the Reader to consider, impartially, whither (supposing all were uncontroverted truth, our Author afferts so confidently, here,) this Answer convells the Matter of Fact afferted by the Author of the Letter? What is there here that looks like proving that the Schism was greater in the North, than was afferted
asserted by the Epistler? Or what is there here that can by any colour of consequence infer that Prelacy in these Northern parts was a great and insupportable Trouble and Grievance, and contrary to the Inclinations of the Generality of the People? Doth not our Author acknowledge that these Ministers served under Episcopacy, and that their People own'd them, without any Reluctancies of Conscience?

But the Epistler had said there were not above 3 or 4 Presbyterian Meeting-houses on the North side of the Tay, and the Vindicator says they far exceeded that number. How easy had it been for the Vindicator to have given us the Definite number of Presbyterian Meeting-houses, in these parts, during the time of the above-mentioned Toleration? He who was so very exact to have his informations from all corners, might, one would think, have readily satisfied himself in this instance, and fairly fixt one lie on the Epistler: And is it not a great presumption that the Epistler was in the Right, and that the Vindicat. who was so anxious to have all his Adversaries Liars, was hardly put to it in this Matter? When he could do no more than oppose ane Indefinite number to the Epistlers Definite one? For my part I think it not worth the while to be positive about the precise number; But I can say this without Hesitation, that all who separated from their Parish Churches, on that side the River, would not have filled four ordinary Meeting-houses.
From what hath been said, I think 'tis clear, the Epifler was honest enough in his reckoning for the North side of the Tay. Can all be made as safe on the South side? The Epifler had said, that (except in the West) the third Man was never engaged in the Schism: G. R. Answers, We know no Schism but what was made by his party: But that the plurality did not suffer under the horrid persecution raised by the Bishops, Doth not prove that they were not inclined to Presbyterian; But either that many Presbyterians had freedom to hear Episcopal Ministers, or that all were not resolute enough to suffer for their principle; So that this is no Rational way of judging of the Peoples inclinations. I will neither engage, at present, with him, in the Question, who is the Scottish Schismatick? Nor digress to the point of the horrid Persecution raised by the Bishops: Another occasion may be as proper for them: But I desire the Reader again, to consider this Answer, and judge, if it keeps not a pretty good distance from the Epiftlers position? Is any thing said, here, that contradicts, that looks like contradicting the Matter of Fact? What new fashion of Answering, is this, to talk whatever comes in ones head, without ever offering to attack the strength of the reasoning he undertakes to discuss?

By this Tafe the judicious Reader may competently judge which is the right side of the present Controversie; and withal, if I mistake not, he may guess if the Presbyterian
an Kirk in Scotland was not well provided when it got G. R. for its Vindicat or. Shall he furnish thee, O patient Reader, with any more divertisement; If thou canst promise for thy patience I can promise for G. R. This Learned Gentleman found himself to puzzled, it seems, about this part of the Article, that he was forced to put on the Fools-cap, and turn Ridiculous to mankind: However, it was even better to be than to yeild into so weighty a Controversie; than to part with the Inclinations of the People, that Articulus Stantis & Cadentis Ecclesie: But is there a Play to succeed worthy of all this Prologue? Consider and judge.

He has so limited and restricted the Generality of the People, to make his cause some way defensible, that, for any thing I know, he has confin'd them all within his own doublet: At least, he may do it, before he shall need to yeild any more, in his Argument: He is at this trade of limiting in both his Vindications. (a) I shall cast them together, that the world may consider the Product.

1. There are many ten thousands who are in- concerned about Religion, both in the greater and the lesser truths of it; And it is most irrational to consider them in this Question.

2. There are not a few who are of opinion, that Church-Government, as to the species of it, is indifferent: These ought not to be brought into the reckoning.
3. There are not a few, whose light and conscience do not incline them to Episcopacy, who are yet zealous for it, and against Presbytery; Because, under the one, they are not censured, for their immoralties, as under the other; These ought to be excluded also. So ought all

4. Who had a Dependance on the Court;

And

5. All who had a Dependance on the Prelates.

6. All Popishly Affected, and who are but Protestants in Masquerade.

7. All Enemies to K. W. and the present Government.

I am just to him; all these Exclusions out of the reckoning he has, if he has not more; And give him these, and he dares affirm, That they who are Conscientiously for Prelacy, are so few in Scotland, that not one of many hundreds or Thousands is to be found; ı Vind. They who are for Episcopacy are not one of a thousand in Scotland; 2 Vind. Now, not to fall on examining his Limitations singly, because that were to be sick of his own disease.

In the first place, one would think, if he had been allowed his Limitations, he might, in all Conscience, have satisfied himself without begging the Question to boot; Yet, even that he has most covetously done; For, I think the Question was not, who were Conscientiously for Prelacy or inclined for Episcopacy? But, whither Prelacy and the Superiority of any Office in the Church above Presbyters was a great and insupportable Grie-
vance and Trouble to the Nation, and contrary to the inclinations of the Generality of the People? And there is some difference, as I take it, between these Questions. But let him take the State of the Question; if he must needs have it, I can spare it to him: Nay, if it can do him service, I can grant him yet more: When the Matter comes to be tried by this his Standard, I shall be satisfied that it fall to his share to be judge; He should understand his own Rule best; and so may be fittest for such Nice Decisions, as a point so tender must needs require; Tho', I think, He may take the short cut, as we say, and give his own judgment without more ado: For thither it must recur at last; Only I cannot guess why he excluded all Popishly affected, &c. Was it to let a friend go with a fee? I think he might have learned from History, if not, from Experience, that Papists have been amongst the best friends to his Interests; and very ready to do his party service upon occasion, which, it is not to be thought they would have done for nothing. But however this is,

Having granted him so much, I think, he is bound to grant me one little thing; I ask it of him only for peace; I can force it from him, if I please: It is, that all his Limitations, Restrictions, Exclusions, Castings-out, Settings-aside, or what ever he pleases to call them, were adduced by him for setting the Article in its Native and proper light, and as it ought to be understood;

But,
But, if so, I cannot think he himself can repute it unfair dealing, to give the world a fair view of the Article as thus explained and enlightened: And so digested, it must run to this purpose, as I take it.

That Prelacy and the Superiority of any Office in the Church above Presbyters, is, and hath been, a great and insupportable Grievance, and Trouble to this Nation, and contrary to the inclinations of the Generality of the People; Excluding from this Generality of the People, 1. All these many ten thousands of the People, who are unconcerned about Religion both in the greater and lesser truths of it. 2. All these many of the People who are of opinion that Church-Government, as to the species of it, is indifferent. 3. All these other many of the People, whose Light and Conscience do not incline them to Episcopacy, who are yet zealous for it, and against Presbytery, because, under the one, they are not censured for their immoralities, as under the other. 4. All such of the People as had any dependance on the Court. 5. Or on the Prelates. 6. Or are Popishly affected, and Protestants only in Maskerade. And 7. All such as are Enemies to K. W. and the present Civil Government; Ever since the Reformation: (They, i.e. such of the People, as are not excluded, from the Generality of the People, by any of the aforesaid Exceptions, having Reformed from Popery by Presbyters) and therefore it ought to be Abolished.

So the Article must run, I say, when duely Enlightened by our Authors Glosses; and when a New Meeting of Estates shall settle another
another New Government, and put such an Article in another New Claim of Right, I do hereby give my word, I shall not be the first that shall move Controversies about it. But till that is done, G. R. must allow me the use of a certain sort of Liberty I have, of Thinking, at least, that his wits were a wool-gathering (to use him as mannerly as can be done by one of his own Complements) when he spent so many of his sweet words (another of his Phrases) so very pleasantly.

Thus did G. R. defend this part of the Article against the Arguments of his Adversaries: But did he produce none, for his own side of the Controversie? Yes, one, and only one, so far as I can remember. It is in his Answer to the first of the four Letters, §. 7. The Letter written by the Military Chaplain, as he was pleased to call him.

This Military Chaplain had said, That the Church Party was Predominant in this Nation both for Number and Quality. That it is not so (says G. R.) is evident from the Constitution of our Parliament: This is the Argument. Now, not to enter upon dangerous or undutiful Questions about Parliaments; I shall say no more at present but this; When G. R. shall make it appear that all the Acts and Deeds of the present Parliament have been, all alongst, agreeable to the Inclinations of the Generality of the People; or when he shall secure the other part of the Article against
against the Dint of this his own good Argument; I mean, when he shall make it appear that such reasoning is firm and solid, in the present case, and withal, shall make it appear, that the Deeds and Acts of twenty seven Parliaments (he knows well enough who numbered them to him) Ratifying and confirming Episcopacy, cannot, or ought not to amount to as good an Argument for the Inclinations of the Generality of the People in former times: When he shall make these things appear, I say, I shall, then, think a little more about his Argument. This I think is enough for him. At present I shall consider it no more; Only, now that he hath brought the present Parliament upon the stage, I will take occasion to propose some few Questions, which the minding of it suggests to me: and I seriously desire (not G. R. but) some truly sensible, ingenious, and sober person of the Presbyterian persuasion; Some person who had opportunity to know how matters went, and a head to comprehend them, and who has Candour and Conscience to relate things as they truly were, or are; To give plain, frank, direct and pertinent answers to them, speaking the sense of his heart, openly, and distinctly, without mincing, and without tergiveration. My Questions shall not, in the least touch the Dignity or Authority of the Parliament: All I design them for, is to bring Light to the present Controversie. And I ask,

I. Whi-
1. Whether the Presbyterian party did not exert and concenter, all their Wit and Force, all their Counsel and Cunning, all their Art and Application, all their Skill and Conduct in Politicks, both before and in the beginning of the late Revolution, for getting a Meeting of Estates formed for their purposes?

2. Whether the Universal Unhinging of all things, then, and the general Surprize, Confusion and Irresolution of the rest of the Nation, occasioned thereby, did not contribute extraordinarily for furthering the Presbyterian Designs and Projects?

3. Whether, notwithstanding all this, when the Estates first met, they had not both great, and well-grounded fears that their Projects might miscarry, and they might be outvoted in the Meeting?

4. Whether very many, very considerable Members had not deserted the House before it was thought seasonable to offer at putting the Article about Church Government in the Claim of Right?

5. Whether, tho' they got this Article thrust into the Claim of Right, and made part of the Original Contract between King and People, in the Month of April 1689. They were not, to their great grief, disappointed of the Establishment of their Form of Church-Government in the first Session of Parliament holden in June, &c. that same year.

6. Whether in the beginning of the next Year 2 Session.
Session (which was in April 1690,) they were not under very dreadful apprehensions of another disappointment? And whither they would not have been very near to, if not in, a state of Despair, if all the Anti-Presbyterian Members had unanimously con-veen'd, and fate in Parliament?

7. After they had recovered from these fears, and when they had the courage to propose the Establishment of their Government, and it came to be voted in the House, I ask, if it was any thing like a full House? Plainly, if a third part of those who might have sit the as Members, were pre-
fent?

8. Whither all those Members who voted for it at that time, can be said to have done it from a Principle of Conscience, or a firm perswasion, they had, that Prelacy was a great and insupportable Grievance and Trouble to the Nation, and contrary to the Inclinations of the Generality of the People? Or whither it may be said without Breach of Charity, that not a few (of the few) voted so mainly from other principles, such as Complyance with some Leading Statesmen? &c.

9. Whither those of the Presbyterian perswasion, after they found that they had prevailed in the Parliament, did not pro-ceed to make the Act, obliging all Persons in publick Stations to sign the Declaration called the Assurance, as much, if not more, for securing the Government in their own hands, and keeping out Anti-Presbyterians, than
than for strengthening K. W.'s interests?  
10. Whither they had not in their prospect, the great difficulty of getting Presbyterian Ministers planted in Churches, if Patronages should continue, when they made the Act depriving Patrons of these their Rights? And whither they had not in their prospect the as great difficulties of getting such Ministers planted, if (according to the true Presbyterian principles, at least pretensions) the calling of a Minister, should have depended upon the plurality of voices in the Parish, when they consented to such a Model for calling of Ministers as was Established in that same Session of Parliament?

11. Notwithstanding that Act of Parliament which Abolished Patronages did notoriously encroach upon the People's power, Legated to them by Christ, in his Testament, according to the Genuine Presbyterian principles, by putting the Real power of calling Ministers in the hands of the Presbytery, for the greater Expedition and security of getting Presbyterian Ministers planted in Churches; notwithstanding all this, I say, I ask, whither they did not meet with many difficulties, and much impediment and opposition in the plantation of such Ministers in very many Parishes? In consequence of this, I ask.

12. Whither it was not the sense of these difficulties and oppositions which so frequently encumbered them, that made the
Presbyterian Ministers, so notoriously, betray their trust which they pretend to have, as Conservators of the Liberties and Privileges of Christ's Kingdom and People, when they consented, that, in the last Session of Parliament, Christ's Legacy should be so clog'd and limited, as that none shall have Power of giving voice in the calling of Ministers, till they shall first swear the Oath of Allegiance and sign the Assurance.

13. And lastly, I ask, whither our Presbyterian Brethren would be content that all that has been done in reference to Church Matters, since the beginning of the late Revolution, should be lookt upon as undone; and that the settlement of the Church should, again, depend upon a new, free, unclogg'd, unprelimited, unover-awed Meeting of Estates?

I am very much persuaded, that a plain, candid, impartial, and ingenuous Resolution, of these few Questions, might go very far, in the Decision of this present Controversie: And yet after all this labour spent about it; I must confess, I do not reckon, it was, in true value, worth thirteen sentences: As perchance may appear, in part, within a little. And so I proceed to
The Fifth Enquiry.

Whither, supposing the Affirmatives in the proceeding Enquiries had been true, they would have been of sufficient force, to infer the conclusion advanced in the Articles, viz. that Prelacy, &c. ought to be Abolished?

The Affirmatives are these two; 1. That Prelacy was a great and Insupportable Grievance, &c. 2. That this Church was Reformed by Presbyters: The purpose of this Enquiry is to try if these were good Reasons for the Abolition of Prelacy; without further Address, I think they were not; Not the First, viz. Prelacy's being a great and insupportable Grievance and Trouble to this Nation, and contrary to the Inclinations of the Generality of the People. Sure I am,

1. Our Presbyterian Brethren had not this way of Reasoning from our Reformers; For, I remember John Knox, in his Letter to the Queen Regent of Scotland, (a) rejected (a) Kn. it with sufficient appearances of Keenness and Ap. 92 Contempt; He called it a Fetch of the Devils, to blind Peoples eyes, with such a Sophism; To make them look on that Religion as most perfect, which the Multitude, by wrong custom, have embraced, or to insinuate, that it is impossible that that Religion should be false, which
which so long time, so many Councils, and so great a Multitude of men have Authorized and confirmed, &c. For (says he) if the opinion of the Multitude ought always to be preferred, then did God injury to the Original world; For they were all of one mind, to wit, conjured against God, except Noah and his family. And I have shewed already that the Body of our Reformers, in all their Petitions for Reformation, made the word of God, the Practices of the Apostles, the Catholic Sentiments and Principles of the Primitive Church, &c. and not the inclinations of the People, the Rule of Reformation. Nay,

2. G. R. himself is not pleased with this Standard; He not only tells the world, That Presbyterians wished and endeavoured that that Phrase might not have been used as it was; (b) But he ridicules it in his first Vindication, in Answer to the tenth Question, tho' he made himself ridiculous by doing it, as he did it. The Matter is this: The Author of the ten Questions finding that this Topick of the inclinations of the People, was insisted on in the Article as an Argument for Abolishing Prelacy, undertook to Demonstrate that, tho' it were a good Argument, it would not be found to conclude as the Formers of the Article intended; Aiming, unquestionably, at no more, than that it was not true, that Prelacy was such a great and insupportable Grievance, &c. and to make good his undertaking; He formed his Demonstration, as I have already accounted. Now hear G. R.
G. R. It is a new Topick (says he) not often used before, that such a way of Religion is best, because, &c. This his Discourse will equally prove that Popery is preferable to Protestantism; For in France, Italy, Spain, &c. not the Multitude only, but all the Churchmen, &c. are of that way. Thus, I say, G. R. ridiculed the Argument, tho' he most ridiculously fancied, he was ridiculing his Adversary, who never dream'd that it was a good Argument; But could have been as ready to ridicule it, as another: However, I must confess G. R. did indeed treat the Argument justly; For

3. Supposing the Argument good, I cannot see how any Church could ever have Reformed from Popery: For I think, when Luther began in Germany, or Mr. Patrick Hamilton in Scotland, or Zuinglius or Oecolompadius or Calvin, &c. in their respective Countries and Churches, they had the inclinations of the People generally against them: Nay, if I mistake not, our Saviour and his Apostles found it so too, when they at first undertook to propagate our Holy Religion; and perchance, tho' the Christian Religion is now Generally Professed in most Nations in Europe, some of them, might be soon Rid of it, if this Standard were allowed to take place.

I have heard of some who have not been well pleased with Saint Paul for having the word, Bishop, so frequently in his Language; and I remember to have been told that one,
(not ane Unlearn'd one) in a Conference, being preft with a Testimony of Irenæus's (in his 3 Cap. 3 Lib. Adversus Her.) for ane uninterrupted Succession of Bifhops in the Church of Rome, from the Aposftles times at fìrft, denied confidently that any fuch thing was to be found in Irenæus; and when the Book was produced, and he was convinced by ane ocular Demonstration that Irenæus had the Testimony which was alleged, he delivered himself to this purpose, I see it is there, Brother, but would to God it had not been there! Now, had thefe People, who were thus offended with St. Paul and Irenæus, been at the writing of their Books, is it probable, we should have had them (with their Imprimatur) as we have them? Indeed, for my part I fhall never confent that the Bible, especially the New Testament, be Reformed according to fome Peoples inclination: For if that fhould be allowed, I fhould be very much afraid, there would be strange cutting and carving: I fhould be very much afraid, that the Doctrine of elf-prefervation fhould juftle out, the Doctrine of the Crofs; That Might fhould find more favour than Right, that the Force and Power fhould poifefs themselves of the places, of the Faith and Patience of the Saints, and that (beside many other places) we might foon fee our laft, of (at leaft) the firft seven verses of the 13th Chapter to the Romans.

I fhall only add one thing more, which G.R.'s naming of France gave me occasion to think
think on: It is that the French King and his Ministers, as much as some People talk of their Abilities, must, for all that, be, but of the ordinary Size of Mankind; For, if they had been as wise and thinking men, as some of their Neighbours, they might have easily stopped all the mouths that were opened against them some years ago, for their Persecuting the Protestants in that Kingdom; For if they had but narrated in one Edict, that the Religion of the Hugonots was, and had still been a great and insupportable Grievance and Trouble to their Nation, and contrary to the Inclinations of the Generality of the People, ever since it was professed amongst them, their work was done. I believe G. R. himself would not have called the Truth of the Proposition in Question.

How easy were it to dwell longer on this Subject? But I am afraid, I have noticed it too much already; To conclude then; What is this Standard, else, than the Fundamental principle of Hobbes, that Holy Scheme for Brutalizing Mankind, and making Religion, Reason, Revelation, every thing that aims at making men Manly, to yield unto, at least, to depend on, the Frisks of Flesh and Blood, or, which is all one, Arrant Sense and ungovernable Passion? And so I leave it. But is the Second Reason any better? If this Church had been Reformed by Presbyters, would that have been a good Argument for Abolishing Prelacy? Who sees not that it is much about the same Size with the former?
Indeed I am apt to think, had the several Churches in the world erected their Governments, by this Rule, we should have had some pretty odd Constitutions; thus, the Church collected, of old, amongst the Indians, by Frumentius and Aedesius, should have been Govern'd still by Laicks; for Frumentius and Aedesius were no more than Laicks when they first convert-ed them. Thus all Xaverius's Converts and their Successors should have been always Govern'd by Jesuits; for 'tis past Controversie Xaverius was a Jesuit. Thus the Churches of Iberia and Moravia should have been Govern'd by Women; for if we may believe Historians, the Gospel got first footing in these parts, by the Ministry of Females. Indeed, if the Argument has any strength at all, it seems stronger for these Constitutions, than for Presbytery, in Scotland, inasmuch as it is more to Convert Infidels, than only to Reform a Church, which, tho' Corrupt, is allowed to be Christian. Nay, which is more and worse, more contrary to the Inclinations of Scotch Presbyterians, and worse for Scotch Presbytery.

By this way of Reasoning, Episcopacy ought still, hitherto, to have continued, and hereafter, to continue the Government of the Church of England; because, that Church was Reformed, by her Bishops. But, if so, what can be said for the Solemn League and Covenant? How shall we defend our Forty-three-men and all the Covenanting work of
of Reformation, in that Glorious Period? And if it must continue there, what constant Perils must our Kirk needs be in, especially so long as both Kingdoms are under one Monarch?

What I have said, I think, might be enough, in all Conscience, for this Fifth Enquiry; But because it is obvious to the most overly Observation, that the Framers of the Article have not been so much concerned for the strength and solidity of the Reasons, they choos’d for supporting their Conclusion, as for their Colour and Aptitude to catch the vulgar; and influence the populace; and because our Presbyterian Brethren have of a long time been, and still are, in use, to make zealous Declamations and huge noises about Succession to our Reformers; Because the clamour, on all occasions, that those who stand for Episcopacy have so much forsaken the principles and maximes of the Reformation, that they Pay our Reformers so little Respect and Deference; That they have Secret Grudges, at the Reformation; That they would willingly return to Popery; And what not? Whereas, they themselves have a Mighty Veneration for those who Reformed the Church of Scotland; They are their, only, true, and Genuine Successors; They are the only Men who stand on the foot of the Reformation, the only sincere and heart-Protestants, the only Real Enemies to Antichrist, &c. For these Reasons, I say, I shall beg the Readers patience
tience till I have discoursed this point a little farther. And to deal frankly and plainly,

In the first place, I own, those of the Episcopal persuasion in Scotland, do not think themselves bound to maintain all the principles, or embrace all the sentiments, or justify all the Practices of our Reformers: 'Tis true, I speak only from myself; I have no Commission from other men to tell their sentiments; Yet I think the Generality of my Fathers and Brethren will not be offended, tho' I speak in the Plural number, and take them into the reckoning. And therefore, I think, I may safely say,

The we think, our Reformers, considering their Education and all their disadvantages, were very considerable men, and made very considerable progress in Reforming the Church, yet we do not believe, they had ane immediate allowance from Heaven for all they said, or did: We believe they were not endued with the Gifts of infallibility, inerrability or impeccability: We believe (and they believed so themselves) that they had no Commission, no Authority, to Establish new Articles of Faith, or make new Conditions of Salvation; We believe they had no Power, pretended to none, for receding from the Original and immovable Standard of Christian Religion. In consequence of this,

We believe and are confident, that where they missed (and being Fallible, it was very
very possible for them to do it) of Conformity to that Standard, we are at Liberty to think otherwise, than they thought; to Profess otherwise than they professed; We are not bound to follow them. To instance in a few of many things.

We own we cannot allow of the principle of Popular Reformations, as it was asserted and practisèd by our Reformers. We own, indeed, 'tis not only Lawful, but Necessary, for every Man to Reform himself both as to Principles and Practice, when there is Corruption in either; And that, not only without, but against publick Authority, whether Civil or Ecclesiastical. Farther, we own, 'tis not only Lawful, but plain and Indispensable Duty in the Governors of the Church, to Reform her, Acting in their own Sphere, even against humane Laws, in direct opposition to a thousand Acts of a thousand Parliaments; I say, Acting and keeping within their own Sphere, i. e. so far as their Spiritual Power can go, but no farther; Keeping within these their own bounds, they may and should condemn Heresies, purge the publick worship of Corruptions, continue a Succession of Orthodox Pastors, &c. In a word, do every thing, which is needful to be done, for putting and preserving the Church, committed to their Care, in that State of Orthodoxy, Purity and Unity, which Jesus Christ, from whom they have their Commission, and to whom, they must be Answerable, has Required by his holy Institution. But we cannot allow
allow them to move Excentrically, to turn Excentrically, to move Excentrically, to turn Excentrically, to turn Excentrically, to turn Excentrically, to turn
orbitant, to stir without their own Vortex. We cannot allow them to use any other, than Spiritual means; or to make any other than Spiritual Defences: We think, they should still perform all dutiful submission to the Civil Powers; Never Resist by Material Arms; never absolve subjects from their Allegiance to their Civil Sovereign; Never Preach the Damnable Doctrine of Depos-ing Kings for Heresy; never attempt to make those whom they should make good Christians, bad Subjects: But to teach them the great and fundamental Doctrine of the Cross, and Exem- plify it to them, in their Practice when they are Called to it. This we Profess: And we do not think it Popery. But our Reformers taught a quite different Doctrine. Their Doctrine was that it belong'd to the Rabble to Reform Religion publickly, to Reform it by Force; To Reform the State if it would not Reform the Church; To Extirpate all false Religion by their Authority; To assume to themselves a Power, to overturn the Powers that are Ordain'd of God; To depose them, and set up new Powers in their stead, Powers that would Protest, that, which they judged to be the best Religion: Whoso pleaseth may see this Doctrine fully taught by Knox, in his Appellation, (a) and he may see the same principle in- sist ed on by Mr. Hendersone in his Debates with K. C. I. And who knows not that our Reformation was but too much founded on this Principle. Herein, I say,
say, we own we have forsaken our Reformers: And let our Presbyterian Brethren, if they can, Convict us, in this, of Heresy.

In short, our Reformers maintain’d that the Doctrine of Defensive Arms was Necessary: That Passive Obedience or Non-resistance was sinful, when People had means for Resistance. (b) That Daniel and his Fellows did (b) Kn. not Resist, by the Sword, Because God had not given them the Power and the means. (c) That the Primitive Christians assisted their Preachers, even against the Rulers and Magistrates, (c) Ibid. and suppressed Idolatry, wheresoever God gave them Force. (d) They maintain’d that the Judicial Laws of Moses (tho’ not adopted into the Christian Systeme) in many considerable instances, continued still obligatory; Particularly that the Laws punishing Adultery, Murder, Idolatry with Death, were binding; That in obedience to these Laws, that Sentence was to be executed not only on Subjects, but on Sovereigns; (e) That (e) Ibid. whosoever executes God’s Law, on such (c) 391, 392, minals, is not only innocent, but in his Duty, (f) Ibid. tho’ he have no Commission from Man for it. That Samuel’s slaying Agag the fat and delicate King of Amalek; and Elias’s killing Baal’s Priests; and Jezebel’s false Prophets; and Phineas’s striking Zimri and Cosbi, in the very AÃ of filthy fornication, were allowable Patterns for private men to imitate. (f) (f) Ibid.

That all these and more such strange Doctrines were Common and Current amongst them, I am able to prove at full length,
length, if I shall be put to it. Besides, they had many other Principles relating to other purposes, which I am perswaded, were not founded on Scripture, had no Countenance from Catholick Antiquity, were not agreeable to found and solid Reason, which we own, we are so far from maintaining, that we think our selves bound, both to Profess and Practice the contrary. And how easy were it to Confute as well as Represent some of Master Knox's principles which perhaps were peculiar to him?

He fairly and plainly condemned St. Paul and St. James, the first Bishop of Jerusalem, for their practice, Act. 21. 18, 19, &c. (g) He esteem'd every thing that was done in God's service, without the express command of his word, vain Religion and Idolatry. (b) He affirmed that all Papists were infidels, both in publick and private;

(i) I cannot think he was right in these things.

He had, sometimes, Prayers, which do not seem to me to Savour any thing of a Christian Spirit: Thus in His Admonition to the Professors of the Truth in England, after he had insisted on the Persecutions in Queen Mary's time, he had this Prayer, (k) God for his great Mercies sake stir up some Phineas, Elias or Jehu that the blood of abominable Idolaters may Pacify God's wrath, that it consume not the whole Multitude, Amen. I must confess it was not without some horror that I put his own Amen to such a petition. In that
fame. Exhortation he prays, also, thus, Repress the pride of these blood-thirsty Tyrants; Consume them in thine anger, according to the Reproach which they have laid against thy Holy Name. Pour forth thy vengeance upon them, and let our eyes behold the blood of the Saints required of their hands: Delay not thy vengeance, O Lord, but let death devour them in haste; Let the Earth swallow them up, and let them go down quick to the hells; For there is no hope of their Amendment; The Fear and Reverence of thy Holy Name is quite banished from their hearts; And therefore, yet, again, O Lord, consume them; Consume them in thine Anger. (1) Let the world judge if such Prayers savour of a Gospel-spirit. Was this loving our Enemies, or Blessing them that Curse us, or Praying for them who despitefully use us, or Persecute us? Was this like forgiving others their trespasses as we would wish our own trespasses to be forgiven? Was this like Father forgive them for they know not what they do. Or Lord lay not this sin to their charge? Did Master Knox consider or know what manner of spirit he was of, when he offered up such petitions?

I shall only give one other Specimen of Master Knox's Divinity, and because 'tis about a point which of late has been so much agitated, I shall not grudge to give his sentiments somewhat fully: Because, perchance, he may come to have some credit by it; He may chance to be honoured as a Father by the Providentialists. The Story is this:

(339)
He wrote a Book against the Regiment of Women, as he called it: His aim was principally against Mary Queen of England: When Queen Elizabeth, was raised to the Throne, some body having told her that he had written such a Book, she resented it so, that she would not allow him to set his foot on English ground, when he was returning from Geneva to Scotland, Anno 1559. This grated him not a little: However, he could not endure to think upon retracting the Positions in his Book; having once asserted them, he deem'd it point of Honour, it seems to adhere to them; for thus he told Secretary Cecil in a Letter from Diepe, April 10. 1559. He doubted no more of the Truth of his Proposition, than he did, that it was the voice of God, which, first, did pronounce this Penalty against Women. In doulour shalt thou bear thy Children. And in a Conference with Mary Queen of Scotland, Anno 1561. He told her, that, to that hour, he thought himself alone more able to sustain the things affirmed in that Book, than any ten Men, in Europe, could be, to confute them. But for all this, Queen Elizabeth (as I said) was raised to the Throne of England; and it was needful her Majesty should not continue to have quarrels with him: Her Kindness and Countenance, at that time to him and his Projects, were worth little less than a Deanry; Some Knack was, therefore, to be devised for making a Reconcilement between his Book and her Regiment; Well! what was it he fix't on? Why? The Providential Right served...
serv’d him to a Miracle: For thus he wrote, in his aforementioned Letter to Cecil; If any Man think me either Enemy to the Person, or yet to the Regiment of her, whom God hath now promoted, they are utterly deceived in me: For the MIRACULOUS work of God, comforting his afflicted by ane infirm Vessel, I do acknowledge: And I will Obey the Power of his most potent hand (Raising up whom best pleaseth his Majesty to suppress such as fight against his Glory) Albeit that both NATURE and GODS MOST PERFECT OR-DINANCE REPUGNE to such Regiment. More plainly to speak: if Queen Elizabeth shall Confess that the EXTRAORDINARY DISPENSATION of Gods great Mercy makes that LAWFUL unto HER, which both NATURE and GODS LAW do DENY unto all Women, Then shall none in England be more willing to main-tain her Lawful Authority than I shall be: But if (GODS WONDROUS WORK set aside) She ground (as God forbid) the just-ness of her Title upon Confucitude, Laws and Ordinances of Men, then I am assured, that, as such foolish presumption doth highly offend Gods Supreme Majesty, so, I greatly fear, that her Ingratitude shall not long lack punishment. This was pretty fair, but it was not enough.

He thought it proper to write to that Queen her self, and give her a Disb of that fame Doctrine. His Letter is dated at Eden-burg, July 29, 1559. (o) In which having told
told her, He never intended, by his Book to assert any thing that might be prejudicial to her yeft Regiment, providing the were not found Unfaithful to God, he bespeaks her thus: Ingrate you will be found in the presence of his Throne, if you transfer the Glory of that Honour in which you now stand to any other thing than the DISPENSATION of his Mercy, which ONLY maketh that Lawful to your Majesty which NATURE and LAW denyeth to all Women, to command and bear Rule over Men— In Conscience I am compelled to say that neither the content of People, the Process of time, nor Multitude of Men can Establish a Law which God shall approve, but whatsoever he approveth, by his Eternal word that shall be approved, and stay constantly firm: And whatsoever he Condemneth shall be Condemned, tho' all Men on Earth should travel for the justification of the fame: And therefore, Madam, The only way to retain and keep the Benefits of God, abundantly of late days, poured upon you, and your Realm, is, unfeignedly, to render unto God, to his Mercy and undeserved Grace, the whole Glory of all this your Exaltation: Forget your BIRTH and all TITLE which thereupon doth hang— It pertaineth to you to ground the JUSTICE of your Authority, not on that LAW which from year to year doth change, but upon the ETERNAL PROVIDENCE of him, who CONTRARY to the ORDINARY course of NATURE, and without your deserving, hath exalted your Head. If thus in Gods presence, you humble your self, I will with Tongue and Pen,
Pen, justify your Authority and Regiment, as the Holy Ghost hath justified the same in Deborah, that Blessed Mother in Israel: But if you neglect (as God forbid) these things, and shall begin to Brag of your Birth, and to Build your Authority and your Regiment upon your own Law, flatter you who so listeth, your Felicity shall be short, &c. Let Contentious People put what Glosses they please on Bishop Overall’s Convocation Book, sure I am, here is the Providential Right so plainly taught that no Glosses can obscure it. Here it is maintain’d, in plain terms, and Resolutely, in opposition, to all the Laws, not only of Men, but of God and Nature.

Thus I have given a taste of such principles as the Prelates, in Scotland, profess they disown, tho’ maintain’d by our Reformers: It had been easy to have instanced in many more; But these may be sufficient for my purpose, which was not in the least, to throw dirt on our Reformers (to whom I am as willing as any man to pay a due reverence) but to stop the mouth of impertinent clamour, and let the world have occasion to consider if it is such a scandalous thing, to think otherwise, than our Reformers thought, as our Brethren endeavour on all occasions, to persuade the populace: For these principles of our Reformers which I have mentioned in Relation to Civil Governments, are the principles in which we have most forsaken them: And let the world judge, which set of principles has most
most of Scandal in it: Let the world judge, I say, whither their principles or ours participate most of the Faith, the Patience, the Self-denial, &c. of Christians: Whither principles have least of the love of the world, and most of the image of Christ in them: Whither principles have greatest affinity with the principles and practices of the Apostles, and their immediate successors, in the most afflicted, and, by consequence, the most incorrupt times of Christianity: Whither principles have a more natural tendency towards the security of Governments and the peace of Societies, and seem most effectual for advancing the power of Godliness, and propagating the Profession and the life of Christianity. I further, subjoin these two things.

1. I challenge our Presbyterian Brethren to convict us of the Scandal of receding from our Reformers in any one principle which they maintain'd, in Common, with the Primitive Church; the Universal Church of Christ, before she was tainted with the Corruptions of Popery: And if we have not done it, (as I am Confident our Brethren shall never be able to prove, we have,) our receding from our Reformers, as I take it, ought to be no prejudice against us. I think the Authority of the Catholick Church, in the days of her indisputed Purity and Orthodoxy, ought, in all Reason to be deem'd preferable to the Authority of our Reformers; especially considering that they themselves professed to
to own the Sentiments of the Primitive Church, as a part, at least, of the Complexe Rule of Reformation, as I have already proved.

2. I challenge our Presbyterian Brethren to instance in so much as one principle, in which we have Deserted our Reformers, wherein, our Deserting them can, by any Reasonable, by any Colourable construction, be interpreted an approach towards Popery. I think, no Man who understands any thing of the Popish Controversies can readily allow himself the Impudence to say, that, to dislike Tumultuary Reformations, and deposing Sovereign Princes, and subverting Civil Governments, &c. upon the score of Religion, is, to be for Popery; or that the Doctrine of Submission to Civil Authority, the Doctrine of Passive Obedience or Non- resistance, or (which I take to be much about one, in the present case) the Doctrine of the Cross, are Popish Doctrines; or that to Condemn the Traiterous Distinction between the Person and the Authority of the Civil Magistrate, as it is commonly made use of, by some People, and as it is Condemned by the Laws of both Kingdoms, is, to turn either Papistical or Jesuitical. Let our Brethren, if they can, Purge their own Doctrines, in these matters, of all Consanguinity with Popery. And now, after all this,

3. I would desire my Readers to remember, that this Artifice of Prejudicating against principles, because different from, or inconstant
ent with, the principles of our Reformers, is none of our Contrivance; Our Presbyterian Brethren, not we, were the First, who set on foot this Popular, tho' very pitiful way of Arguing; By all the Analogies, then, of equitable and just Reasoning, they ought to endure the Trial of their own Text. And this brings me to Enquire whither they have stuck so precisely by the principles of our Reformers, that they are in Bona Fide to insist on such a Topick? And I think they will not be found to be so, if I can make it appear that they have Notoriously deserted the principles of our Reformers.

I. In the Faith.
II. In the Worship.
III. In the Discipline. And
IV. In the Government of the Church.

I. I say they have forsaken our Reformers as to the Faith of the Church. Our Reformers digested a Confession of Faith, Anno 1560. They got it Ratified in Parliament that same year; It was again Ratified, Anno 1567. and in many subsequent Parliaments. It continued still to be the publick, Authorized Standard of the Faith of this National Church, for more than eighty years. Our Reformers design'd it to be a perpetual and unalterable Standard of the Faith of this National Church, for ever. When the Barons and Ministers gave in their Petition, to the Parliament, for an Establishment of the Refor-
Reformation, Anno 1560. They were called upon and Commandment given unto them, to draw into plain and several Heads, the sum of that Doctrine, which they would maintain, and would desire the Parliament to Establish, as wholesome, true, and only necessary to be believed, and to be received within the Realm: And, they willingly accepted the Command, and, within four days, presented the Confession, which was Ratified, (a) and that its Establishment might pass with the greater solemnity and formality of Law, The Earl Marshal protested that it might never be altered. (b)(b)Kn.

Yet, now,

Our Presbyterian Brethren have set up a quite different Standard of Faith, namely, the Westminster Confession, and have got it, now, Ratified by this current Parliament, Anno 1690. (it was never, before, Ratified by Act of Parliament) I call it a quite different Standard of Faith: Indeed, whosoever diligently compares both Confessions, shall readily find it such; He shall not only find many things kept out of the Westminster Confession, which are in the Confession of our Reformers; and many things put in the Westminster Confession, which were not in the Confession of our Reformers; and many things, nicely, minutely, precisely and peremptorily determined, and that in the most Mysterious matters, in the Westminster Confession, which our Reformers thought fit (as was indeed proper) to express in very General and Accommodable Terms: But he shall meet
meet with not a few plain, evident and irreconcileable Contradictions: And now, by this present Parliament, in its Last Session, particularly, upon the twelfth day of June, Anno 1693, it is statuted and ordained, That no Person be admitted, or continued, for hereafter, to be a Minister or Preacher, within this Church, unless he subscribe the Westminster Confession, declaring it to be the Confession of his Faith; and that he owns the Doctrine therein contained to be the true Doctrine, to which he will constantly adhere. And by unavoidable consequence, he is bound to subscribe to, and own, God knows how, many propositions, not only not required nor professed by our Reformers; but directly contrary to their Faith and principles: And now, let the world judge if our Presbyterian Brethren are the Successors of our Reformers in point of Faith.

II. They have forsaken them, yet more, in the point of Worship: and here a vast field opens; For to this head I reduce (artificially or inartificially, is no great matter, if I adduce nothing but wherein our Brethren have deserted our Reformers) the publick Prayers, the publick Praises, the publick Preaching of the word, the administration of the Sacraments, &c. with all their Ceremonies, Solemnities and Circumstances, &c. Generally, whatever uses to be comprehended in Liturgies.

1. In the General, our Reformers were far from Condemning Liturgies, or Set-Forms
Forms in the publick Offices of the Church.

There's nothing more plain, than that they preferred publick Compofures to those that were private: Compofures digested by the publick Spirit of the Church, to Compofures digested by the private Spirit of particular Ministers; and Premeditated and well digested Compofures, tho' performed by private persons, to the, too frequently, Raph, indigested, incomposed performances of the Extemporary Gift. They preferred Offices which were the productions of grave, sedate, well pondered thoughts, to Offices which were mostly the productions of Animal Heat, and warmth of Fancy.

John Knox himself (one who had as much Fire in his temper, and was as much inclined to have given scope to the Extemporary Spirit, I am apt to think, as any of our Reformers) had even a set-form of Grace or Thanksgiving after meat, (c) he had a set-form of Prayer for the publick, after Sermon, (d) and he had set-forms of Prayers read, every day in his Family. (e)

In conformity to this principle, our Reformers for seven years, together, used the Liturgy of the Church of England, as I have fully proven.

When (by the importunity and persuasions of John Knox, principally, I am sure, if not only) they resolved to part with the English Liturgy, they continued still as far as ever from Condemning Liturgies. They did not lay it aside to take up none; They chose
choosed another to succeed it; they choosed that which went, then generally, under the name of the Order of Geneva, or the Book of Common Order; Since, under the name of Knox's Liturgie, or the Old Scottish Liturgie: This Liturgie continued in use, not only, all the time, the Government of the Church subsisted by Imparity, after the Reformation; But even, for many Decads of years, after the Presbyterian Spirit and Party turn'd prevalent.

It was so universally received and used, and in so good esteem, that, when it was moved by some in the Assembly holden at Burnt-Island, in March, Anno 1601. That there were sundry Prayers in it, which were not convenient for these times, and a change was desirable, the Assembly rejected the motion, and thought good, that the Prayers, already, contained in the Book, should neither be altered nor deleted; But if any Brother would have any other Prayers, added, as more proper for the times, they should first present them to be tried, and allowed, by the General Assembly.

(d) Here, indeed, was caution and concern about the publick worship worthy of a General Assembly. Nay,

The First-Rate Presbyterians themselves used the Book, as punctually, as any other People. When Mr. Robert Bruce (of whose zeal for the good cause, no Man, I think, can doubt) was relegated to Innerness, Anno 1605. He remained there four years, Teaching every Sabbath, before noon, and every Wednesday; And exercised at the Reading of the Prayers every
every other night. (e) And Master John (e) Cald.

Strimgeour (another prime Champion for the 496. cause) when he appeared before the High
Commission, March I. Anno 1620, and was
challenged for not putting in practice the
five Articles of Perth; Particularly for not
Ministering the Eucharist to the People on
their knees, answered, there is no warranta-
ble form directed or approved by the Kirk, besides
that which is extant in Print, before the Psalm
Book, (i. e. the old Liturgy) according to
which, as I have always done, so now, I Mi-
nister that Sacrament. (f) In short,

It continued to be in use even after the 748.
beginning of the Horrid Revolution, in the
days of King Charles the First, and many old
People, yet alive, remember well, to have
seen it used indifferently, both by Presbyte-
rians and Prelatifs. But it is not so
now.

Our Modern Presbyterians do not only
Condemn the Liturgie of the Church of Eng-
land (used as I say by our Reformers) calling
it a Dry, lifeless service, a spiritless, powerless
service; ane unwarrantable service; ane ill-
mumbled mass; a farce of Popish Dregs and
Reliques; a Rag of Romish Superstition and
Idolatry; and God knows how many ill
things: But they Generally Condemn all Li-
turgies, all set-forms of publick worship and
devotion; They will admit of none: All to
them are alike odious and intolerable.

Herein, I think, there is a palpable
Receffion from the principles of our Reformers,
about the publick and solemn worship of the Church; and that in a most weighty and material instance: But this is not all; They have not only deserted our Reformers, and Condemn'd them as to Forms; But they have made very considerable and important Receptions from them, as to the matter, both in the substance and circumstances of Liturgical Offices; and here I must descend to particulars.

1. Then, our present Presbyterians observe no Forms in their publick Prayers, either before, or after Sermon; For the most part, they observe no Rules; They Pray by no Standard; Nay they do not stick by their own Directory: All must be Extemporary work; and the newer, the odder, the more surprizing both as to matter and manner, the better. If any Brother has not that fire in his temper, that heat in his blood, that warmth in his Animal-spirits, that sprightlyness and fervour in his fancy, or that readiness of elocution, &c. If he wants any one or two of these many Graces, which must concur for accomplishing one with the ready Gift, and shall adventure to digest his thought, and provide himself with a PremeditatedForm of his own making; He shall be concerned likewise to be so wise and wary, as to provide himself, either with a variety of such Forms, or many disguises for his one form, or he shall run the hazard of the success of his Ministry, and his Reputation to boot; He is a Gone-man if the Zealots of the gang smell it out, that he

Prayed
prayed by Premeditation. Fore-thought Prayers are little less Criminal, than fore-thought Felony: He wants the spirit, and deserves to be ranked amongst the Anti-Christian Crime of Formalists. Nay, so much are they against set-forms, that 'tis Popery, for any thing I know, to say the Lords Prayer.

Our Reformers never met for publick worship, but they used it once or other; And they used it as in obedience to our Saviour's Commandment. Take, for a taste, these instances, which I have collected from the old Liturgy.

The Prayer for the whole Estate of Christ's Church, appointed to be said after Sermon, is Concluded thus, *In whose name we make our humble petitions unto thee, even as he hath taught us, saying, Our Father, &c.* (g) (g) Scot.

Another Prayer to be said after Sermon, Liturgy has the Lords Prayer in the very bosom of it, page 27. (b) 39.

The Prayer to be used when God threatens his Judgements, concludes thus, — Praying unto thee with all humility and submission of minds, as we are taught and commanded to Pray, saying, Our Father, &c. (i) (i) p. 53.

The Prayer to be used in time of Affliction, thus, Our only Saviour and Mediator, in whose name we Pray unto thee as we are taught, saying, Our Father, &c. (k) (k) p. 56.

The Prayer at the Admission of a Superintendent or a Minister, thus — Of whom the perpetual increase of thy Grace, we crave, as by thee our Lord, King, and only Bishop, we A a
(l) p. 74. are taught to Pray, Our Father, &c. (l)

The Prayer for the Obstinate (in the order for Excommunication) thus, — These thy Graces, O Heavenly Father, and farther, as thou knowest to be expedient for us, and for thy Church Universal, we call for, unto thee, even as we are taught by our Lord and Master.

(m) p. 104. Christ Jesus, saying, Our Father, &c. (m)

The last Prayer before Excommunication thus, — This we ask of thee, O Heavenly Father, in the boldness of our Head and Mediator Jesus Christ, praying as he hath taught us, Our

(n) p. 109. Father, &c. (n)

The Confession of sins, &c. in time of publick Fast's, thus, — We flee to the obedience and perfect Justice of Jesus Christ our only Mediator — Praying as he hath taught us, saying, Our Father, &c. (o)

(o) 170. The Prayer of Consecration in Baptism, thus, — May be brought as a lively Member of his Body, unto the full fruition of thy joys, in the Heavens, where thy Son, our Saviour Christ Reigneth, world without end; In whose name, we Pray, as he hath taught us, saying, Our

(p) p. 189. Father, &c. (p)

So many of the Prayers used by our Reformers were concluded with the Lords Prayer: And it is obvious to any body that sometimes 3 or 4 of them were to be said at one Assembly: And still when the Lords Prayer is brought in, you see, 'tis plainly in Obedience to our Saviours Command, from which, 'tis clear our Reformers look't on the using it, as, not only Lawful, but, Necessary.
Our present Presbyterians will not only not use it, but they Condemn and write against the using of it. Indeed, they have not retained so much as one Form, except that of Blessed used by Saint Paul, 2 Cor. 13. 14: This indeed they commonly say (tho' I am not sure they say it in the Form of a Blessing) before the Dissolution of the Assembly: But why they have kept this and rejected all other Forms; or, how they can reconcile the retaining of this, with the rejection of all other Forms, I confess I am not able to tell: Let themselves answer for that, as well as for retaining set forms of Prayer while they Condemn set forms of Prayer.

2. Our Reformers, in their publick Assemblies, never omitted to make a solemn and publick Confession of their Faith, by rehearsing that which is commonly called the Apostles Creed: It was said after the Prayer for the whole Estate of Christ's Church, and it was introduced thus; Almighty and Everliving God, vouchsafe we beseech thee, to grant us perfect continuance in thy lively Faith, augmenting the same in us daily, till we grow to the full measure of our perfection in Christ, whereof we make our Confession, saying, I believe in God the Father, &c. Herein they are entirely defeated by our present Presbyterians also.

3. The Preaching of the word may be performed two ways; By the publick Reading of the Scriptures; and by Sermons, &c. founded on the Scriptures: Our present
Presbyterians, in both these, have Receded from our Reformers.

1. As for the Reading of the Scriptures, our Reformers delivered themselves thus, in the First Book of Discipline, Head 9. (q) We think necessary that every Church have a Bible in English, and that the People convene to hear the Scriptures Read and Interpreted; that by frequent Reading and Hearing, the gross ignorance of the People may be removed; And we judge it most expedient, that the Scriptures be read in order, that is, that one Book of the Old and New Testament be begun and followed forth to the end. For a good many years after the Reformation these was one order of men, called Readers, who supplied the want of Ministers in many Parishes: Their Office was to Read the Scriptures and the Common Prayers: The Scriptures continued to be Read in Churches for more than eighty years, after the Reformation: In many Parishes, the old Bibles are still extant, from which the Scriptures were Read: Even the Directory itself, introduced, not before the year 1645, appointed the Scriptures to be Read publickly in Churches, one Chapter out of each Testament, at least, every Sunday before Sermon, as being part of the publick worship of God, and one means Sanctified by him for the Edifying of his People. Yet, now, what a Scandal would it be to have the Scriptures Read in the Presbyterian Churches? The last days Sermons, taken from the mouth of the powerful Preacher, by the inspired fingers of Godly George
George or Gracious Barbara, in some Churches of no mean Note, have been Dem'd more Edifying than the Divine Oracles. The Scriptures must not be touched but by the Man of God, who can interpret them; And he must Read no more than he is, just then, to interpret: What shall I say? Let Protestant Divines Cate as they please about the Perfiduity of the Scriptures, 'tis a dangerous thing to have them Read publickly without Orthodox Glosses, to keep them close and true to the principles of the Godly: And who knows but it might be expedient to wrap them up again in the unknown tongue? But enough of this.

2. As for Sermons, &c. The First Book of Discipline gives us the sentiment of our Reformers, thus, The Sunday, in all Towns, must precisely be observed; before and after noon; before noon, the word must be Preached, Sacraments Administred, &c. After noon, the Catechism must be taught, and the young Children examined thereupon, in audience of all the People. (r)This continued the manner of the Church of Scotland, for full twenty years, after the Reformation: For I find no mention of afternoons Sermons, till the year 1580, that it was enacted (by that same General Assembly which Condemned Episcopacy,) That all Pastors or Ministers should Diligently travel with their Flocks to convene unto Sermon, after noon, on Sunday; Both they that are in Landward, and in Burgh, as they will answer unto God. (s) The whole Kingdom knows, (s) MS.
Lectures before the forenoons Sermon, were not introduced, till the days of the Covenant and Directory: Yet, now, a mighty stress is laid upon them, and I my self have been told, that they were one good Reason for forsaking the Episcopal Communion, where they were not used, and going over to the Presbyterians, where they were to be had. I am not to condemn a diligent instruction of the People: But to speak freely, I am very much persuaded the Method of our Reformers, in having but one Sermon, and Catechizing, after noon, was every way as effectual for Instructing the People in the substantial knowledge of our Holy Religion, and pressing the practice of it, as any method has been in use since; Much more might be said on this subject; But from what I have said, 'tis plain there is a great dissimilitude between our Modern Presbyterian and our Reformers even in this point; and that is enough for my purpose.

4. They have as little stuck by the Pattern of our Reformers in the Office of Praise: Our Reformers, beside the Psalms of David had, and used, several other Hymns in Meter: They had the Ten Commandments, the Lords Prayer, the Creed, Veni Creator, the humble suit of a sinner, the Lamentation of a sinner, the Complaint of a sinner, the Magnificat, the Nunc Dimittis, &c. They never used to conclude their Psalms without some Christian Doxology: The Gloria Patri was most generally used: In the old Psalm Book, it is turn'd into all the different kinds of
of Measures, into which the Psalms of David are put, that it might still succeed, in the conclusion, without changing the Tune: It was so generally used, that, (as Doctor Burnet in his Second Conference, (t) tells us) even a Presbyterian General took it in very ill part, when it begun to be difused: Yet, now, nothing in use, with our present Presbyterians but the Psalms of David; and these too, for the most part, without Discrimination. The Gloria Patri, recovered from Desuetude, at the last Restitution of Episcopacy, and generally used in the Episcopai Assemblies, these thirty years past, was a Mighty Scandal to them; So great, that even such as came to Church, hang'd their Heads and sat silent, generally, when it came to that part of the Office.

Having mentioned Doctor Burnet's Conferences, I will transcribe his whole Period, because some other things than the Gloria Patri are concerned in it. When some Designers (says he) for popularity in the Western Parts of that Kirk did begin to disuse the Lord Prayer in worship, and the singing the conclusion or Doxologie after the Psalm, and the Ministers kneeling for Private Devotion, when he entered the Pulpit, the General Assembly took this in very ill part; And, in the Letter they wrote to the Presbyteries, complained sadly of a Spirit of Innovation was beginning to get into the Kirk, and to throw these Laudible practices out of it, mentioning the three I named which are commanded still to be practiced, and such as refused
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Obedience, are appointed to be conferred with, in order to the giving of them satisfaction; And if they continued unratale, the Presbyteries were to proceed against them as they should be answerable to the next General Assembly. Thus he; and this Letter, he said, he could produce, Authentically Attested: I doubt not, he found it amongst his Uncle Waristown's Papers, who was Scribe to the Rampant Assemblies from the year 1638, and downward. I wish the Doctor had been at pains to have published more of them; If he had employed himself that way, I am apt to think he had done his Native Country better service, than he has done her Sister Kingdom by publishing Pastoral Letters to be used, he knows how; But even from what he has given us, We may see how much the distributing of the Lords Prayer, and the Doxologie is a late Innovation, as well as a Reception from the Pattern of our Reformers. And as for the decent and Laudable custom of kneeling for private Devotion, used by the Minister when he entered the Pulpit; It may be reckoned

5. Another Presbyterian late Reception. It is certain it was used by our Reformers; It is as certain, it continued in use, till after both Covenants were sworn; The National I mean, and the Solemn League and Covenant; It was not turn'd Authoritatively (I intend no more than the Equivocal Authority which Schismatical Assemblies pretend to) into distribute till the General Assembly 1645. Even, then,
then, it was not Condemned as either superstitious or indecent; it was laid aside, only, in compliyance with the English Presbyterians. By that Assembly, a Committee was appointed, to give their opinion, about keeping a greater Uniformity in this Kirk, in the practice and observation of the Directory, in some points of public worship: And the fourth Article to which they Agreed, was this, word for word, *It is also the judgment of the Committee, that the Ministers bowing in the Pulpit, tho' a Lawful Custome in this Kirk, be, hereafter, laid aside, for satisfaction of the desires of the Reverend Divines in the Synod of England, and Uniformity with that Kirk so much endeared to us.* And then followeth the Assembly's approbation of all the Articles digested by the Committee. Here, 'tis evident this Assembly own'd it to be a Lawful Custome: A former Assembly called it Laudible. And yet it is Scandalous if not Superstitions to our present Presbyterians. Let me add as ane Appendage to this;

6. Another (in my opinion) very decent, and commendable Custome, which obtain'd in Scotland, generally, till the latter times of Presbytery. This, when People entered the Church, they commonly uncovered their Heads, as entering into the House of God; And generally, they put up a short Prayer to God (some kneeling, some standing, as their conveniency allowed them) deeming it very becoming to do so, when they came thus into the place of God's special presence and
his public worship. This custom was so universal, that the vestiges of it may be, even yet, observed amongst old People, educated before the Donatism of the Covenant, who continue to retain it; Now adays, 'tis plain Superstition to a Presbyterian, not to enter the Church, with his Head covered. 

Mas John himself doth it as mannerly as the courteft Cobbler in the Parish. In he steps, uncovers not till in the Pulpit, claps straight on his Breech, and within a little falls to work as the Spirit moves him. All the Congregation must fit close in the time of Prayer; Clap on their Bonnets in the time of Sermon, &c. This is the way; and it brings me in mind of ane observe, ane old Gentleman has frequently repeated to me, which was, that he found it impossible to perform Divine worship without Ceremonies; For (said he) the Presbyterians themselves, who pretend to be against all Ceremonies, seem, even to Superstition, precise, in observing the Ceremonies of the Breech, &c. But——

Thus I have represented, in some instances, how our Presbyterian Brethren have deserted our Reformers in the ordinary stated parts of publick worship. I proceed now to the Sacraments.

7. Then, our Reformers had not only a set form for Administ ring the Sacrament of Baptism; But, beside the Father of the Child, they allowed of Sureties or Sponsors. This is plain from the conclusion of the discourse concerning the nature and necessity of
of Baptism, in the old Liturgy; For, the Minifter, there, addressed to the Father and the Sponsors, thus: Finally to the intent that we may be assured that you the Father and the Sureties, consent to the performance hereof (of the conditions mentioned before) Declare, here, before the Face of this Congregation, the sum of that Faith wherein you believe, and will instruct this Child. After this there is this Rubrick: Then the Father, or, in his absence, the God-Father, shall rehearse the Articles of his Faith, which done, the Minifter expoundeth the same as followeth. That which followeth is, a large explanation of the Apostles Creed, &c. Thus it was appointed in the old Liturgy; and thus it was practiced Universally for some scores of years.

But our Modern Presbyterians do not only abhor all Sect-forms, as I have said, but, to name Sponsors or Godfathers, to them is to incur the Scandal of Popery. The Apostles Creed is no agreeable Standard of the Christian Faith, into which one is initiated by Baptism. They cannot endure to hear of it, in this Office. Whoso presents a Child to them to be Baptized, must promise to bring up the Child in the Faith, as it is contained in the Westminster Confession, and the larger and shorter Catechisms. This they Require Generally: Not a few Require that the Child be educated in the Faith of the Solemn League and Covenant.

7. About the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, I find many considerable alterations. Take these for a Taste.
1. It was Administered by our Reformers, by a set-form, contained in the Old Liturgie: It continued to be so Administered for more than 60 years, by Presbyterians themselves, as I have observed already in the instance of Scrimgeour.

2. As for the frequency of this most Christian Office; The First Book of Discipline, (v) Spot. Head 9th, (v) Determined thus: Four times in the year, we think sufficient, for Administration of the Lords Table—Albeit we deny not, but every Church for Reasonable causes, may change the time, and Minister the same, oftner. The General Assembly helden at Edinburgh, Decemb. 25. 1562, Ordained, the Communion to be Minisred four times in the year in Burghs, and twice, in Landward, (w) The First Rubric in the Office for the Lords Supper, in the Old Liturgy, intimates it was oftner administered, for thus it runs; Upon the day that the Lords Supper is Minisred, which commonly is used once a Month, or as often as the Congregation shall think expedient, &c.

3. Our Reformers had no preparation Sermons on the Saturdays immediately before the Administration of the Sacrament: No vestige of any such Sermons in the Old Liturgy, nor in the Acts of the Old Assemblies, nor in any of our Histories. It is plain, such Sermons were not required by the Authority of any (even Presbyterian) Assembly till the year 1645. Then, indeed, amongst the Articles prepared by the Committee, mentioned before, I find this the seventh Branch of
of the Third Article, which was about the Lords Supper, That there be one Sermon of Preparation, delivered in the ordinary place of publick worship, upon the day immediately preceding. And it is clear from the style of these Articles that this was new; and had not been practiced, at least generally, before.

4. Our Reformers thought as little on Thanksgiving Sermons on the immediately succeeding Moondays. Indeed such were not required, no not by that Innovating Assembly, 1645. All it has about Thanksgiving Sermons, is in the 8th Branch of the aforesaid Article, which is this, That before the serving of the Tables there be only one Sermon delivered to those who are to Communicate, and, that, in the Kirk, where the service is to be performed: And that, in the same Kirk, there be one Sermon of Thanksgiving, after the Communion is ended.

5. No Vestige of Assistant Ministers at the Administration of this Sacrament, in the practice of our Reformers; So far as I can learn, it was that same Assembly 1645 which first allowed this, also, in the Sixth Branch of the aforesaid Article, which is this; That when the Communion is to be Celebrated in a Parish, one Minister may be employed for assisting the Minister of the Parish, or at the most two. Indeed, as our Reformers digested the matter, there was no use for any; The Minister of the Parish, was sufficient, alone; for all the work; for they were careful that it might be no insupportable task; as, sure,
Presbyterians, in both these, have Receded from our Reformers.

1. As for the Reading of the Scriptures, our Reformers delivered themselves thus, in the First Book of Discipline, Head 9. (q) We think necessary, that every Church have a Bible in English, and that the People convene to hear the Scriptures Read and Interpreted; that by frequent Reading and Hearing, the gross ignorance of the People may be removed; And we judge it most expedient, that the Scriptures be read in order, that is, that some one Book of the Old and New Testament be begun and followed forth to the end. For a good many years after the Reformation there was an order of men, called Readers, who supplied the want of Ministers in many Parishes: Their Office was to Read the Scriptures and the Common Prayers: The Scriptures continued to be Read in Churches for more than eighty years, after the Reformation: In many Parishes, the old Bibles are still extant, from which the Scriptures were Read: Even the Directory itself, introduced, not before the year 1645, appointed the Scriptures to be Read publicly in Churches, one Chapter out of each Testament, at least, every Sunday before Sermon, as being part of the publick worship of God, and one mean: Sanctified by him for the Edifying of his People. Yet, now, what a Scandal would it be to have the Scriptures Read in the Presbyterian Churches? The last days Sermons, taken from the mouth of the powerful Preacher, by the inspired fingers of Godly George...
George or Gracious Barbara, in some Churches of no mean Note, have been De-void more Edifying than the Divine Oracles. The Scriptures must not be touched but by the Man of God, who can interpret them; And he must Read no more than he is, just then, to inter- pret: What shall I say? Let Protestant Divines Caut as they please about the Per spi-cuity of the Scriptures, 'tis a dangerous thing to have them Read publickly without Orthodox Glosses, to keep them close and true to the principles of the Godly: And who knows but it might be expedient to wrap them up again in the unknown tongue? But enough of this.

2. As for Sermons, &c. The First Book of Discipline gives us the sentiment of our Re-formers, thus, The Sunday, in all Towns, must precisely be observed; before and after noon; before noon, the word must be Preached, Sacra-ments Administered, &c. After noon, the Cate-chism must be taught, and the young Children examined thereupon, in audience of all the People.

This continued the manner of the Church of Scotland, for full twenty years, after the Reformation: For I find no mention of afternoons Sermons, till the year 1580, that it was enacted (by that fame General Assem-bly which Condemned Episcopacy,) That all Pastors or Ministers should Diligently travel with their Flocks to conveen unto Sermon, after noon, on Sunday; Both they that are in Land- ward, and in Burgh, as they will answer unto God. (s) The whole Kingdom knows, (s) Me.
Thus the Eucharist was Celebrated by our Reformers; and thus, it was Innovated by the Presbyterian General Assembly, Anno 1645. Well! what is the Method of our present Presbyterians? Whether do they keep by the Measures of our Reformers, or their own Assembly 1645? Or have they receded from both? I shall give an account of their Method, as just and faithful as I can, and let the world judge.

The Practice of our present Presbyterians is this: In many places, particularly in the West, a Fast is kept on some day of the week, before the Sacrament is Celebrated: The Congregation Meets: A Lecture, and two long Sermons are Preached: Long enough; Good enough; But if they are not long, they are good for nothing. In all Parishes, on Saturday, afternoon, another long Sermon in the Church, and, in most places, a long one too, in the Church-yard, Preached by some Neighbour-Frother.

On Sunday (the day on which the Communion is given) six, seven, eight, ten or twelve Ministers, leaving their own Churches empty, that day, and without Divine Service, convene at the Church where the Sacrament is to be Administered: The People of their Parishes, deprived of the publick worship, at home, resort thither, frequently also. If the Minister who gives the Sacrament, is a Gracious Man, a man of renowned zeal for the good Cause; most of the First-Rate zealots, both Masculine and Feminine, especially,
especially, the Females of the first Magnitude; the Ladies, who live within 6, 10, 16, 20, 30 miles distance, must be there also.

In the morning, pretty early, some two or three hours sooner than ordinary, they fall to work. The Minister of the Parish himself, commonly Preaches a long long Sermon in the Church; After some two hours and ane half, sometimes three full hours, spent in hard labour (too hard for sides that are not very substantial) He descends from the Pulpit, to the Communion Table, there he has another long Discourse, before he Consecrates the Elements; That done, he Consecrates, not by a form, that were highly scandalous and unspiritual, but, as the ready Gift serves him. After that, ane Exhortation, which wants nothing but the Formality of having a Text Read, to make it a pretty long Sermon. Then the Elements are distributed to those who are set about the Table; and that is called, the First Table. These, having participated, arise and remove; Others plant themselves about the Table: Sometimes the Parish-Minister serves this Second Table also; But if he does not, a fresh Brother succeeds, with another long Exhortation; and so onward, so long as there are People who have not fate down, at every Table (and sometimes there may be 10, 12, 14 Tables, more or fewer, as it happens) there is a new long Exhortation, before the Distribution of the Elements; and shorter ones, in the time the Communicants (who re-
ceive not from the Minister, but from one another, sitting 50, 60, 70, 80, &c. about the Table) are eating and drinking. After all the Tables are served the Minister of the Parish ascends the Pulpit, again declaims another long Harangue, then Prays, &c. and all this, without Papers, from the Magazine of his Memory, unless it be sometimes supplied from the stores of the Extemporary Spirit. But this is not all.

All this time, the Sermons are thundering in the Church-yard, sometimes by pairs together, if the Confluence is great: Brother succeeds after Brother, and there is Sermon upon Sermon, insufficient Sermoning, till the Congregation within the Church is dissolved, which is not, for the most part, till much of the day is spent, indeed cannot readily be, considering what work there is of it.

The Congregation dissolved, there is a little breathing time; Then the Bells rings again, and the work is renewed: Some other Brother than the Parish Minister mounts the Pulpit in the Church, in the afternoon; and Preaches a Thanksgiving Sermon, and the rest are as busy in the Church-yard as ever: And then on Mondays morning the Preaching work is fallen to a fresh and pursued vigorously, one Preaching in the Church, another in the Church-yard, as formerly. I am sure I am just in all this Account; I could prove it by many instances, if it were needful, but I shall only name two. Thus,
Last year when this Sacrament was Celebrated at St. Cuthberts, where the renown'd Mr. David Williamsone Exercises, on the three dayes, viz. Saturday, Sunday and Moonday, in the Church and Church-yard, there were no fewer than 12 or 13 formal Sermons, besides all the Incidental Harrangues, and all the Exhortations at the Tables, &c. And when the Sacrament was given in the New Church in the Canon-gate in September, or the beginning of October 1692, there was much about the same number. I my self overheard parts of some three or four which were Preached in the Church-yard: And that which made me have the deeper impressions of the unaccountableness of this their Method, was, that all who were in the Church-yard, on Sunday, at least, and four times as many, might, that day, have had room enough in the Churches of Edinburgh, which were at no great distance: But, it seems, the solemnity of Church-yard Sermons, is now become necessary on such occasions.

I have narrated nothing in this strange account (I say) but what is Notorious Matter of Fact: All this Parade they have, ordinarily, even in the Countrey; and tho' there are but some scores, or, at most, but some hundreds to Communicate, yet the Communion is not Solemn enough, there's a Cloud upon the Ministers reputation, something or other is wrong, if there are not some thousands of Spectators.

I doubt not, when Strangers Read this

Bb 2
account, they will think it a very surprizing one: And no wonder, for, not to insist how much they have receded, not only from the Rules and Practices of our Reformers, but even from the Determinations of their own General Assembly 1645; not only receded from them, but, almost, in every particular, run quite Counter to them: not to insist on what occasions, may be given to much scandal, and many wickednesses, by such indigested, disorderly, confused, and mixt Convocations: For who knows not that hundreds, generally, strangers to one another, who have no sense of, no concern for, no care about serious Religion, may meet, on such occasions, for Novelty, for Curiosity, for Intrigues not to be named, for a thousand such sinister ends? Not to insist on these things, I say, tho' they are of no small consequence: What a vast difference is there between such Communions, and the Orderly and Devout Communions of the Primitive Church? What would the Ancient Lights and Guides of the Christian Church, who would suffer none to stay in the Church but such as were to Participate, say, if they saw such promiscuous Routs assembled, and mostly, for no other end, than making a Spectacle of such a Venerable Mystery? Is not such unaccountable Parade much liker to the Popish Processions, than the Devout Performances of the purer times of Genuine Christianity? How impossible were it, at this rate, to Celebrate the Sacrament, once a Month
in every Parish Church? How much more impossible to restore it to its due and proper frequency? How far is this from looking on this Holy Sacrament, as an ordinary, tho' a very signal part of Divine worship? Or rather is it not to make a Prodigie of this Divine Mystery? Certainly, when People observe how seldom, and withal, with what strange Pomp, with what, ordinarily, impracticable solemnity such an holy ordinance is gone about, it cannot but work differently upon their different dispositions.

It stands fair to be a Scare crow to the weak Christian; He dares not approach, where there is so much frightening Address; It stands as fair for being a scandal to the strong and understanding Christian, when he sees so much vain show, so much needless ostentation, so much odd, external tricking, about it;

And the Hypocrite can hardly wish any thing more useful for him; For who should doubt of his being a Saint, when he approaches, amidst so much solemnity? Besides,

Every body may easily see what is aim'd at by all this; It is, as they think, a proper Method for catching the Populace; It is to make them admire the Devotion, the Religion, the Abilities of the Party. How Glorious and August are their Communions! What singular preparations have they! How many Powerful Prayers! How many Soul-searching Sermons! Who can compare with them for fervour and zeal, for Graces and Gifts, for special marks of Gods peculiar favour and assistance!
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Must
Muft not their way be Gods way! Muft not those of their way be the true, the only People of God! I ask God and my Presbyterian Brethren pardon, if this is not at the bottom of the Matter; But if it is, I wish they would consider from what principles it proceeds; How easy is it to discern in such Arts and Methods, the clear Symptoms, the lively Signatures, of a Schismatical temper? How easy to perceive the plain features of Faction, and the Lineaments of a preposterous Fondness to have their way and party had in Admiration? How easy were it, more fully to expose such dangerous and dreadful Methods? But I am afraid I have digressed too much already. There is

8. Another very considerable instance of their Deferring the principles of our Reformers in the Matter of this Sacrament; Such an instance as may make another strange Figure, when seriously considered.

Our Reformers, having once Established the Confession of Faith, as the Standard for this National Church, required no more for qualifying private Persons for the Sacrament of the Eucharist, than, that they could say the Lords Prayer, the Articles of the Belief, and the Summ of the Law, and understand the use and Vertue of this Holy Sacrament; So it is expressly delivered in the ninth Head of the First Book of Discipline. (x) Supposing the Person free from scandal, this was certainly a Genuine Measure, and agreeable to the Rules and Principles of Catholick Unity. For

How-
However expedient it may be, upon some Emergent Occasions, or Necessities, to require suitable Obligations of Office-bearers in the Church, yet, no man, I think, who loves Christian Simplicity and Unity, but will acknowledge, 'tis proper and prudent, to make the terms of Communion as Catholic and Comprehensive, as Christ's institutions will allow them to be made. Now, not to insist on our Brethren separating, from the Communion of those, who keep by the terms of Communion required by our Reformers, whereby they expressly Condemn the Communion of our Reformers: not to insist on this, I say, tho' it might be more than enough, to prove their Rejection from the principles of our Reformers, in this Matter:

Our Presbyterian Brethren are bound by ane Express Act of the General Assembly 1648, not to give the Sacrament of the Lords Supper to any who do not, first, swear the Solemn League and Covenant. The occasion was this:

In the beginning of that year 1648, most part of the Nobility and Gentry of Scotland having come to a sense of the Miseries and Calamities, the Kingdomes had been involved in, by the horrid Rebellion, which had, then, prevail'd, too long, and too successfully; and willing to acquit themselves, for once, as dutiful subjects, for the relief of their suffering Sovereign, at that time, most sadly oppress'd, and kept in prison, by a prevailing party of his
most undutiful subjects, entered into a most Dutiful Confederacy, commonly called Duke Hamiltons Engagement, by the Presbyterians, the Unlawful Engagement: And in pursuance thereof, made suitable preparations, provided Arms, levied men, &c. to form an Army. The Presbyterian Preachers were generally against it; Preached and Prayed Damnation and Ruine to the undertakers, Condemn'd the undertaking as Unlawful and Perjurious, as Traiterous to the Cause of God, and a Breach of Solemn League and Covenant, and what not? Particularly, The Presbytery of Edinburg, the leading Presbytery, the Presbytery which fate upon the Watch-Tower, of the Nation, shewed, I must say, Remarkable, tho' I cannot say, Good Example to the Rest of the Presbyteries, in the Months of May and June; They rack't their inventions for falling on methods to crush and disappoint the Designs of the Engagers. For instance, they let on foot this Politick in the Respective Parishes, within their District, that the Ministers and Kirk-Sessions should form supplications against the Engagement, and give them in to the Presbytery, who were to give them in to the Committee of Estates, and thereby, to represent to them how much their undertaking was contrary to the Inclinations of the Generality of the People. The Device took effect in some Parishes: The Kirk-Sessions of Edinburgh, Holy-Rude-house, Duddingstown, Liberton, Ratho, Curry, Cramond, gave in their supplications.
applications, declaring that they could not be satisfied in their Consciences about the Lawfulness of the Engagement. I have instanced in the forwardness of the Presbytery of Edinburgh, to give my Reader a Taste of the humour of these times; nor is it to be imagined that others were asleep, while they were so diligent.

The General Assembly met on the twelfth of July, they justified the endeavours and diligence used before, against the Engagement, with a witness: They approved all the Declarations, Remonstrances, Representations, Petitions, &c. against it, which had been made by the Commission of the Kirk: They declared there was no possibility of securing Religion, so long as this Unlawful Engagement was carried on. They made Acts and Declarations against Acts of Parliament; and threatened all who should obey them, with the wrath of God and the Censures of the Kirk: They gave out their publick warnings against it, and wrote to their Covenanted Brethren in England, shewing their utter abhorrence of it: They made their Act Declaring silence about it, a Crime, and requiring all Ministers to make the main current of their Applications in Sermons against it, under the pain of being Censured by their Presbyteries. And to shew their sincerity and real zeal in all this, and for preventing all such ungodly Engagements, for the time to come, &c. They made this Act, That hereafter all Persons, whatsoever, should take the Covenant, at
their first Receiving of the Lords Supper, requiring Provincial Assembly's and Presbyteries to be careful, that this Act should be observed, and account thereof taken, in the visitation of particular Kirks, and the tryal of Presbyteries. If this was not to streighten Christian Commun-ion, if this was not to impose strange terms, on all who desired this Holy Sacrament; let the world judge: And it is very well known that for some years thereafter this Act was observed. Perhaps it were no difficult task to give an account of many strange things which happened in pursuance of this Act: But I shall content my self at present with one instance.

In pursuance of the Politick, of the Presbytery of Edinburg, mention'd before, the Ministers of South Leith, proposed, to that Kirk Session, the overture of supplicating against the Engagement. The Plurality of the Elders rejected it: This was in May or June; The Engagement, as every body knows, was unsuccessful; The Army was Routed at Preston, &c. and the Kirk had opportunity to be avenged of Malignants. The Presbytery of Edinburgh, therefore, on the sixth of December, that same year, kept a Visitasion at the Church of South Leith; they made diligent Enquiry, who of the Elders, refused to supplicate against the Engagement; They Depos'd them from their Office, and they ordered the Ministers to go about ane Election of a New Session. But this was not all.

Upon
Upon the 8th of December, they met again, to digest a Method for Renewing the Covenant, in obedience to the Assemblies Act; and particularly, they Ordained that such Seducers as dissuaded others from petitioning against the Engagement should be debarred from the COVENANT. Nay upon the 24th of January 1648 it was ordered, particularly, That those in South Leith who had accession to the Paper drawn in Captain Ramsey's house, (which Paper, so far as one can Conjecture, from the Depositions of the Witnesses about it, was nothing but ane Apologetick, for their not supplicating) as also those who were sent from the Corporations (the Town, as I think, is divided into four Corporations) to the Ministers and Session, to desir'd them to forbear supplicating, against the Engagement, should make publick acknowledgement of their Offence, before they should have permission to take the Covenant: So that at last, as is obvious, the matter resulted in this: The Elders of South Leith, and those who came from the Corporations to the Session to Dissuade from supplicating, could not have the Sacrament without first taking the Covenant; and they could not have the Benefit of the Covenant (as it was then Deem'd) till they should make publick acknowledgement of the Heinous Guilt of not supplicating, and, as Seducers, Dissuading others from supplicating, against the Unlawful Engagement. For the Truth of this I Appeal to the Faith of the publick Register of that Presbytery.

I know,
I know, our Presbyterian Brethren will be ready to say, that this was only a Deed of the particular Presbytery of Edinburgh, so that, if there was any thing amiss in it, it ought not to be imputed to the whole party: If this be said, I have these things to reply; 1. What did the Presbytery here-in that was not in pursuance of the publick Spirit of the times, and the Acts of the General Assembly? But then 2. as extravagant as the Presbytery of Edinburgh was in this matter, They came not up, it seems, to the full Measures of Rigidity, which the Spirit of the Assembly, required: For who so pleases to turn over, in the Register, to the 31st of January 1648, shall find that the Commission of the Kirk (the Authentic Vehicle of the publick Spirit of the Kirk, during the Interval between Assemblies) wrote a Letter to the Presbytery, Requiring greater accuracy in the Tryal of Malignants, and admitting People to the Renovation of the Covenant, prohibiting Kirk Sessions to meddle in such Matters, and Ordering all to be done by the Presbyteries themselves; Except very difficult Cases, which were to be referr'd to the Commission of the Kirk. And to secure this side also, let him turn over to the Acts of the General Assembly, Anno 1649, and he shall find First Act Intituled, Approbation of the proceedings of the Commissioners of the General Assembly; by which Act that Assembly (Acted by that same Spirit, with the former) found that the Commissioners appointed, Anno 1648, had been zealous, diligens
diligent and faithful in the discharge of the trust committed to them, and therefore did unanimously Approve and Ratify the whole Proceedings, Acts, and Conclusions of the said Commission; Appointing Mr. John Bell, Moderator pro tempore, to return them hearty thanks, in the name of the Assembly, for their great pains, travel, and fidelity.

If it be said, farther, that our present Presbyterians require not, now, that condition of taking the Covenant of those, they admit to the Sacrament: I reply, 1. do not the Cameronians, who, in all true Logic, are to be reputed the Truest Presbyterians observe it punctually?

2. How can our present Regnant Presbyterians justify their Omission of it? By their own principles the Act binds them; for it stands as yet unrepealed by any subsequent General Assembly: By the common principles of Reason they are bound, either to obey that Act or Reprobate the Assembly which made it. This I am sure of, they can neither plead the Dissuade of that Act, nor any Peculiarity in the Reason of it, for their neglecting it, more, than many other Acts which they own still to be in vigour: But I am afraid my Reader has too much of this.

Thus I have shewed, in part, how much our Presbyterian Brethren have Deferted the Rules and Rites of our Reformers about the Sacraments, proceed we now to other Liturgical Offices.

8. Then,
8. Then our Reformers not only appointed a form for the Celebration of Marriage, (to be seen in the Old Liturgy) but in that Form some things agree word for word with the English Form; Particularly, the charge to the Persons to be Married to Declare if they know any impediment, &c. A Solemn Blessing was also appointed, to be pronounced on the Married Persons; and after that the 128 Psalm to be sung, &c. Besides it was expressly appointed, by the First Book of Discipline, that Marriages should be only Solemnized on Sunday, in the forenoon, after Sermon, Cap.

9. (y) And this was so Universally observed, that the Introduction of Marrying, on other days, is remarkable: For it was proposed to the General Assembly, holden at Edin- burg, July 7. Anno 1579, as a doubt, whether it was Lawful to Marry on week days, a sufficient number being present, and joying Preaching thereunto? and the General Assembly Resolved

It was Lawful. (z) But

Our present Presbyterians, if I mistake not, make it rather a Doubt, whether it be Lawful to Marry on Sunday: Sure I am, it is inconsistent with their principles to do it by a Form: As sure I am, tho' they were for a Form they could not well digest the Form of our Reformers; which smell'd so rankly of the English Corruptions: I know not if they use, solemnly, to Bless the Married Pair: If they do it not, I know they have Deserted their own Second Book of Discipline. I think they will not deny but the singing of
9. They have also forsaken our Reformer in the Burial of the Dead: 'Tis true, indeed, the First Book of Discipline seems to be against Funeral Sermons, neither doth it frankly allow of Reading suitable portions of Scripture, and singing Psalms at Burials; Yet it was far from Condemning these Offices: We are not so precise in this (say the Compilers) but that we are content that particular Churches, with Consent of the Minister, do that, which they shall find most fitting, as they will Answer to God, and the Assembly of the Universal Church, within this Realm. (a) But (a) Spot: the Old Liturgy, which was Authorized by two General Assemblies (which the First Book of Discipline could never pretend to) has not only a Form for visiting the Sick (not observed, I am sure, by our present Presbyterians) but expressly allows of Funeral Sermons. These are its very words about Burial. The Corps shall be Reverently brought to the Grave, accompanied with the Congregation, without any further Ceremonies; which being Buried, the Minister, if he be present, and required, goeth to the Church, if it be not too far off, and maketh some Comfortable Exhortation to the People, touching Death, and the Resurrection; Then Blesseth the People, and dismisseth them. To our present Presbyterians, Funeral Sermons are as the worshipping of Reliques; They are every whit as ill as Praying for the Dead, and the
the Doctrine of Purgatory. One thing more
I shall take notice of in the Old Liturgy.
It is

10. The Form and Order of the Election of
the Superintendent, which may serve, in Election
of all other Ministers. I shall not repeat what
I have already observed as to this point,
concerning our Presbyterians Condemning
the Office of Superintendents; and their
forsaking our Reformers, as to the Ceremony
of imposition of hands, in Ordinations;
a point wherein our Reformers, I confess,
were somewhat unaccountable. That which
I take notice of now, is, that that Form
continued, at least, for sixty years, to be
used in Ordinations: Particularly it was in
use, even with the Parity men, Anno 1618,
as is evident from Calderwood, (b) and it
was insisted on by them, then, as a Form,
which was to be reputed so venerable, and
of such weight, that any Reception from it,
was an intolerable innovation: And yet I re-
fer it to our present Presbyterians them-
selves, if they can say that they have not
entirely Deferred it. Because the Designa-
tion of the Person to be Ordained is Prior
in order of nature to his Ordination; I shall
add as an Appendix to this Head, the
Discrepancy between our Reformers and our
present Presbyterians, about Patronages and
Popular Elections of Ministers.

Our present Presbyterians, every body
knows, are zealous for the Divine Right of
Popular Elections: The Power of Choosing
their
their own Ministers, The Persons who are to have the charge of their Souls, is a Privilege which Christ, by his Testament, hath bequeathed to his People: It is his Legacy to them; an unalienable part of their Spiritual Property; It cannot be taken from them without a Direct crossing of Christ's institution, and the horrid sin of Robbing his People of their indisputable Privilege. Patronages are an Intollerable Grievance, and Tool of Bondage on the Church: They have been always the cause of Pesterling the Church with a bad Ministry; They came in amongst the latest Anti-Christian Corruptions and Usurpations, &c. This is their Doctrine, tho', 'tis obvious to all the world, they put strange Comments on it by their Practice: Well! What were the sentiments of our Reformers in this Matter? The First Book of Discipline, indeed, affirms (Head 4.) That it appertained to the People and to every several Congregation to Elect their own Minister: But it has not so much as one syllable of the Divine institution of such a Privilege: On the contrary, in that same very breath, it adds, and in case they be found negligent therein, the space of 40 days, the Superintendent with his Council may present a Man, &c. If this Man after tryal is found qualified, and the Church can justly reprehend nothing in his Life, Doctrine or Utterance, then, we judge (say our Reformers) the Church, which, before, was destitute, unreasonable, if they refuse him, whom the Church...
doth offer; And that they should be compelled, by the Censure of the Council, and Church, to receive the Person appointed and approved by the Judgment of the Godly and Learned; unless that the same Church hath presented a Man better, or as well, Qualifie, to Examination, before that the aforesaid trial was taken of the Person, presented by the Council of the whole Church. As for Example, the Council of the Church presents a Man unto a Church to be their Minister, not knowing that they are otherwise provided; In the mean time, the Church hath another sufficient, in their judgement, for that charge, whom they present to the Learned Ministers, and next Reformed Church to be examined: In this case, the presentation of the People to whom he should be appointed Pastor, must be preferred to the presentation of the Council or greater Church, unless the Person presented by the inferior Church be judged unable for the Regiment, by the Learned. For this is always to be avoided, that no man be intruded or thrust in upon any Congregation. But this liberty, with all care, must be reserved for every several Church, to have their voices and suffrages in Election of their Ministers; Yet we do not call that violent intrusion, when the Council of the Church, in the fear of God, regarding only the salvation of the People, offereth unto them, a man sufficient to instruct them, whom they shall not be forced to admit before just Examination. So that Book. Add to this, this consideration, That at that time the Popish Clergy were in possession of all the Benefices; the Reformed Clergy had not, then, so much as
as the prospect of the Thirds, which I have discoursed of, before: These things laid together, 'tis obvious to perceive, 1. That it was only from Prudential Considerations, our Reformers were inclined to give the People so much Power at that time; It was much for the Convenience of the Ministers, who were to live by the Benevolence of the Parish, &c. They did not grant them this Power, as of Divine Right; No such thing so much as once intimated, as I have said; 'Twas plainly nothing but a Liberty. And no injury, no violence was done to a Parish, even in these circumstances of the Church, when the Council of the Church gave them a Minister without their own Election. 'Tis as plain, 2. that (so far as can be collected from the whole Period above) our Reformers (the Compilers of the Book I mean) abstracting from the, then, circumstances of the Church were more inclined, that the Election of Ministers should be in the hands of the Clergy, than of the People; Which I am much inclined to think was not only, then; but a long time after, the prevailing sentiment; And all the world sees, I am sure, it was a sentiment utterly inconsistent with the opinion of the Divine Right of Popular Elections.

I have been at pains to set the First Book of Discipline, thus in its due light, that our Brethren may not complain, it was neglected, not that my Cause required it; For that Book was never Law, either Civil or Ecc.
Ecclesiastical, and so I might fairly have omitted it. Let us try next what were truly the publick and Authoritative sentiments of our Reformers.

The first which I find of that nature, is the sentiment of the General Assembly, held in September 1565. The General Assembly held in June immediately before, had complained, that some vacant Benefices had been bestowed by the Queen, on some Noblemen and Barons. (c) The Queen answered, She thought it not Reasonable to deprive her of the Patronages belonging to her: And this General Assembly in September answer thus: Our mind is not that her Majesty, or any other Person, should be deprived of their just Patronages, but we mean, whenever her Majesty, or any other Patron, do present any Person, unto a Benefice, that the Person presented should be tryed and examined, by the judgement of Learned Men of the Church; Such as are, for the present, the Superintendents: And as the presentation of the Benefice belongs to the Patron, so the Collation, by Law and Reason, belongeth to the Church. (d) Agreeably, we find, by the 7 Act I Parl. Fac. 6. Anno 1567. (The Parliament holden by Murray Regent) It was enacted (in pursuance (no doubt) of the Agreement between the Nobility and Barons, and the Clergy in the General Assembly, holden in July that year) That the Patron should present a qualified Person, within six Months, to the Superintendant of these parts, where the Benefice lies, &c. And by the Agreement at Leith, Anno 1572,
1572, the Right of Patronages was reserved to the Respective Patrons. (e) And by the (e) Cald. General Assembly holden in March 1574, it was enacted that collations upon presentations to Benefices should not be given without consent of three qualified Ministers, &c. (f) The General (f) Cald. Assembly in August that same year, suppli- cated the Regent that Bishops might be present- ed to vacant Bishopricks, as I have observed before. By the General Assembly holden in October 1578, it was enacted, that presen- tations to benefices be directed to the Commissio- nors of the Countreys where the Benefice lies. (g)

'Tis true, indeed, the Second Book of Dis- cipline, Cap. 12. S. 10. Condemns Patronages, as having no ground in the word of God; as con- trary to the same; and as contrary to the Liberty of Election of Pastors, and that which ought not to have place in the Light of Reformation. (b) (h) MS. But then 'tis as true; 1. That that same General Assembly, holden in April 1581, which first Ratified this Second Book of Dis- cipline, Statuted and Ordained, That Laick Patronages should remain whole unjointed, and undivided, unless with consent of the Patron. (i) So that, let them, who can, reconcile (i) MS. the Acts of this Presbyterian Assembly. Per. 410. (g) MS. Cald. 99. 

For to my skill (which I confess is not very great) it seems, as we use to say, to have both burnt and blown Patronages; blown them by this Act, and burnt them by Ratify- ing the Book which Condemned them. But what- ever is of this, that which I observe 2. is far
far more considerable; For tho' the Book Condemned Patronages, yet our Presbyterian Brethren, of the Modern Cut, have no great advantage by it, for it had nothing less in its prospect, than to Condemn them, for making way for Popular Elections. Indeed it gave no countenance to such Elections, far less did it suppose or assert them to be of Divine Right. This is its Determination in the 9th § of that 12. Cap. The Liberty of Electing Persons to Ecclesiastical Functions, observed without interruptions, so long as the Church was not corrupted by Anti-Chrift, we desire to be restored and retained within this Realm; So as none be intruded upon any Congregation, either by the Prince, or any other inferior Person, WITHOUT LAWFUL ELECTION, and THE ASSENT OF THE PEOPLE, over whom the Person is placed, according to the Practice of the Apostolick and Primitive Church. Now, 1. considering that it was the common talk, of the Presbyterians, of these times, that Antichristian Corruptions, began to pester the Church, so soon as Episcopacy was introduced, It is clear, that that which they call the Uninterrupted Practice of the Church, must have descended, according to themselves but for a very few years: and I shall own my self their humble servant, if our present Presbyterians shall prove that Popular Elections were in Universal uninterrupted Practice, during that interval, of their own making; the interval, I mean which they make between the Apostles times, and the
first Introduction of Episcopacy. Indeed, 2. the Book plainly distinguishes between LAWFUL ELECTION, and THE ASSENT OF THE PEOPLE, and all the world knows they are naturally distinguishable; and whosoever knows any thing of the Monuments of these Primitive times, knows they were actually distinguished; and that all the Peoples Privilege was to ASSENT, not, to ELECT; They were not in use of ELECTING, if I mistake not, till towards the end of the third Century: So that, if we can believe the Compilers of the Book; if they were for restoring the Primitive Practice, 'tis easy to understand that they meant no such thing as to restore Popular Elections. Especially, if 3. it be considered that we have one very Authentick Explication of this 9th Article of the 12. Cap. of the Second Book of Discipline, handed down to us by Calderwood himself. (k) The story is this. (k) Cald.

King James the Sixth, continually vexed with the Turbulency of the Presbyterian temper, caused publish 55 Questions, and proposed them to be sifted, thinking that clear and distinct Resolutions of them, might contribute much for ending many Controversies, agitated, in those times, between the Kirk and the Crown. They were published in February, or January 1595. They are to be seen both in Spotswoods (l) and Calderwoods Histories. I am only concerned, at present, for the third 434. Question, which was this, Is not the Consent Cald. 382 of
of the most part of the Flock, and also of the Patrons necessary in the Election of Pastors? Now, Calderwood says, that there were Brethren delegated from every Presbytery of Fife, who met at St. Andrews upon the 21. of February, and, having tossed the Kings Questions, sundrie days, gave Answers to every one of them, particularly, to the third, this was their Answer, The Election of Pastors should be made by those who are Pastors, and Doctors Lawfully called, and who can try the Gifts, necessarily belonging to Pastors, by the word of God: And to such as are so chosen, the Flock and Patron should give their Consent and Protection, (m) Now this, I say, is a very Authentick Explication of the words of the Book, for these Delegates Meeting at St. Andrews, it is not to be doubted, but Mr. Andrew Melvil, at that time, principal of the New College, was with them, probably they met, in that City, that he might be with them; for sure I am, it was not otherwise the most convenient place of the County for their Meeting: And having him with them, they had one, than whom, none on earth was capable of giving a more Authentick Sense of the words of the Book.

It were very easy to adduce more Acts of General Assemblies to this purpose: But I am afraid I have insisted too much on this subject already: In short then, the Groundless Fancy of the Divine Right of Popular Elections, is more properly an Independent than a Presbyterian principle. The English Presbyterians of the Provincial Assembly of London, wrote zealously
zealously against it, in their *Jus Divinum Ministerii Evangelici*: It is truly inconsistent with the Old Presbyterian Scheme; it obtained not generally amongst our Scottish Presbyterians till some years after 1638. It was not adopted into their Scheme till the General Assembly 1649. Patronages were never taken away by Act of Parliament till of late, i.e. in the year 1690. 'Tis true G. R. in his *True Representation of Presbyterian Government*, (n) says, they were taken away by(n) p. 15 Law, meaning, no doubt, by the Act of the pretended Parliament, Anno 1649. But he had just as much Reason for calling that Rout, a Parliament, or its Acts, Laws, as he had for making the supressing of Popular Elections of Ministers, a just Cause for separating from the Communion of a Church. Thus I have insisted on the Receptions of our present Presbyterian Brethren from the sentiments of our Reformers about the publick worship of the Church and some of its Appendages; Perchance I have done it too tediously; if so, I shall endeavour to dispatch what remains, more curtly.

III. They have also Deferted our Reformers in the Discipline of the Church; The particulars are too numerous to be insifted on; Let any man compare the two Books of Discipline; The First compiled by our Reformers, Anno 1560; The Second, by the Presbyterians of the first Edition, and Ratified by Act of the General Assembly, holden in April 1581, and he shall find no scarcity of
differences; He shall find Alterations, Innovations, Oppositions, Contradictions, &c. Let him compare the Acts of Assemblies after the year 1580, with the Acts of Assemblies, before, and he shall find many more. Indeed,

Our present Presbyterians have made not a few notorious Receptions from the Second, The Presbyterian Book of Discipline. To instance in a few.

The Third Chapter of the Second Book of Discipline is thus Intituled, How the Persons that bear Ecclesiastical Function, are admitted to their Offices. This Chap. treats of such Persons in the general; The particular Orders of Pastors, Doctors, Elders, &c. are particularly treated of, in subsequent Chapters. This Third Chapter treating, thus, of Ecclesiastical Officers in the general, makes two things necessary to the outward call, Election and Ordination, § 6. It defines ordination to be the separation and sanctifying of the Person appointed by God, and his Church, after that he is well tried and found qualified. It enumerates Fasting, Prayer, and imposition of hands of the Eldership, as the Ceremonies of Ordination, § 11, 12. Now the whole Nation knows, no such thing as either Tryal, Fasting, or imposition of hands, are used by our present Presbyterians in the Ordination of Ruling Elders.

The Sixth Chapter is particularly concerning Ruling Elders, as contra-distinct from Pastors or Teaching Elders. And it determines thus,
thus, concerning them, § 3. Elders once lawfully called to the Office, and having Gifts of God fit to exercise the same, may not leave it again. Yet nothing more ordinary with our present Presbyterians, than laying aside Ruling Elders, and reducing them to a state of Laicks; So that, Sure I am, if ever they were Presbyters, they come under Tertullians Censures (De Praæscript.) Hodie Presbyter, qui erat Laicus. A Presbyter to day, and a Porter to morrow.

By the 9th § of that same Chapter, It pertains to them (these Ruling Elders) to assist the Pastor in examining those that come to the Lords Table, and in visiting the Sick. This Canon is not much in use, I think, as to the last part of it; as to the first, it is entirely indefetitude. Indeed some of them would be wondrously qualified for such an Office.

The Seventh Chapter is about Elderships and Assemblies. By § 2. Assemblies are of four sorts, viz. either of a particular Congregation, or of a Province, or a whole Nation, or all Christian Nations. Now of all these indefinitely it is affirmed, § 5. In all Assemblies a Moderator should be chosen by common consent of the whole Brethren convened; Yet no such thing observed in our Kirk-Session, which are the Congregational Assemblies spoken of § 2. But Mas John takes the Chair without Election; and would not be a little grated if the best Laird in the Parish should be his Competitor. Crawford himself, the First Earl
Earl of the Kingdom, had never the Honour to be Moderator in the Kirk-Session of Ceres.

The 14th Canon, in the same 7th Chapter is this, When we speak of Elders of particular Congregations, we mean not that every particular Parish Church can, or MAY have their particular Elderships, especially to Landward, but we think three or four, more, or fewer particular Churches may have a common Eldership to them all, to judge their Ecclesiastical Causes. And Chapter 12. Canon 5. As to Elders, there would be in every Congregation, one, or more, appointed for censoring of manners, but not an Assembly of Elders, except in Towns and Famous Places, where men of judgement and Ability may be had: And these to have a common Eldership placed amongst them, to treat of all things that concern the Congregations of whom they have the Oversight. But as the world goes now, every Parish, even in the Country, must have its own Eldership; and this Eldership must consist of such a number of the Sincerer sort, as may be able to out-vote all the Malignant Heritors, upon occasion; as when a Minister is to be chosen, &c. So long as there is a precise Plough-man, or a well-affected Webster, or a covenanted Cobbler, or so, to be found in the Parish, such a number must not be wanting. The standing of the Sect is the Supreme Law: The good cause must not suffer, tho’ all the Canons of the Kirk should be put to shift for themselves.

IV. The last thing I named, as that, wherein
wherein our present Presbyterians have forsaken the principles and sentiments of our Reformers, was the Government of the Church: But I have treated so fully of this, already, that 'tis needless to pursue it any farther. I shall only therefore, as ane Appendage to this, represent one very considerable Right of the Church, adhered to by our Reformers, but disclaim'd by our present Presbyterians. It is, her being the First of the three Estates of Parliament, and having vote in that great Council of the Nation.

It is evident from the most Ancient Records, and all the Authentick Monuments of the Nation, That the Church made still the First of the Three Estates, in Scottish Parliaments, since there were Parliaments in Scotland. This had obtained, time out of mind, and was lookt upon as Fundamental, in the Constitution of Parliaments, in the days of the Reformation. Our Reformers never so much as once dream'd, that this was a Popish Corruption: What Sophistry can make it such? They dream'd as little of its being unseemly or scandalous, or incongruous, or inconvenient, or whatever, now adays, men are pleas'd to call it. On the contrary, they were clear for its continuance, as a very important Right of the Church. The First Book of Discipline, Head 8th, allowed Clergy-men to Assist the Parliament when the same is called. 'Tis true Calderwood both Corrupts the Text, here, and gives it a false Gloss. Instead of these words
when the fame is called, he puts these [if he be called,] (o) and his Glofs is, Meaning with advice, (says he) not by voice, or fitting as a Member of that Court. I say this is a false Glofs. Indeed, it runs quite counter to all the principles and practices of these times: For not only did the Ecclesiastical Estate fit, actually, in the Reforming Parliament, Anno 1560, and all Parliaments, thereafter, for very many years; But such stress, in these times, was laid on this Estate, that it was generally thought, that nothing of publick concern could be Legally done without it: The Counsel of the Ecclesiastick Peers was judged necessary in all matters of National Importance. Thus

Anno 1567. when the Match was on foot, between the Queen and Bothwell, that it might seem to be concluded with the greater Authority, pains were taken to get the consent of the principal Nobility, by their subscriptions. But this was not all; that all might be made as sure as could be, All the Bishops, who were in the City, were also Convoked, and their subscriptions required, as Buchanan tells us.

And

Anno 1568. when the Accusation was intended against the Queen of Scotland, before the Queen of England's Arbitrators, that it might be done with the greater appearance of the Consent of the Nation; That it might have the greater semblance of
of a National Deed, as being a matter wherein all Estates were concerned, the Bishop of Orkney, and the Abbot of Dunfermline were appointed to represent the Spiritual Estate. (p) Again,

Anno 1571. when the two Counter Parliaments were holden at Edinburg, those of the Queens Faction, as few as they were, had the Votes of two Bishops in their Session held den July 12, as is clear from Buchanan and Spotiswood compared together. (q) In their next Session, which was holden at Edinburg, August 22, that same year, tho' they were, in all, but five Members, yet two of them were Bishops, as Spotiswood tells. (r) But Buchanan's account is more considerable. (s) For he says, one of these two was there unwillingly, so that it seems he was forced by the rest to be there, out of a sense they had of the Necessity of the Ecclesiastical Estate. Now 'tis to be Remem bred that those who appeared for the Queen, were Protestants as well as these who were for her Son.

No Man, I think, will deny but the subsistence of the Ecclesiastical Estate, and their Vote in Parliament was confirmed and continued by the Agreement of Leith, Anno 1572. Indeed,

When the Project for Parity amongst the Officers of the Church was set on Foot by Melvil, Anno 1575, and some of the Clergy were gained to his side, and they were using their utmost endeavours to have Episcopacy
Episcopacy overturned, it seems this was a main difficulty to them, a difficulty which did very much entangle and retard their purpose; This, I say, that the overturning Prelacy, was the overturning one of the three Estates of Parliament. This is evident not only from Boyd, Arch Bishop of Glasgow, his Discourse, to the General Assembly, Anno 1576. mentioned before, but also from the two Letters I have often named which were written to Mr. Beza: the one by the Lord Glamis, Anno 1576, or 1577, the other by Mr. Melvil, Anno 1579. Because they contribute so much light to the matter in hand, I shall once more resume them. Glamis was then Chancellor of Scotland; It is manifest he wrote not indeliberately, or without advice: Undoubtedly he stated the Question, according to the sense, the Generality of People had, then, of it; Now he states it thus. Seeing every Church hath its own Pastor and the Power of Pastors in the Church of Christ seems to be equal; The Question is whether the Office of Bishops be Necessary in the Church, for convocating these Pastors, when there is need; for Ordaining Pastors, and for Deposing them for just Causes? Or whether it be better, that the Pastors Acting in Parity, and subject to no Superior Bishop, should choose Qualified Men, for the Ministry, with consent of the Patron, and the People, and Censure, and Depose, &c.? For Retaining Bishops we have these two Motives; One is, the stubbornness and ungovernableness of the People, which cannot pos-
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fibly be kept within Bounds † if they are not over-
amed by the Authority of these Bishops, in their
visitations. The other is, that such is the con-
stitution of the Monarchy * which hath obtain'd
time out of mind, that as often as the Parliament
meets, for consulting about things pertaining to
the safety of the Republick, nothing can be deter-
mined without the Bishops, who make the Third
Estate of the Kingdom, which, to change or
subvert, would be extremely perilous to the King-
dom. So he, from which we may learn
two things: The First is, a farther confir-
mation of what I have before assured to
have been the sentiment of these times con-
cerning the Election of Pastors, namely that
it was, that they should be Elected by the
Clergy, and that the People should have no
other Power than that of Consent: The
other is part in Relation to our present busi-
ness, namely, that the Ecclesiastical Estate
was judged Necessary, by the constitution of
the Monarchy; It could not be wanting in
Parliaments: It was to run the hazard
of subverting the constitution, to think of
altering it or turning it out of doors. And

Melvil's Letter is clearly to the same pur-
pose: We have not ceased these five years to
fight against Pseudepiscopacy (many of the Nobi-
liety resisting us) and to press the severity of Disci-
pline: I've have presented unto his Royal Majesty,
and three Estates of the Realm, both before, and
now, in this Parliament, the form of Discipline,
to be insert amongst the Acts, and to be confirm-
ed by publick Authority: We have the King:  
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mind bended towards us, (too far said, I am sure, if we may take that Kings own word for it) but many of the Peers against us: For they allege, if Pseudepiscopacy be taken away, one of the Estates is pulled down: If Presbyteries be erected, the Royal Majesty is diminished, &c. 'Tis true, Melvil himself, here, shews no great kindness for the third Estate: But that's no great matter; It was his humor to be singular; All I am concerned for, is the publick sentiment of the Nation; especially the Nobility, which we have so plain, for the Necessity of the Ecclesiastical Estate, that nothing can be plainer. Nay,

So indubitable was it, then, that this Ecclesiastical Estate was absolutely necessary by the constitution, that the Presbyterians themselves never called it in Question, never offered to advance such a Paradox as that, it might be abolished: After they had abolished Episcopacy by their Assembly 1580, the King sent several times to them, telling them, "He could not want one of his three Estates. How would they provide him with ane Ecclesiastical Estate, now that they had abolished Bishops? Whoso pleases to Read Calderwood himself shall find this point frequently insisted on. What returns gave they? Did they ever in the least offer to return that the having ane Ecclesiastical Estate in Parliament was a Popish Corruption? That it was ane unwarrantable constitution? That it was not Necessary? Or that the constitution might be inte sufficient without it? No
No such thing entered their thoughts; On the contrary, they were still clear for maintaining it; They had no inclination to part with such a valuable Right of the Church; Their Answer to the Kings Demands was still, one and the same; They were not against Churchmen having vote in Parliament; But none ought to vote in name of the Church without Commission from the Church. And this their sentiment they put in the very Second Book of Discipline, for these are word for word the seventeenth and eighteenth Articles of the eleventh Chapter.

17. We deny not in the mean time that Ministers MAY and SHOULD assist their Princes when they are required, in all things agreeable to the word of God, whither it be in Council or Parliament, or out of Council; Providing always they neither neglect their own charges, nor, through flattery of Princes, hurt the publick Estate of the Kirk.

18. But generally we say, that no Pastor under whatsoever Title of the Kirk, and specially the abused Titles in Popery, of Prelates, Chapters and Convents, ought to attempt any thing, in the Churches name, either in Parliament, or out of Council, without the Commission, of the Reformed Kirk within this Realm. (t) And (t) Spots.

It was concluded in the Assembly holden at Dundee, March 7. 1598. That it was NE-Cald, 112; CESSARY and EXPEDIENT for the well of the Kirk, that the Ministry as the third Estate (u) MS: Pet. 545; Spor. 449 of this Realm, in name of the Church, have vote in Parliament. (n) So indubitable was it in Cald. 429, D d 2 these
these times, that the Ecclesiastical Estate was necessary, and that it could not be wanting without the notorious subversion of the constitution of Parliaments. Indeed, it was not only the sentiment of General Assemblies, whatever side, whether the Prelatical or the Presbyterian prevailed, but it was likewise the sentiment of all Parliaments: It were easy to amass a great many Acts of a great many Parliaments to this purpose: I shall only instance in a few. Thus

The eight Act Parl. 1. Jac. 8. holden in Decemb. 1567, appoints the Coronation Oath to be sworn by the King: And it is one of the Articles of that Oath, That he shall Rule the People committed to his Charge—according to the loveable Laws and Constitutions received in this Realm, no wise repugnant to the word of the Eternal God. Now, I think, this Parliament made no Question, but that the Fundamental Law of the Constitution of Parliaments, was one of these Loveable Laws and Constitutions, received in this Realm, no wise repugnant to the word of the Eternal God. Indeed

The 24th Act of that same Parliament is this, word for word; Our Soveraign Lord, with advice and consent of his Regent, and the three Estates of Parliament, has Ratified, and Ratifies, all Civil Priviledges granted and given by our Soveraign Lords Predecessors to the Spiritual Estate of this Realm in all points, after the form and tenor thereof. Than which there cannot
cannot be a more Authentick Commentary, for finding the true sense and meaning of the Coronation Oath, in Relation to our present purpose: I shall only adduce two more, but they are such two as are as good as two thousand.

The 130th Act Parl. 8. Fac. 6. Anno 1584, is this word for word; The Kings Majesty considering the Honour and the Authority of his Supreme Court of Parliament, continued, past all memory of Man, unto these days, as constituting upon the free votes of the three Estates of this Ancient Kingdom; By whom the same, under God, has, ever, been upheld; Rebellious and Traitorous Subjects punished; the good and faithful preserved, and maintained; and the Laws and Acts of Parliament (by which all men are Govern'd) made and Established; and finding the Power, Dignity, and Authority of the said Court of Parliament, of late years, called in some doubt, at least, some (such as Mr. Andrew Melvil, &c.) curiously travelling to have introduced some Innovations thereanent; His Majesty's firm will and mind, always being, as it is yet, that the Honour, Authority and Dignity of his saids three Estates shall stand and continue in their own integrity, according to the Ancient and Loveable custome by-gone, without any alteration or diminution: THEREFORE, it is Statuted and Ordained by our Sovereign Lord, and his said three Estates, in this present Parliament, that none of his Leiges and Subjects, presume or take upon hand to impugne the Dignity, and the Authority of the said three Estates; or to seek or
procure the Innovation or Diminution, of the
Power and Authority of the same three Estates,
or any of them, in time coming, under the pain
of Treason. Here I think the necessity of the
three Estates, whereof, the Ecclesiastical
was ever reckoned the first, is asserted pretty
fairly. Neither is this Act, so far as I
know, formally repealed by any subsequent
Act: And whoever knows anything of
the History of these times, cannot but
know that it was to crush the Designs set
on foot, then, by some, for innovating
about the Spiritual Estate, that this Act was
formed.

The other which I promised, is, Act 2.
Parl. 18. Jac. 6, holden Anno 1606. Intit-
tuled Act anent the Restitution of the Estate of
Bishops. In the Preamble of which Act we
are told, That of late, during his Majesties
young years, and unsetled Estate, the Ancient
and FUNDAMENTAL Policy, consisting
in the Maintenance of the THREE E-
STATES of Parliament, has been greatly
impaired, and almost subverted; Specially by
the Indirect Abolishing of the Estate of Bishops,
by the Act of Annexation of the Temporality of
Benefices to the Crown—— That the said Estate of
Bishops is a Necessary Estate of the Parliament,
&c.

Such were the Sentiments of these times:
So Essential was the Ecclesiastical Estate
deem'd in the Constitution of Scottish Parlia-
ments. And no wonder: For no man can
doubt, but it was as early, as positively,
as incontestedly, as fundamentally and unalterably in the constitution, as either the Estate of Nobles, or the Estate of Burrows. There is no Question, I think, about the Burrows: As for the Estate of Nobles, 'tis certain all Barons were still reckoned of the Nobles: The lesser Barons in Ancient times, were still reckoned a part of the Second, never a distinct Estate of Parliament; and they must quit all pretensions to be of the Nobles, when they set up for a distinct Estate: Setting up for such, they are no more of the Nobility, than the Burrows. And then,

If two Estates can vote out one, and make a Parliament without it; If they can split one into two, and so make up the three Estates: Why may not one split it itself as well into three? Why may not the two parts of the splitted Estate joyn together and vote out the Estate of Burrows? Why may not the Nobility of the First Magnitude joyn with the Burrows to vote out the smaller Barons? Why may not the smaller Barons and the Burrows vote out the greater Nobility? After two have voted out one, why may not one, the more numerous, vote out the other, the less numerous? When the Parliament is reduced to one Estate why may not that one divide and one half vote out the other? And then subdivide and vote out, till the whole Parliament shall consist of the Commissioner for Rutherglen, or the Laird of, or the Earl of Crawford? Nay why may not...
not that one vote out himself and leave the King without a Parliament? What a dangerous thing is it to shake Foundations? How doth it unhinge all things? How plainly doth it pave the way for that which our Brethren pretend to abhor so much, viz. a Despotick Power, an Absolute, and unlimited Monarchy? But enough of this.

To conclude this point; there's nothing more notorious than that the Spiritual Estate was still judged Fundamental in the Constitution of Parliaments, was still called to Parliaments, did still Sit, Deliberate, and Vote in Parliaments till the year 1640, that it was turned out by the, then, Presbyterians: And our present Presbyterians following their footsteps, have not only freely parted with, but forwardly rejected, that Ancient and valuable Right of the Church: Nay, they have not only rejected it, but they declaim constantly against it as a Limb of Antichrist and what not? And have they not, herein, manifestly Deserted the undoubted principles and sentiments of our Reformers?

It had been easy to have enumerated a great many more of their notorious Receptions from the principles of the Reformation: e.g. I might have insisted on their Deserting the principles and practices of our Reformers about the Constitution of General Assemblies; about Communion with the Church of England; about the Civil
Magistrates Power in Church Matters (justly or unjustly is not the present Question) and many more things of considerable importance. Nay, which at first sight may seem a little strange, as much as they may seem to have swallowed down the principles of Rebellion and Arm'd Resistances against Lawful Soveraign Princes, maintain'd by our Reformers, yet even herein, there is difference; Considerable difference.

Our Reformers, as much as they were inclined to Rebel against Kings, did yet maintain that they held their Crowns immediately of God. John Knox in his Sermon preached on the 19th of August 1565, and afterwards published, hath this plain position, That it is neither birth, Influence of Stars, ELECTION OF PEOPLE, Force of Arms, nor, finally, whatsoever can be comprehended under the Power of nature, that maketh the distinction between the Superior Power, and the Inferior, or that doth Establish the Royal Throne of Kings; But it is the only and perfect Ordinance of God, who willeth his Terror, Power and Majesty, in a part, to shine in the Thrones of Kings and in the Faces of Judges, &c. Neither was this only his private sentiment.

The 24th Article of the Confession of Faith, compiled by our Reformers, and Ratified by Act of Parliament, is every whit as plain and Decretory; For there, They Profess to believe that Empires, Kingdoms, Dominions and
and Cities are Distincted and Ordained by God: That the Powers and Authorities therein are Gods Holy Ordinance; That Persons placed in Authority are to be Loved, Honoured, Feared, and holden in most Reverend Estimation, because, they are Gods Lieutenants, in whose Session God Sits, as Judge; to whom, by God, is given the Sword; &c. That therefore whosoever deny unto Kings, their Aid, Counsel, or Comfort, while they vigilantly travel in the executing of their Office, they deny their help, support and Counsel to God, who, by the presence of his Lieutenant, craveth it of them. So it was professed by our Reformers: How this principle could consist with their practices, is none of my present concerns. That is no more than to shew how our Presbyterian Brethren have deserted them in this matter: Now Our Presbyterian Brethren make Kings, as such, not Gods, but the Peoples creatures, by consequence, not Gods, but the Peoples Lieutenants; The People lets them on their Thrones; They have their Power from the People; They are the Peoples Trustees; They are accountable to the People; So that whosoever denies his Aid, Counsel or Comfort to them, while they vigilantly travel in executing their Office, in true Logick can be said to deny them only to the People. Even here then there is this great difference, our Reformers maintain'd one good principle in Relation to Sovereign Powers: Our present Presbyterians have even rejected that one good
good principle. 'Tis true indeed, our Reformers seem to have been inconsequential in substituting Rebellious practices in the retinue of an Orthodox principle; And our Presbyterian Brethren seem to be consequential in having their principle and their practice of a piece; But doth this mend the matter? Nothing, as I take it; for all ends here, That our Reformers believed **Right**, tho they practiced **Wrong**. But our Presbyterian Brethren are altogether **Wrong**; They neither believe, nor practice **Right**.

Thus, I say, it had been no difficult task to have instanced in many more of our Presbyterian Innovations; But the taste I have given, I think, is sufficient for my purpose; For laying together so many undeniable Innovations, so many palpable and notorious Receisions from the principles and practices of our Reformers, as I have adduced; and these in so weighty and important matters, as the **Doctrine, Worship, Discipline, Government, and Rights of the Church**, I may fairly leave it to the world, to judge, if our Brethren have just reason to insist so much upon the principles of our Reformation, or to entitle themselves (as, on all occasions they are so solicitous and forward to do) the only Real and Genuine Successors of our Reformers.

Neither is this all that may justly pinch them. They have not only Receded from our Scottish Reformers, but from all other Reformed Churches. What Reformed Church
in Christendom maintains all the Articles of the Westminster Confession? What Reformed Church requires the profession of so many Articles, not mainly for Peace and Unity, but as a Test of Orthodoxy? What Reformed Church, except our Kirk, maintains the Divine Institution of Parity among the Pastors of the Church, so as to make all kind of Prelacy simply unlawful? What Reformed Church, except the Scottish, wants a Liturgy? What Party in Europe that assumes the name of a National Church, Condemns Liturgies, yet Forms of Prayer, &c. as Unlawful, except Scottish Presbyterians? What Transmarine Reformed Church, that is not Lutheran, Condemns the Communion of the Church of England? What Reformed Church maintains the Divine institution and the Indispensable Necessity of Ruling Elders in contradistinction to Pastors? What Reformed Church maintains the Divine institution and the unalienable Right of Popular Elections of Pastors? What Reformed Church ever offered to maintain that the Government of the Church, by Bishops, or a publick Liturgy, or want of Ruling Elders, distinct from Pastors; or choosing Pastors, otherwise, than by the voices of the People, or using some innocent and unforbidden Ceremonies, as circumstances or Appendages of Divine worship, or observing some days besides Sundays, were sufficient grounds for breaking the Peace of a Church, and dividing her Unity, and setting up Altar against Altar? What Reformed Church was ever Bound by
by her Rules and Canons to require of all such as she admitted to the participation of the Lords Supper, the Subscription of such terms as are contained in the Solemn League and Covenant? What Reformed Church doth not satisfy her self with the Profession of the Faith contain'd in the Apostles Creed at Baptism? What Reformed Church requires the Profession of such a vast, such a numberless number of Articles and Propositions as are contained in the Westminster Confession, and the larger and shorter Catechisms, of all those, whom they receive into the Catholic Church? What is this less, than to make all these Propositions Necessary terms of their Communion? And how impossible is it, at this Rate, ever to think of a Catholic Communion among Christians? Is not this, needlessly, and, by consequence, very Criminal and Unchristianly, to lay a Fund for unavoidable, unextinguishable and everlasting Schisms? Neither yet is this all the Misery: For

Considering the Measures our Brethren steer by, there is little ground to hope that they shall ever turn weary of Innovating. The first Brood of Presbyterians, the old Melvilians, inverted (as I have told) almost the whole Scheme of our Reformers: The next Birth, the thirty-eight-men, made innumerable Receptions from their Progenitors, the Melvilians: The present Production have forsaken most of the Measures of the thirty-eight-men: And what hopes of their fixing? When
When shall it be proper for them to say, we have done innovating? Hitherto we have innovated, but we will innovate no farther? How dreadful a thing is it for men to give loose reins to the Spirit of Innovation! But I shall not pursue this farther: I know the temper of our Brethren; tis but too probable, they may impute it to Malice or Revenge, or an imbittered Spirit, to some ill thing or another, that I have pursued this matter so far; But if they shall, I pray, God forgive them, for they are injurious to me. The principle which prompted me to represent these things, was truly, that of Fraternal Correction. My main Design was to soften, not irritate them; not to exasperate them, but to bring them to a more Manageable and Considering temper.

For I can, and do, sincerely, protest, that it is daily the earnest desire of my Soul, that all men may be saved and come to the knowledge of the Truth. I wish all Men Christians, and I wish all Christians, Christians Indeed; In a special manner I wish our Presbyterian Brethren, and we, may, yet, be so much Honoured and blessed of God, that in the sincerity of Brotherly kindness, we may be all United in one Holy Communion. I wish we may all earnestly contend, with all Christian forbearance, fellow-feeling, and Charity, as becometh the members of the one Church, whereof Christ Jesus is the Head, to have the poor, divided desolated Church of Scotland restored
restored to that Peace, Purity and Unity; That Order, Government and Stability, which our Blessed Master hath instituted and commanded. May Almighty God inspire us all with the Spirit of his Son, that our hearts being purified by ane Humble and a Lively Faith, the Faith that worketh by Love, and our Lives Reformed according to the Laws and great purposes of our Holy Religion, we may be all unanimously and dutifully disposed for so Great, so Glorious, so Desirable a Mercy. And with this I end this Fifth Enquiry. And now,

I think, I have competently answered the ends of my undertaking, which was to Examine this Article of our new Claim of Right, and try its firmness and solidity. I think, I have comprized, in these five Enquiries, every thing that is material in it, considered, either in it self, or as it supports the great alterations have been, lately, made in the Church of Scotland. It might have been more narrowly sifted; and sifted more narrowly it might have been found lyable to many more exceptions. For instance,

1. It may seem somewhat surprizing that such ane Article should have been put into a Scottish Claim of Right; That it should have been made so seemingly Fundamental, at least, in the Constitution of the Scottish Monarchy, which is so famous and has been so much renowned for its Antiquity. Was ever such ane Article in a Scottish Claim of Right before? No Man, I think, will say it
it was in the Original Contract made with Fergus the First (if any Original Contract was made with him) for if he was, he was advanced to the Throne, 330 years before our Saviour's Birth, if we may believe our Historians: And, I think, it was not ane Article in the Original Contract, then that the Christian Church should be so or so Governed. Few men, I think, will say, it was part of the Original Contract made with any Scottish King before the Reformation. No man can produce any such Article in any Original Contract, made with King James the Sixth, King Charles the First, or King Charles the Second, unless it was the Solemn League and Covenant, or the Act of the West Kirk. It cannot be said that it was in any Original Contract, made with King James the Seventh, for all the Nation knows it was Declared by the Meeting of Estates, that he forfeited his Right to the Crown for having made no Original Contracts. These are all the real or pretended Kings we have had since the Reformation, till the late Revolution. Is not this Article, therefore, a New Fundamental, added to the Constitution of the Ancient Scottish Monarchy? This is all upon the supposition that it is, truly, a part of our new Claim of Right. Tho' indeed,

2. It may be made a Question, whether it can be justly called a part of the Claim of Right? It is very possible for one thing to be in another without being part of that other.
other. And one would think, this Article lookt very unlike a part of a Claim of Right: It seems not to run in the file that is proper for Claims of Right; 'Tis certain, it runs not in the file of the rest of the Articles. All the rest of the Articles tell us either what is contrary to Law, or what are the undoubted Rights of the People: This Article imports nothing like either the one or the other. It only Declares Prelacy to be a Grievance, &c. This doth not say that it was contrary to Law: For Laws themselves may be, and actually were Declared to be Grievances by the Meeting of Estates, in another paper; And the Articles Declaring that Prelacy ought to be Abolished, is an Argument that it subsisted by Law, and it was abolished as subsisting by Law, for the Act which abolished it Repealed the Laws by which it subsisted. Neither is Prelacy declared by the Article to be contrary to the Rights, but only to the Inclinations of the People; and I think, it requires no Depth of Metaphysical precision to distinguish between Rights and Inclinations. Indeed, it seems obvious to any body that this Article had had its situation more properly and naturally amongst the Grievances, which were digested in another paper; and therefore, I say, being only praeter-naturally, and by apparent force, thrust into the Claim of Right, it may be made a Question, whither its being, so, there, be enough to make it part of the Claim of Right? Or whither its nature should not be regarded rather
rather than its post. And, it should be con-
structed to have no more weight than if it
had been Regularly ranked in its own Cate-
gory? But such Questions are too hard for
me, and more proper for Lawyers to de-
terminate. Neither shall I meddle.

3. With many other obvious difficulties
which must necessarily result from this Ar-
ticle, being made truly a part of the Origina-
ral Contract, between King and People;
Such as its making the settlement of the Crown
to depend, not on Right of Inheritance, or
Proximity of Blood, or any such Ancient, Le-
gal, Solid, Hereditary Title, but on the,
every day, changeable Inclinations of the Peo-
ple, for these are the main fund of the Ar-
ticle, and by the supposition, the Article
is intrinsical and fundamental to the present
settlement. This, I say, (and many more
such, which might be easily named) seems
a very considerable difficulty that might be
urged on such a supposition: But I shall
not insist on them. Farther,

4. Besides all these Awkward exceptions,
whether it is, or is not, a part of the Claim
of Right, the style of it might deserve to be
considered: Particularly, that Phrase, of
Prelacy's being a great and insupportable Grie-
vance and Trouble to the Nation. 'Tis true I
have in my Third Enquiry, guessed at its
meaning; But I do sincerely acknowledge
it was but guessing; and even yet, I can do
no more but guess about it. Doth it not,
at first sight, appear a little too big and
swelling?
Is it not hard to find, for it, a certain and determined sound? To call a thing a great and insupportable Grievance and Trouble, seems a little too flashy and fanciful. Is it not liker to the flights of the Rhetoricians design'd for popular amusement, than to the plain, solid significant stile which is proper for the Grand Council of a Nation? For Original-Contract, and Claim-of Right-makers?

5. Seeing, 'tis plain, the Article was formed for the abolition of Prelacy, and the Introduction of Presbytery, it seems a little strange, that such an important Revolution, in the Church, should have been founded on such Untheological Reasons. It seems to lye at the bottom of this Article, that the Government of the Church is Ambulatory and Indifferent; That there is nothing of Divine Institution about it; that the State may alter it when it pleases; and, as it thinks expedient, set up, Alternatively, either Prelacy or Parity, or neither, but plain Erastianism, if it has a mind for it. These are suppositions, which, I think, ought not to be very relishing even to our Presbyterian Brethren: Tho hitherto they only have got advantage by the Article, yet it seems not honourable for their Government, to stand on such a foot, nor can they be secure but that it may be very soon turn'd down again. Tho', in consequence of this,

6. By G. R's Measures, the Framers of the
the Article, were incapable of Voting about the Establishment of any Form of Government in the Church: For they proceeded in Voting this Article, clearly upon the principles of Indifference. But according to him as I have already observed, such, tho’ they may be persons both Religious and Learned, are not to be brought into the Reckoning, with those who have Right to vote about Church-Government. Indeed according to his Scheme, the Nation, by this Article, is brought to a very lamentable State. For thus an Article is imposed on it, by such as had no Right, no Power to impose it, because they have fairly declared themselves to be for the Indifference of particular forms of Church Government. And yet by another proposition, in his Scheme, this Article cannot be altered: For this is one of his positions, that the Deed of a Meeting of Estates is to be interpreted the Deed of the whole Nation: From which it follows by unavoidable consequence, that the whole Nation, hereafter must be excluded from voting about the Government of the Church: For the whole Nation (even Presbyterians themselves not excepted) by Establishing this Article have declared themselves indifferent, as to the Species of Church Government. Now as I said, is not this a Lamentable State to which the Nation is reduced? It lyes under the burden of ane ill-contrived Article, imposed by such as were not Competent, had no Right, to impose it; and yet it must lye, Remi-
Remedilessly, under this burden, because those who imposed it, by imposing it, while they were not competent nor qualified for imposing it, have rendered the whole nation incompetent, and unqualified for altering it, or freeing it self of such a burden. Was ever nation so miserably intricated? But enough of G. R.

These, I say, and several other things, might have been farther considered and insisted on: But having already answered the ends of my undertaking, I shall proceed no farther: I conclude with this.

If these Papers shall have the fortune to come to the hand of any Scottish Noblemen or Gentlemen, and if they shall think it worth their while to peruse them, I earnestly beg one piece of justice from them: It is, that they would not apprehend, I had the least intention or inclination to cast disgrace on such of them as concurred either to the framing or the voting of this Article. I love my native Country: I honour all persons of true honour in it: I have nowhere impugned the authority of those who established this Article; I had no such purpose; My undertaking required no such performance; All I designed was to do service to my country, according to my poor abilities: I cannot think any ingenuous person, any person of true honour, can deny, that it is good service done to mankind to tell them truth civilly, and endeavour dutifully to recover them from mistakes,
takes, if they labour under any. We are all fallible, and capable of taking things by the wrong handle; and a very mean Person may be sometimes a reasonable Monitor. If I have said any thing false or amiss, I crave all men pardon: But if I have advanced nothing but Truth, if I have done nothing but Justice to this Article (and I protest seriously, I think, I have done no more) I cannot think it will be just or Generous, in any Man, to harbour Piques against me, for doing what I have done; The Genuine use (I am sure it is Genuine) I wish, my Country-men, of whatever Station or Character, may make of my Examination of this Article, is, to suffer themselves to be put to thinking by it, and Enquiring whether there may not be some other Articles, every whit, of as great importance to the Nation, in our new Claim of Right, as ill-founded as this; And if any such are found, to contribute their joint endeavours, as becometh true Scottishmen and good Christians to have all Righted.

FINIS