

84-5



0321

Toleration's Fence REMOVED, The Thoughts

Concerning the present state of Affairs in so far as they respect
a *Toleration* considered, And Exposed;

Plain-Dealing

With the Presbyterians as it is not found, so not to be expected
from Prelatical Pamphleteers.

O R

A Vindication of a Letter from a Gentleman to a
Member of Parliament concerning *Toleration* from
all the Cavils that have been advanced against it,
and the wilfull mistakes about it.

*Jerem. 18. 19, 20. Give heed to me O LORD, and hearken to the
voice of them that contend with me. Shall evil be recompensed for
good? for they have digged a pit for my soul: remember that I stood
before thee to speak good for them, and to turn away thy wrath from
them.*

Edinburgh, Printed by George Mosman and are to be
sold at his Shop in the Parliament-Clofs 1703.

Toleration's Fence Removed &c.

I have seen a Phamphlet Entituled *Toleration Defended &c.* Whereby I understand the dispute about *Toleration* is degenerate unto a mere scolding, on the side of those that Write for it: And as the Letter from a Gentleman to a Member of *Parliament*, was the first Paper that appeared in the Field against *Toleration*, so every one that have signified their Inclinations for it, in Print, have evidenced their Dissatisfaction with the *Letter*, and in my opinion that is all the evil they have done it. But neither doth the *Letter*, nor the Author much regard their Kindness, nor fear their Feud, so long as the chaines of Providence do tye their Hands. But of all that have Written none appears more highly offended with that *Letter*, than the Author of the *Defence*, nor has any touched the Reasons of it less than he.

Page 1. He pretends to discover *some falshoods and gross mistakes which the Author of the Letter obtrudes upon the World for Truth and Reason*, but has he done it? No indeed, yea he can do nothing that way, unless ye take his bare Word, and bold Assertions for Demonstration; and then he knows well how to Answer all Papers. However, I presume that neither he, nor any for him, shall ever be able to discover Falshoods, and gross Mistakes in that *Letter*, and that all serious and sensible Men will look upon what is contained in it, as Truth and Reason; I much doubt it our Author has advanced any one Truth in matters of Fact, and I am very confident he has fallen in the grossest Mistakes in point of judgement, as afterwards shall be observed.

A

Rem. 1,

Rem. 1 Page 1. By his Definition of Schism, all are Schismatics that separate from any part of the Catholick Church, where the Terms of Communion are not Sinful, now granting it to be so: Our Reformers were not Schismatics (as he seems to insinuate, Pretending that we cannot free them from that stain) in separating from the Church of Rome, for I hope Prelatists will not deny that the Terms of that Churches Communion were and are Sinful. And if there was no Schism nor Division in this Church before the 66. as the Author of the *Case*, the Author of the *Defence*, and the *Plain Dealer* tells us, and I am sure there was no Schism in it before the 62. Then by this Definition of Schism, all that separate from the present Established Church are condemned as Schismatics by our Author.

Rem. 2 p. 2. In his Description of a Church he would have the World believe that no Society of Christians can be reckoned a part of the Catholick Church and Body of Christ, if their Ministers are not Ordained by Prelats: And thus he condemns all the Reformed Churches Abroad and at Home; some very few excepted, as companies of Pagans among whom there is no Baptism, no Sacraments, no Salvation to be expected, and now he will send all to Hell by the lump, that have not Prelats actually Established among them, yea so extravagant is this Gentleman, that he will have the Ordination of Pastors by Prelats, by an uninterrupted Succession from the Apostles, necessary to the Being of a Church, for beside what he says in the Definition of a Church in that same page he adds, That Episcopacy is an Apostolick Institution (by which he means Prelacy no doubt) and not only necessary to the well-being, but even to the very Being of a Church; our Author is high enough here in his Assertions, but blessed be God, he was never born that could give the least shadow of proof for what is here said, and if this were true, I am confident there is not any Society of Men under Heaven, that could be reckoned a Christian Church, for it is simply impossible to prove a lineal and uninterrupted Succession of Prelats and Pastors canonically Ordained (as he terms it) in any one Church: For if in the days of *Eusebius* this of lineal Succession was so uncertain, it must be much more so now, it being above 1200 Years since he Wrote, and yet this Author ingenuously confesseth after all the conjectures that he makes concerning the Successors of the Apostles

Ecclesiast. lib. de veteri nra. rive. vñhoia Enaolai veyovotie & paldov iuriv. &c. But how many, or hist. lib. who were the true Successors of the Apostles, and thought sufficient to Govern the 3. ch. 4. Churches founded by them is hard to say, excepting those which perhaps some one may gather out of the Writings of the Apostle Paul. And I am confident, none will have the impudence to pretend that Catalogues of Prelats are contain'd in the Scriptures, and therefor according to Eusebius, there is no thing cer- tain.

tain about them. Its plain also from *Jeroms* Epistle ad *Euagr.* that for 235 Years the Church of *Alexandria* had no such Prelatical Ordination as this vain Man doth pretend, the Presbyters of that Church choised one of their own Number, and made him President or Moderator, and when he dyed they choised another in his room, others also besides *Jerom* give us this account of that Famous Church. And yet our Author will render the Salvation of Men to depend upon this uncertainty. And if the Prelats of any Society cannot prove their lineal and uninterrupted Succession from the Apostles, that Society cannot be reckoned a Church, and seeing this cannot possibly be done, it's a question with our Author whether it be possible for Men of any particular Society to be Saved, seeing according to his Principles, it is impossible to prove any one particular Society to be a Christian Church, and for my part I cannot conceive how any Man can be Saved without the pale of the Catholick Church, and who is not a Member of the mystical Body of Christ. Doth not the Scripture say, that there is no Name given under Heaven among Men by which we can be Saved, but the Name of Jesus Christ. And now seeing such hard and dreadful consequences follow from the positions of this unwary Man, I hope his word shall not be taken as a sufficient proof.

Rem. 3. p. 3. He alledges that Presbyterians require the renouncing of Episcopacy as an unlawful Usurpation over the Church, as a term *sine quo non* of their Communion, from whence no doubt he infers Men of Prelatical Principles cannot join, but this we reckon among the rest of these impudent Falshoods wherewith his whole Book is stuffed. And then he tells us the Validity of Presbyterian Ordination is doubted, pray who questions Presbyterian Ordination, but the Church of *Rome*, and some in *England*, and how often has Presbyterian Ordination been powerfully, and irrefragably proven against the *Romish* Writers, and even by eminent Prelats of the *English* Church, yea *Spotwood* in his History gives us an account that in a Convocation of *English* Bishops, when he and his Fellows were to be Consecrate at *London*, the Bishop of *Ely* moved whether or not they should be first Ordained Presbyters, but all held that Presbyterian Ordination was Valid where Prelats could not be had. *Dr. Andrews* acquiesced &c.

Rem. 4. p. 4. He will have us guilty of an unreasonable Schism, and consequently without the hopes of Salvation as being cut off from the true Church of God, and compares submission to the Established Church, to a bowing the Knee to *Baal*. He will still pretend that sinful terms of Communion are imposed, and to prove this he enumerates a great many particulars in the foregoing page, and I am confident there is not any one of these particulars he speaks of made a term of Communion, but as I said

[6]

before, he hardly speaks any one Truth in his whole Pamphlet, I bid him defiance to condescend upon any penal Law against Prelatical Persons. And as for the hard usage of some particular persons he speaks of, they that know the circumstances can best Defend them.

Rem. 5. p. 7. He pretends Presbyterians opened a door to a deluge of Errours &c. in the days of King Charles 1st. Pray what Errours in Scotland? Will he pretend that Arminian Errours were introduced by Presbyterians? Deism or the like? Nay these have been introduced by Men of another stamp. He adds these mischiefs can never be amended so long as this Schism lasts, here the Gentleman intimats his desire and inclination to ruine Presbyterians, and by calling them Schismatics he would have all Men judge it their duty to bear them down.

Rem. 6. p. 8. He deals plainly and tells us, if a Toleration be granted they will have their own Prelats to Inspect them, that the Claim of Right doth not meddle with the Intrinsic power of the Church, that he needs not tell the Author of the Letter that his Argument from the standing Laws and Claim of Right is nought, because one Parliament may alter, yea and rescind what was done by another. I am of opinion this is a bold Adventure against the Claim of Right, and yet I think the weakness of the Authors Head, should prove a security for his Neck. And I heartily wish the Lord may change his Heart, and awaken his Conscience.

It had fared the better with Presbyterians, let our Author pretend what he will, if Parliaments had not altered the Laws in favours of the Presbyterian Government made at, and after the Reformation, yea and for the whole Nation too. For then should we never been plagued with Prelacy, then should we have been free of much Perjury and Persecution which drave to Intestine Wars, and unaccountable Murthers. I understand the Author of the Letter is not a stranger to what is written in defence of English Conformity, nor yet to what is written in defence of English Non-conformity, and many eminent Men of the Church of England, and particularly the Learned Dr. Burnet in their writings acknowledge the blame is not to be laid at the door of the Dissenters, and if this Gentleman would be pleased to read Mr. Owen and Mr. Baxters Books, in defence of Non-conformity, not to speak of others, he would see what might serve to satisfy any Man. But what needs me advise this Author, for he has a peculiar Talent (and it were good it were only peculiar to him) to speak and to write whatever he will, true or false, against Presbyterians, without taking the least notice of what is written for them, and he thinks his word is a sufficient proof of the worst things that can be said against them.

Rem. 7.

[7]

Rem. 7. page 11. He pretends the Author of the Letter raises an Objection, viz. Presbyterians had a Toleration granted them, and why should not a Toleration be granted to the Prelatists, but that he shifted and gave no Answer to it. O! Wonderful, after this he may say any thing, but I appeal to the Letter where this Objection is abundantly Answered. page 9.

He pretends they were not required to renounce his Solemn League and Covenant, till the State found it be the Argument of their Rebellion, and all the Sanguinary Laws of which they so much complain were nothing else but the Effects of their own Rebellions and Wicked practices against the King and Government. I would only ask if the Presbyterians, or any under that name were guilty of Rebellion, or so much as charged with it, after King Charles came home, before the 1662, and yet by the 5th Act Parl. 1. Sess. 2. Anno 1662, They were required to Renounce the Solemn Covenants, which King, Parliament, yea and the whole Nation had entered into with God, and how the Insurrection, or Rebellion call it as you will, at Painland-Hills in the 1666 could be the cause of enacting, and requiring the Renunciation of these Solemn Covenants in the year 1662. is somewhat mysterious to me, tho' not to the Author, considering his peculiar Talent of saying what he will. And whereas he pretends all the Sanguinary Laws were the Effects of their Rebellious and Wicked practices; Upon the contrary it may be justly said, the Violent Persecutions, and horrid Oppressions they met with when they were most peaceable and quiet, were the cause of all the Extravagancies that some were guilty of, for Oppression will make, even Wise Men, Mad. But to insist a little upon this, Was it a Rebellious practice for Presbyterians to absent from their Paroch Kirks where Prelatical Ministers were violently settled, and yet even for this, exorbitant Fines were exacted, and such corporal pains inflicted as the Council judged necessary *Ch. 2. Parl. 1. Sess. 3. ch. 1.* Yea and if they should continue so to withdraw the Council were empowered to make them sign a Bond which if they refused to do, they were to be secured, or Banished, or amit to the King their Liferent Echeat. *Ch. 2. Parl. 2. Sess. 2. ch. 7.* and if this was Rebellion in Presbyterians then, we have many Rebels now, but no such Laws, private Meetings in Houses under the pretence of Religious Exercise discharged. *Ch. 2. Parl. 1. Sess. 2. ch. 4.* It is Enacted that no Minister not Licenced by the Council or the Bishop Preach Expound Scripture, or Pray in any Meeting, except in their own Houses, and to those of their own Family only, and great Fines imposed upon the Minister or the Hearers, that transgress this Act, and all of them to be Imprisoned till they make payment. Again if a Minister preach or pray at a Field-meeting, or where there may be more than the House contains he shall be punished with Death, and loose his Goods beside, the In-

former

[8]

former is to have 500 *Merks*, and all the Hearers are to be exorbitantly Fined *Ch. 2. Parl. 2. Sess. 2. ch. 5.* Preaching in House or Field Conventicles and presence for hearing at Field Conventicles to be punished by Death and Confiscation, *Ja. 7. Parl. 1. ch. 8.* And as for the Rigid Execution of the Sanguinary Laws we have yet many Thousands of living Witnesses, yea for as cruel as they were, such was the Cruelty of the Executors, that where it was possible they went beyond them. Many instances of which might be condescended on, And it's well enough known that poor Women were Executed in the *Grass-mercat*, sure it was not for rising in Arms against the King, others of them were tyed to Stakes within Flood mark, till the Sea came up and drowned them, and this without any form or process of Law, how many were by the Souldiers taken up by the way, or while they were about their Employments Examined upon this and the other head, and if the Common Souldiers were not satisfied with their Answers, they Shot them Dead upon the Spot, how many Worthy Gentlemen were Fined, even above the value of their Fortunes, merely because a Presbyterian Minister Preached or Prayed in their Families, yea tho' the Gentlemen observed the Law themselves, if their Ladies, tho' never so privately went to hear a Presbyterian Minister, their Husbands were harrassed and broken, and even in *Edinburgh*, what diligent search was made to find out Presbyterian Meetings by Major *Johnstoun* and others, and how cruelly were the poor people handled that were found at them, was not the Highland Host brought down upon the West when these places were most quiet and peaceable, and notwithstanding that the Nobility and Gentry offered the best securities to the Government, that the peace should be kept, and what plunderings and horrid Abuses those Highlanders committed are well known, yea this Oppression was so heavy, that the Spirits of the people could not bear it, and the design of the Advisers could never yet be learned, unless it was to force a Rebellion that they might find an opportunity to cut them off at once, and to turn the West of *Scotland* into an Hunting-field. Now after all this with the Author of the Defence to enquire, *did ever a peaceable Man upon the account of his Perswasion meet with Trouble?* And also with him and others to assert, *that their Rebellious and Wicked practices were the cause of the Sanguinary Laws,* and that they all suffered as Rebels and Traitors is strange to a wonder, it seems they have borrowed Impudence from those Popish Writers that deny the Massacre of *Paris* by *Charles the 9th*, and that of *Ireland* in the dayes of King *Cha. the 1st*, yea those who now take upon them to deny the Sufferings of the Church of *Scotland*, stand not in their ordinary Discourses to magnify and to defend the *French King*, and to deny the Persecution and Dragooning, whereby that

once

(9)

once famous protestant Church has been overturned by him: And thus by telling one Impudent Falshood they are hardened and prepared to vent an other.

I can find no Evasion for them, unless they pretend their practices were Rebellious and Wicked, *viz.* their Preaching and Praying tho' never so privately, because they were contrary to the standing Laws. Now if an Act of Parliament or a mere Civil Constitution in a Nation be sufficient to make a Deed Rebellious, Treasonable or Wicked, then it will necessarily follow the Christian Religion never had a Martyr. The Apostles were Rebels, and Traitors, and dyed deservedly, for transgressing the Commands of the Superior powers, and it was a most Impudent and Rebellious Saying of *Peter* and the other Apostle, *Acts 5 29. We ought to obey God, rather than Man,* the Prophet *Daniel* was an obstinate Rebel, in Praying thrice a Day in his House, and was justly thrown into the Lyons Den for that wicked Deed, the King having commanded the contrary, the Three Children were justly thrown into the Firy Furnace, seeing at the Kings command they did not fall down to Worship the Image he had set up. But let Men rant and rave as they will, God was pleased in his Righteousness, Wisdom, and Goodness, to bring his people in *Scotland* into the Furnace of Affliction, yet did not desert them in it, the Son of God, who was also the Son of Man, was in the Furnace with them to keep them from Fainting, and by his Omnipotent Arm, and for His own Names sake hath brought them forth, and set them in Safety; and O that the various Dispensations of Gods Providence towards them may help them to cleave to God, and improve the present priviledges to his Honour, that God may not be provoked to hide His Face, to reduce them to straits, and strengthen the Hands of the Adversaries against them whose tender Mercies are Cruelty, and look upon all they formerly suffered as justly inflicted, yea such is the Enmity of their Hearts, especially of our Authors, that he will not allow the Hardship they met with, to be called by the Name of Suffering, their Preaching, or Praying forsooth, tho' never so privately deserved the severest Death and Torture according to him, so that we well know what we may expect from him, and Men of his Kidney, had they the World at their will, yea he tells us, if Prelacy be restored, Presbyterians may Rebel, and yet miscarry, as at *Pentland-Hills* and *Boswell-bridge*, many of them may be killed Dead upon the spot, Presbyterian Ministers may dye on Scaffolds, the People that follow them may be thrown into Jailes, put into the Bas, and sent into *Dunottar*. And then concludes *ergo quid.*

Rem. 8. page 12. The Bloody Murthers he there speaks of were horrid indeed, and those that committed them deserved Death, but how the wicked

ed

(10)

ed Deeds of those few can be charged upon all that are called Presbyterian I do not understand. My Lord Arch-Bishop of York had actually a command under the Parliament against King Charles the 1st. Ergo, All the Prelates and Prelatical persons in England and Scotland were actually in Arms against that King, Gordon Elect Bishop of Galloway turned Popish, as Rue, Dalgleish and Taylor, Three Prelatical Ministers turned Popish in the Reign of King James the 7th. Ergo, All the Prelates, and all Prelatical persons turned Popish and went to Mass, all which to the great Reproach of Christianity they did avowedly, and is as agreeable to their principles, as is natural for the shadow to attend the Body: Is not this curious Logick, and a notable method of arguing, and thus you have a Swatch of this Gentlemans skill that way, and in his own words.

Rem. 9 page 13. He charges the Author of the Letter of Malice and Calumny, because he had said those who had taken the Test, and do own the Civil Government are bound likewise to own the Presbyterian Government under the pain of perjury, the Author of the Letter in saying so, said a Truth, and gave an unanswerable Argument for it, and it is not this Gentlemans Calling that Argument a Sophism and his Wheedling with an Act of Council, and his coming with a *primo*, a *2do*, and a *3^{to}*. instead of a formal Answer, that will do the Business, let any Judicious Man seriously consider what is said in the Letter, and also what is said in the Case, and I am confident he will find the charge of perjury just, as the Author of the Letter intended it.

Rem. 10. page 14. But tells us plainly saith our Author are all Presbyterians so very well satisfied with the Civil Establishment, as you seem in your Charge against the Episcopalians to insinuate, and I do tell them plainly, all the Presbyterians I know, and I have no ground to jealous any one of them, are very well satisfied with the Civil Establishment, and the Acts assertory that lately passed in the several Synods are so far from smelling rankly of Dissatisfaction, that all of them I have seen bear pregnant proofs of hearty concern for Her Majesties person and Government, and it is but the ill Mind of those that are neither pleased with the Ecclesiastick, or Civil Establishment that improves them as our Author here doth. But to stop his Mouth, as well as to silence all others, this may be sufficient, that some Synods and Presbyteries passed Acts of that Nature, and to the very same purpose some Four or Five years agoe, and how these should import no jealousy of K. W. and yet that those do import a Jealousy of Queen Ann, can only be cleared by a person of our Authors Talent that can inter *quidlibet ex quolibet*: And as for the Presbytry of Ross their refusing to qualify, it is not upon the account of disaffection, or dissatisfaction with the

[11]

the Civil Establishment, they did not qualify to K. W. And yet went without suspicion, so that this Author assigns *non causam pro causa*. But then he tells us that there is no people under the Sun that use to express themselves more equivocally in Praying for the Queen than the Presbyterians, O brave Man! If this had been his first mistake it might have been pardoned, and he might have been recovered, but having acquired an habite of speaking at this rate, I am afraid he is past hopes, did he ever hear a Presbyterian express himself equivocally in Praying for the Queen? Did ever Man hear them do so? Yea is it possible to be more express and full than Presbyterians are in Praying for Her Majesty, and that with all Fervour and Affection, and therefore the Oath of Calumny he speaks of is only used by him as a shift when he was told of the abominable juggling of the Meeting-Houses Preachers. But enough of this already in the Letter, and in the Remarks upon the Case, To which I refer the Reader.

Rem. 11. page 15. Do Presbyterians generally disown King Charles's Death to be a Murther, and will none of them oow their Kneec to God upon that account and doth the Author of the Letter know this very well? whatever the Author of the Letter knows, I am sure I know the Author of the Defence so very well, that I shall never believe a word that he speaks, because he speaks it, and I bid him and all Men defiance to name me any one Presbyterian, far less a Presbyterian Minister, that looks not upon the Death of King Charles the First as a Horrid Murther, I am very sure the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland at the time declared it an Horrid Murther, the Presbyterian Ministers faithfully and boldly gave in their Remonstrance against Oliver Cromwells proceedings, the whole Body of Presbyterians in Scotland joined with King Charles the 2^d. Yea and the Ministry put forth a Regiment upon their own Expence to assist the King in Revenging the Murther of his Father, and to bring the Arch-Murtherer Cromwel and his Adherents to condign punishment, But alas, because of our Sins that work proved too hard for them, however this may serve to make the Accuser blush if he be capable of it. And in fine the treatment the Scots Commissioners met with for their Love and Loyalty to their King at that time, is abundantly known, both Abroad and at Home.

Rem. 12. page 16. He needs not tell us of Bishop Kings Books concerning Humane Inventions in the Worship of God, for I know it, and in my Opinion, it falls far short of its design, if ever any Book had that misfortune, and for proof of this, I refer the Reader to the Books written in Answer to it, by Mr. Boyes, and Mr. Craighead, and in the mean time, it looks like a Paradox to pretend the English Ceremonies are indifferent, and yet to deny them to be of Humane Institution. As for our Learned and Ingenious Au-

B

thors

(12)

thors, Learned and Ingenious observes on Mr. Meldrums Sermon, I suppose, the Judicious Reader, will find the Foundations on which they are built removed by what is advanced in this paper, as well as in the Remarks upon the Case &c. And if the Reverend Mr. Meldrum shall find so much spare time, and think it worth his pains, he may easily give them a more particular, and full consideration, if it be judged necessary, tho' in my Opinion, it would be but too much respect payed the Author, for such an one as Mr. Meldrum to take notice of what the Author hath written against him.

I have seen a Pamphlet Entituled, *Some Thoughts on the present State of Affairs, &c.* In the latter part of which, page 10, he owns that he is little seen in the present controversy between our Church-men, And if he had said nothing of it, in my Opinion, it had been no prejudice to his Reputation, for it hath happened to him as is usual to those that are led by Affection, and not by Judgement. He expresseth a concern for the Fundamentals of Religion, but is of Opinion, it is not necessary for a Gentleman to concern himself for lesser Truths, I am sure, this Gentleman is not of the Judgement of the Royal Psalmist, *Psal. 119. 6. v. Then shall I not be ashamed, when I have respect to all thy Commandments, small and great, Fundamental or not.* It seems our Author has not considered that of the Apostle, *James 2. 10. For whosoever shall keep the whole Law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all.* Nor is he it seems afraid of the Curse denounced, *Gal. 3. 10. Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the Book of the Law to do them;* And yet every one that hath the least true Knowledge of Religion must own, that there are many things written in the Scriptures that cannot be reckoned Fundamentals of Religion. But that the matter may be the more fully understood, I would change the distinction of Fundamental and Non-Fundamental Truths, for that which equivalent, viz. Essential and Integral parts of the Body of Religion, and now if this Gentleman were no more tender of his Natural Body, than he seems to be for the Body of Religion, he would not be much concerned, if one should cut off his Hand, or pull out his Ears, because these are but Integral parts of the Body, and a Man may subsist without them. But he would be highly offended if one should cut off his Head, or pull out his Heart for these are Essential parts, and the removal of them infers present Death. I will not say the Author is so very tender and careful to keep his Body as he ought but yet I easily believe, his concern for it goes somewhat beyond this. However our Author was resolved to Write, and being straitned to find new Thoughts there being so much Preached, spoke, and written on this subject, necessity obliged him to lay hold on this, which would not otherwise perhaps have been his choice. And being then necessity drove him to

it

[13]

it, if he has got any relief by it, it is the more excusable, but I find he is no more singular in his thoughts than partial in his Judgement, and it must be reckoned unfair in any Man to take upon him to approve of the Writings of the Prelatists for their Calmness of Temper, and condemn those of the Presbyterians as full of Malice, Spite, Strife, and bitter Railing without pointing out particulars for the proof of such a general and heavy charge. I am certain if he had declared the quite contrary, he had spoke Truth but this Gentleman being necessitated to Write, and resolved on it, but not finding Leisure to Read what has been written, either by the Prelatists, or by the Presbyterians, it seems he has proceeded merely upon Hearsay, and his Informers being byassed have misled him, and thus I more firmly believe because he tells us, to use his own words, *he is very little seen in the Debate,* and that he judgeth it not necessary for a Gentleman to acquaint himself with it, it seems indeed this Author is not for Niceties to serve him in his own Terms, he uses a latitude, and in his Ramblings perhaps he has received a Rub from some precise Constable or other, and thus finding the Effects of a strict Government, he crys out, *let us break their Bands asunder, and cast away their Cords from us.* It seems indeed our Author has been in straits, for he hath advanced nothing new upon this head, but what I have already considered, and therefore I refer the Reader to former Papers and Answers for satisfaction. There is only one thing that this Gentleman and others of his Disposition have much harped upon, and tho' the Argument be naught, as is clearly evinced in the Answer to the Postscript of the Case, yet for further satisfaction, I shall a little inform the Reader with respect to Matter of Fact, they pretend there were but *Fourty* Ministers or *Fifty* at most that were put from their Charges since the 62 alive, at the Revolution, and yet it is certain there were above 90, if not a full 100 of them, and their Names can be particularly condescended on, and a great Number also of those whom they had received into Ministerial Communion with themselves, even during the time of their severest Tryals, as well as under King 7^a. his Liberty, and all these had as good a Right to the Government, as the surviving Ministers aforesaid had, and in the Year 1690. the Assembly was near as full, as any Assembly since that time, and for the Age, Piety, Learning, Prudence and Gravity of the Members it is much to be doubted if they were not equal, if not Superiour to any Assembly, or convocation of Church men that ever were in *Britain* in our Day.

I observe that according to that of *Solomon* of making many Books there is no end, and that what is offered by the well-wishers of the Church and Nation against Toleration in our present circumstances, is so strong and nervous, that notwithstanding of all the attempts of the promoters and

B 2

desirers

[14]
 desirers of it, there is not any one Argument advanced in the Letter, or in the Speech without Doors, or in the Essay, that has received any solid Answer, however that set of Men know they have a People to deal with, so addicted to a Jacobite-Interest, and to a Licentious way of Living, that they will greedily receive every thing spoken, or written, against the present Established Church, tho' never so strange and contrary to Reason, they persuade themselves those their blind and implicate Followers will read their Books, and believe what they say without so much as ever considering what is said against them, and therefor it is that every Paper must have an Answer, and Papers must be multiplied, and the same thing written over and over again, as if by often repeating the same thing, they design to gain Credit to what they say, tho' never so unjust and contrary to the common Sense and Sentiments of all Judicious thinking Men. I am much convinced of all this by a Pamphlet lately fallen into my hand, called *Plain Dealing with the Presbyterians &c.* I have read it over, and I do believe there is not one new Argument in it all, yea there is nothing in it that hath the least relation to the present debate, but has been Answered or obviated again and again, particularly in the Remarks upon the Case, and in the second Letter from a Gentleman to a Member of Parliament, and altho both these were abroad, and the last of them a Fourtnight before our Author exposed himself, and his old and borrowed thoughts in a new dress to the World. Yet he has not been at leisure to take any notice of what is contain'd in those Papers. He was resolv'd to write, and finding that which is contained in the second Letter, and in the Remarks upon the Case, especially with respect to the pretended Grounds and Reasons, why the Ministers and People of his persuasion cannot join with the Established Church, to be too hard for him, he learned a trick from his fellow writers to set his thumb upon it, and with confidence to utter his fond conceits, as if forsooth they had never been heard of before, and if this be *Plain Dealing*, let the World judge. But more of this hereafter.

Rem. 1. p. 3. He charges the Presbyterians with malice, and of telling a long train of false Stories and mischievous Inventions to the Members of Parliament. How comes our Author to know this, is it *plain dealing* to advance a Charge so heavy and general against Men, without condescending on particulars, but the first, any Man of a bad disposition may do, but as for the last, condescend on particulars, no Man can do, and therefor this *Plain-Dealer* has done what he could, and thinks he ought not to be blamed for not doing what was impossible. As for what has been spoke from the Pulpit, when this *Plain-Dealer* condescends on particulars, he may expect a particular Answer. And as for what is contained in the
 Three-

Threefold Cord, I am not much concerned, if there be any thing singular there, let the Author look to it. Again in the same page he will have Presbyterians to be partial and disingenuous, and that because they were so great Advocats for a Toleration some Years ago, but do bitterly oppose it at this time. I peremptorily refuse that Presbyterians were Advocats, or did plead for a Toleration in King James his time, as he pretends, that Toleration came unexpectedly, and out of no good will to Presbyterians, it was a favour designed for Papists, but Presbyterians who Preached at their peril before, might have been reckoned mad-men if they had given it over because they might do it without hazard, and the freedome to Papists made their Preaching more necessary. Altho this *Plain-Dealer* and I cannot agree about the description of a Church (for which I have given unanswerable Arguments already, and I would have all Men to judge them so, until the contrary be made appear) yet I heartily agree with him as to the nature of Schism, as well as with the Author of the Defence, viz. To separate from a duely Constitute Church where nothing unlawful is required as a condition of Communion with it, is to be guilty of Schism. (and I add) But to separate from the present Established Presbyterian Church of Scotland, is to separate from a Church duely Constitute, where nothing unlawful is required, as a condition of Communion, and therefor those that separate from Her are guilty of Schism. According to our *Plain-Dealer* nothing in this Argument can be excepted against, save the *Minor*, perhaps some will tell us our Church is not duely Constitute, because we want Prelats: But then most of the Reformed Churches are not duely Constituted; and this Popist pretence is so baffled by the Writers of the Reformed Religion, and even by the Prelates of the Church of England themselves, that till our Author or some for him, give a new Argument for that pretence, I will hold the cause yeilded, notwithstanding of the positive, uncharitable, and unchristian, Assertions of some particular Men, driving particular Designs. I say particular Men, because no Reformed Church did ever yet judge any Church not duely Constitute because it wanted Prelates. But then this *Plain-Dealer* will pretend, the Church doth impose unlawful Terms of Communion, and therefor the Argument doth not conclude. I shall Answer to this in General, First that not only is the Church the same way Constitute as it was before the 62. but the Terms of Communion with it, are as easy and condescending now, as then. And seeing the Authors of the *Case*, and of the *Defence*, as well as this *Plain-Dealer*, do all acknowledge, there was no Schism in this Church before the 66. (and I will yeild there was none before the 62.) and the first of these tells us plainly, that notwithstanding of all the changes with respect to Church Govern-
 ments

ment, the respective parties held Communion with one another, till that time. It may appear pretty plain, that it is in vain to pretend, with the *Plain-Dealer*, p. 4. That neither their *Clergy-men nor Lay-men*, can in Conscience hold Communion with the Established Church, unless they have got a new light, but more particularly if those particulars the *Plain-Dealer* enumerats, p. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8. As Terms of Communion required by the Church, be not required as Terms of Communion, whether they are sinful or not, even according to his own way of speaking, they ought not to scruple the Prelatists, and to speak of them here, is so far from *Plain-Dealing*, that it is either Simple Dealing, or disingenuous Dealing, as being impertinent and beside the purpose, I shall consider them one by one, tho' most if not all of them were duely considered in the second *Letter and in the Postscript to the Remarks upon the Case*, tho' this *Plain-Man* cunningly carries as if he had taken no notice of it. And First, He pretends their *Clergy-men* (as he calls them) cannot in Conscience come up to the Terms of Ministerial Communion. [1] 'Because they require of Episcopal Ministers whom they 'Assume, that they declare their grief and sorrow for having served under 'Prelacy. 2. That the Kirk Government consisting of a party of Ministers and Ruling-Elders (whom he vainly calls Seculars) to be the only 'Government Institute by Christ in his Church, and that they shall adhere 'to it, all the days of their Life. [3] they require uniformity in their 'Worship as it is now Preached and Practiced, and falsely pretendeth there are some necessary, if not essential parts of Publick Worship cast off, such as the reading of the Holy Scriptures, the singing of the Doxology, the use of the Lords Prayer, that we deny Baptism to dying Infants that cannot be brought to Church, and the Sacrament of the Supper to a dying Christian; ----- the Apostolick Creed must not be used at Baptism, Ministers must not bow a knee to God for the Assistance of his Grace, and the Acceptance of their Services when they enter the Pulpit, they must not stand at Prayer, or uncover the Head in time of Preaching, they must not kneel at the Lords Table, yea (says he) perhaps we must be bound to owne either expressly or virtually, the very League and Covenant it self, for by an implicate Faith (as he falsely pretends) we must promise to conform to whatsoever the Kirk shall afterwards Authorise and Ordain. This is *Plain Dealing* with a Witness. It is well known, that many of the particulars here enumerated, were excluded by the universal practice of Prelatical Ministers, even when Prelacy was Established, and it is as plain, that these particulars that were not, are not universally excluded by the practice of Presbyterians now, a very few excepted. I am sure the reading of the Scriptures is not excluded, nay nor yet the use of the Lords Prayer.

Prayer universally; but to this black charge an Answer has been given already. Baptism is not refused to weak dying Infants that cannot be brought to Church, I very well remember the practice of Prelatical Ministers in this matter, and I as well know, that of Presbyterians now; And I do assert, that where there was one Child Baptised out of the Church then there are six Baptised now: Yea this charge is so unjust, that altho' for 16, or 18. Years I observed the practice of Prelatical Ministers, I do not remember of any one Child Baptised by them out of the Church, and now few weeks pass, but I know Children are Baptised by Presbyterian Ministers in the Houses of their Parents. It's true Presbyterian Ministers are careful to have the face of a Congregation present when they Baptise in private Houses, and People are duely warned for that purpose generally, tho' in the North and particularly at *Dundee*, the Sacrament of Baptism is sometimes Administrate without that Solemnity. I abstract now from considering either the Lawfulness or Unlawfulness of things, and I plainly say, That the commemoration of the Nativity, Circumcision, Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension of our Lord, and the Descent of the Holy Ghost &c. as well as the Administration of the Lords Supper to a dying Christian, were as little known, or observed in *Scotland* in time of Episcopacy, as in time of Presbytry, save that on Christmas-Day, in some particular places, and under the Prelats Nose a Sermon was Preached, and there as well as in the Country, Feasting and Drinking and that to Excess, in many places was much in vogue. I am sure I was Fourteen Years in the World, and that in a place where Men will say Prelacy is as much Idolized as in any place in *Scotland*, and I never heard tell of any Anniversary Sermons, save that of the 29 of *May*, nor yet of Baptising Children out of the Church, or giving the Sacrament of the Supper to dying Persons, yea and for seven Years after that, I am very sure there was nothing of that nature usually (if at all) practised there. It's folly to follow this *Plain-Dealer* close at the heels, it's certain Presbyterians either stand or kneel in time of Prayer, and allow of no other Gesture to be so Decent, as also they judge it Decent to hear the Word Uncovered, when Infirmity and Weakness pleadeth not for the contrary, whatever this *Plain-Dealer* may insinuate, but to pretend that by an implicate Faith, they must promise to Conform to whatsoever the Kirk shall afterwards Authorise and Ordain, is a peice of *Plain-Dealing* that I desire few may imitate, and in a word the whole of this is beside the purpose: And therefore for a confutation I shall here set down the Terms required by the Assembly, of those that are received into Ministerial Communion.

I Do sincerely own and declare, The above Confession of Faith, approved by former General Assemblies of this Church and Ratified by Law in the Year 1690, to be the Confession of my Faith; And that I own the Doctrine therein contained, to be the True Doctrine, which I will constantly adhere to; As likewise that I own and acknowledge Presbyterian Church Government of this Church, now settled by Law, by Kirk-Sessions, Presbyteries, Provincial-Synods, and General Assemblies; To be the only Government of this Church, And that I will submit thereto, concur therewith, and never endeavour directly or indirectly the Prejudice or Subversion thereof; And that I shall observe Uniformity of Worship, and of the Administration of all publick Ordinances within this Church, as the same are at present performed and allowed.

And thus the Conditions required are neither Sinful nor Rigorous, and there is no necessity laid upon them of holding a distinct Communion, and consequently their Separation is causeless, and it would be adverted, that its possible sometimes to find Church Communion Lawful, where Ministerial Communion cannot be had upon such Lawful and easy Terms, and I do hold that in this case Separation from Church Communion is Sinful, and it's too selfish and base for Ministers to attempt it, and consequently let the Terms of Ministerial Communion be never so high, which yet they are not, if the Terms of Church Communion be easy and Lawful, even to Men of Prelatical Principles, as they are indeed, the separation cannot possibly be justified, Presbyterians are not so Pharisaical as to represent themselves the only Men of Conscience in this Nation; I know there are Conscientious Men Prelatical in their persuasion, that make no scruple of Joining with the Established Church. And this *Plain-Dealer* will prove more plain than Dutiful to his Superiours, if he shall reckon *Stillingfleet*, *Burnes*, *Usher*, and many others Learned, and Eminent Prelats, and even *Cranmer* who dyed a Martyr for the Protestant Faith, Inconscientious Men, and yet by their principles would they be bound to hold Communion with a Presbyterian Church.

Rem. 2. P. 7. He pretends the People of his Perswasion, observe notable Defects in the Presbyterian Worship, and therefor are not satisfied in holding Communion with them. [1] I absolutely refuse that there are notable Defects in the Presbyterian Worship, nor will ever any sensible Man pretend, that the publick reading of the Holy Scriptures with a gloss after the Congregation is duely constitute, is a notable Defect in Worship, as our *Plain-Dealer* alledgeth, but for a Man that hath no Orders nor Commission from Jesus Christ, to read the Holy Scriptures before the Congregation be constitute, if it be not a Defect, it is certainly a Novelty. And the

the Scripture, our Author citeth *Acts 13. 31.* will not at all help him, the Apostle *James* and Bishop of *Jerusalem* as our Author pretends, saith indeed *Moses* of old time hath in every City them that Preach him, being Read in the Synagogue every Sabbath Day. Doth this in the least justify the Prelatick practice? Surely not. Will he pretend that *Moses* was Read in the Synagogue on the Sabbath by Men that had no Office, and before the Congregation was duely convened, or that those that Read the Books of *Moses* did not give the sense of what they Read unto the People, Nay by all the Light Scripture affords, as well as the accounts we have of the Jewish practice, and of the practice of the Primitive Christians, its plain no publick Ordinance of God was performed till once the Congregation was duely convened. And altho' the Reading of the Scriptures without a Gloss may be well reckoned one of Gods publick Ordinances, yet its strange to alledge that the adding of an Interpretation for the Edification of the People should be reckoned a defect in that Ordinance, yea and perhaps, our Author may find it difficult to prove that any person not in Office, and who can pretend no Commission from Christ has a right to perform any of Christs publick Ordinances, and consequently to justify the Prelatical practice in this matter. And if we may take information from *Nehemiah Ch. 8.* throughout, and particularly the 8. ver. it will be found the Scriptures were read by Men in Office, and the Sense was given, and the People were made to understand the reading by the Priest or Levite, which is exactly agreeable to the practice of the Church, and quite contrary to that of the Prelatical Ministers in *Scotland*, and consequently our way and method in this is inexceptionable, but this *Plain Dealer* would make men believe that the Scriptures are not Read in our Churches at all. As for what he says concerning Baptism and the *Westminster* Confession, this I have Answered already, and it hath been frequently Answered tho' our *Plain Dealer* hath taken no notice of it: Again he pretends that *in deliberate disobedience to the Command of Christ, the Lords Prayer is not used, and as if that portion of Holy Scripture were to be antiquated,* But to this a sufficient Answer is given in the Case and Postscript thereof, and if he and his Fellows should repeat this arrant Untruth a Thousand Times, it cannot thereby become a Truth, nor yet require any other Answer than what has been returned already. But then he tells us the *Doxology* is not Sung in our Churches, nay the Ministers (whom he in Derision calls *these good Men*) use neither to sing nor say *Glory to God, Father, Son and Holy Ghost in express Terms.* But this is a peice of *Plain Dealings* for all the Hearers will bear record, that every Sermon is concluded with a *Doxology* to the Blessed Trinity, and usually the Prayers too. And they must have mighty squeemish Consciences that are necessitated

[20]

to separat from a Church that so frequently use the *Doxology* in prose, merely because Four Lines of Human Composure are not Sung in Meeter to that purpose. Beside all this, he pretends the *more judicious in the Kingdom, see shew the vain pretences for a party, doubt of the Ordination, and Authority of the Ministers to perform their office.* Its easy for a Man to assert such things, but I firmly believe, yea and its consistent with my certain knowledge that the more and most knowing and judicious in the Kingdom make no doubt of the validity of Presbyterian Ordination, and were it not that some of them do question the Civil Authority whereby Presbytry is established, they would have no scruple against it. And it is owing to Men of our Authors stamp and practices that there is any in the Nation, whether more or less judicious that scruple Communion with the Established Church. They speak with such confidence, they make such horrid misrepresentations and utter such gross and unaccountable Falsehoods against the Government of the Church, And the Ministers thereof that *Turks and Pagans* would blush to hear of them, and thus Men are prejudged, and their Party kept up, and some are so mightily prejudicated that they look upon Presbyterian Ministers to be Monsters, and when they fall in company with them, they frankly acknowledge they have been basely abused, yea in some parts of the North that are now as orderly as any in the Nation, I have been told that such was the strange account their Prelatical Preachers had given of Presbyterians and Presbyterian Ministers that they did truly believe they were not like other Men: No not so much in Form and Figure, yea according to the dress they were represented in, a Jesuite, or Popish Priest was a Lovely Creature, and of Lovely Principles, in respect of a *Cammy* or *Cameronian Minister*, as they most reproachfully termed the Ministers of the Church. And thus in the beginning while the Priest was hugg'd and carras'd, and had all deference and respect pay'd him by Young and Old, the Children were taught to hold out the Finger, and cry *Cammy* to Presbyterian Ministers, and the Common People would have gathered together in Companies, and run to their Doors when they heard of a Presbyterian Minister expecting to see some strange sight and figure, And after all, finding themselves disappointed, they began to say, we are deceived by our Teachers, for Presbyterians are like other Folks, this I speak from my own certain knowledge, and Blessed be God, matters are far changed, and in those very places Ministers are much esteemed for their Works sake, and the People abundantly satisfied and join in the Worship of God, as unanimously as in any place in *Scotland*. And last of all he tells us that it is observable, *some Presbyterians have been reordain'd by Bishops, but never any complying Prelatical Minister by Presbyterians.* And the more unreasonable, and Foolish were the Reordained and Reordainers, and sure Reordina-
tion

[21]

nation was not lookt upon as necessary by Prelats and Prelatical Ministers in the 62, and afterwards, otherways they would have Re-ordain'd all that complied with Prelacy, which yet they did not, tho' our *Plain Dealer* seems to insinuate this. From all which it may be easily seen that those of the Prelatical persuasion, both Ministers and People have not the least shadow of Reason to separate from the Established Church, and consequently a Toleration is absolutely unnecessary, and therefore ought not to be allowed. And thus the first Argument in the Letter against a Toleration standeth firm and stedfast. Nor is it manifest by what is above said, that the matters wherein the Prelatists differ from the Presbyterians are not reckoned indifferent by them, and consequently the second Argument standeth good, and the Appeal is renewed. As for Ministers being cast out by the Rabble, who were Legally and Ecclesiastically settled in their Churches as he pretends, this is accounted for in the Remarks upon the Case, and sure where Ministers were thus driven away the People were so far from reckoning it penal to them, as this *Plain Dealer* doth pretend that they look'd upon it as a Merciful Deliverance. To insinuat that the Communion of Prelatists is better and more safe than that of the Presbyterians, is most unjust, but to say Prelatists have met with severe proceedings from Presbyterians these bygone Years upon the account of their persuasion is a notorious Falsehood. And thus what he hath said against the Third Argument of the Letter is removed, tho' indeed it did not so much as touch the strength of the Argument, no penal Law against Dissenters being named by the *Plain Dealer*.

In the Fourth Argument the Author of the Letter is far from begging the cause, he only asserts what doth necessarily follow from what he had proven before, but it seems the *Plain Dealer* was required to consider every paragraph of that Letter, and therefore he was obliged to take notice of this, yea he is obliged to his correspondent that did not require an impossibility of him *viz.* to Answer every paragraph of that Letter, as well as consider it. The Author of the Letter expressly affirms that all the aim of a Toleration is to furnish a Maintainance to some Episcopal Ministers, but he will neither tacitly nor expressly acknowledge that there are many in the Kingdom willing to afford it, yea he certainly knows the contrary, for if they were willing what hinders them now to afford them Maintainance. I am unwilling to name Places or Persons, but I do know a certain Shire in *Scotland*, where there is but one Prelatical Meeting-House, to which the disaffacted repair, and yet so unwilling are they to be at much Expence for the Ministers Maintainance, that by their withdrawing from their own Paroch Churches, and giving their Collection at that Meeting-House only, they most uncharitably Rob the Poor to Maintaia their Preacher, in giving the Collection to him.

C 2

And

And thus the Cripple and the Lame, the Aged and Weak must be squeezed and have their Bellies pinched to maintain Men to Preach to their Humours, rather than to their Consciences, for of all those that frequent that Meeting, yea the Preacher himself not excepted, there is not any one Soul that has the least scruple against the Worship and Service of God, performed by Presbyterian Ministers, nor do they in the least quarrel their Ordination, for I have conversed with them all and know their Sentiments, a few of the meaner People excepted. And I doubt not but this is the practice and way of other places. And thus the fourth Argument in the Letter stands in it's full strength: For it cannot be supposed, but the Wisdom of the Nation may fall upon more justifiable methods, than this to supply the wants of a few Prelatical Ministers, and it must be reckoned highly unreasonable, for their sake, to rent and imbroid the Church by a Toleration.

To the Fifth Argument *viz.* That it is utterly unnecessary with respect to Ministers to grant a Toleration, there being so many indulged, and the Terms of Assumption being so easy and condescending. He pretends that because the State hath protected those in their Churches, that owned the Civil Authority by that same reason they are bound to grant a Toleration, to those that refuse to own the Civil Authority, and were turned out upon that account, and to fortify this he useth the Latine phrase, *ubi par ratio idem statuen dum est*, and then goes on, if it were not unlawful to continue an hundred Episcopal Ministers (who owned the Civil Government) it is far less so to Tolerate their Brethren, who have lived peaceably these 14 Years, divested of their Churches and Benefices. I do not well take up this Argument, if he means that it is far less unlawful to Tolerate those Prelatical Ministers that are peaceable, to live divested of their Churches and Benefices, from which they were laid aside, either for their Scandals or Errors, or disaffection to the Civil Establishment, I am of his mind: But if he means, that these Prelatical Ministers that have been turned out, upon the grounds foresaid, should be Tolerate to intrude upon Churches, and planted Congregations, to distract and to divide the People it is far more unlawful, and he is most Illogical in his Arguing here. The Terms of Communion required of Prelatical Ministers, the Reader is desired to consider as above set down, whereby it may be easily observed, how grossly they are misrepresented by the *Plain-Dealer*. It is not too bare-faced for the Author of the Letter to talk of a willingness to receive these that served under the late Prelacy, it is a manifest Truth, and they have abundantly evidenced it by Word and Deed. As for cruel and unjust proceedings against many complying Ministers, and processes still extant against them,

I suppose our Author by this, as well as by other bold strokes, has forfeited the Character of a *Plain-Dealer*. I am better acquaint than he, and this is the very first time that ever I heard of a process intended against any complying and assuaged Minister, and I very much doubt if he can condescend upon any one in particular, if he means those that qualified themselves to the State, but were not assumed into Ministerial Communion to the Church, then he is raving; for we are speaking of Assumption into Ministerial Communion. I have indeed known some Prelatical Ministers Deposed that had qualified themselves to the Civil Government, but upon the most solid grounds for which a Presbyterian Minister could not have escaped the like censure, and I have likewise known some that were not qualified, Deposed, and the grounds of the Sentence being judged slender, I have known the Sentence taken off again by the Superiour Judicatories of the Church, and if any person that is received be long of setting, is it not because Paroches will not agree to call them?

Rem. 3 p. 10. The *Plain-Dealer* having considered the Arguments against the necessity of a Toleration, he comes to the other class of Arguments whereby the inconvenience of it is made evident by the Author of the Letter.

And to the first of these our Author alledgeth it cannot be pretended in reason that the granting a Toleration would increase our breaches with all their bad effects, he pretends that he and Men of his stamp, are of known peaceable Principles and Deportment, and I pretend the contrary is abundantly known, they have not lived peaceably since the Revolution, and how peaceable and easy they were before the Revolution to those that Dissented from them is also known. In a word their Principles and Deportment are so very peaceable, that when they have the opportunity they are sure to affix Names of Reproach to those that Dissent from them, and then Ruine and Destroy them: Yea notwithstanding of the standing Laws they deny the Established Church to be a Church, they reckon us not only Schismatics, but also a Society of Heathens and Pagans, among whom there is no Baptism, Sacrament, nor Salvation to be expected; So that for odious Names they transcend those that were given us in the worst of times, and therefor may we expect that upon the first opportunity their cruelties shall as far exceed those we suffered in the late persecutions. The Author of the Letter is no Friend to Mobs, and as we know no party in the Nation Authorized to set up Meeting-Houses in *Glasgow*, or in any planted Congregation, so he perfectly understands that the practice of the Prelatists in *Glasgow* was not only contrary to Law, but that they were the first Aggressors, and drew the People upon them; Yea from an Officer of State.

[24]

State that is entirely acquaint with the Queens Mind, especially with respect to the Letter to the Council, the foresaid Author had assurance that, that Letter was not intended to countenance any Meeting contrary to Law (as that of *Glasgow* was) or where they were not in use before, and altho' Mr. *Abercromby* would not have us to take the Queen as she speaks, but as speaking one thing and intending another, as is evident by his Letter; yet we dare not conceive Her Majesty to be so disingenuous.

It is certain the very expectation of a Toleration, and hopes of favour and connivance has occasioned the grossest disorders. How many since that time have intruded upon Churches, a thing never allowed in, and is inconsistent with any Government, did not some disaffected persons in *Elgin*, together with a company gathered out of several Congregations in the Country on the Lords Day, invade one of the Churches in that Town, which they still possess, notwithstanding that there are two Ministers Legally settled there upon the most unanimous Calls? And several such unaccountable disorders might be mentioned, which Mr. *Abercromby* the Grand-Secretary of the party did not only advise them to do, in his first Letter, but doth applaud and highly commend those illegal attempts and the success of them, in his second Letter, which is in the hand of a Friend, and may be published if we be put to do it. The starting aside of the People in some places from the Presbyterian Preachers, is no evidence that they joined with them of necessity, and not of choice, for I am able to instruct, that a few particular persons of Interest and Influence, who have no scruple of Conscience, but being encouraged and put in hopes of preferment, have used their utmost endeavours by Threats and Promises to force the People to a separation, and it being known how much the Country People of the North depend upon their Masters, and how ignorant they are, and unconcerned in matters of Religion, I should not think it strange tho' by that same influence, I should see them carried to the Mass in many places, so that it's plain still, that a Toleration would be so far from healing our breaches, that it would encrease them with all their bad effects. Especially if it be considered, that there are many of Interest and influence, yea and of the greatest consideration that will do their utmost to oppose the disaffected in the North, and even in *Elgin*. And thus the first Argument holding forth the inconveniency of a Toleration standeth firm, and so doth the second upon the same account.

As to the third Argument every one that looks upon it cannot but be convinced of it's force, and altho' the Ministers have had but too much ground to represent to the Parliament, that wickedness did exceedingly abound, and to declaim against Atrocious Crimes from the pulpit, yet it's
mani-

[25]

manifest that the granting of a Toleration would give a latitude to heinous Transgressours to go on in their wickedness, and afford them a colourable pretence to evite all Censure, and inevitably ruine all Discipline and good Order in the Church. It's in vain to pretend, that people are willing to submit to Censures, experience hath taught us that those who most deserve them, are least willing to submit to them, and most ready to shift them, which they are indeed encouraged to do by the Meeting-House-Preachers, and a company of outed Curats, who are indeed a Scandal, and would be so to a Society of Heathens under any form or model of Government, the most wicked may have all Church Priviledges from them at far easier rates and without any penance, than from Popish Priests and Jesuites, this is no Calumny, it is a necessary Truth, to hold forth the strength of the Argument, and it cannot be supposed, that they will be less irregular if they had a Legal Standing. And if they put us to it, we can give particular instances, and would do it, were it not that we love not to furnish sport to the common Enemies of the Protestant Interest. He tells the Episcopal Ministers that possess their Churches, never yet fought nor needed the assistance of the Secular Arm to curb the irregularities of their People, which if true (but I must in charity doubt of it) they have an excellent People indeed, there are no notorious Swearers, nor Drunkards, nor Whoremongers, nor Sabbath-breakers &c. in any of their Congregations, that break not off their Sins by Repentance, and their Iniquities by turning unto the Lord. I am sure I live in a Congregation where the Presbyterian Minister is necessarily and frequently obliged to require the assistance of the Secular Arm, and yet I am confident that those Abominations do not more abound in our Paroch, than in these where Prelatists are Ministers, nay further I am sure, that there is no Congregation in the Nation, where the people gives more full obedience to the Censures of the Church or submission to the Session than our Paroch, and yet because their appearances with respect to some, are but mock appearances, and their professions of Repentance merely feigned, they going on in their sins, I say (some of them) the Minister and Session find themselves obliged to address the Magistrate as said is, that they may be restrained for Fear, who are not for Conscience sake: And therefor a greater Accusation can hardly be advanced against Prelatical Ministers possessing Churches, than our *Plam-Dealer* inadvertantly doth give in against them. How loath am I to discover the wickedness of Protestant Ministers, and yet to stop the mouths of some I must say I am forced to give an account of a passage that fell out in the Congregation where I live, There was a certain person guilty of Fornication and acknowledged it, but would by no means evidence his Repentance
according

according to the Rules of the Church, and in a word the Prelatical Minister (for then we had the unhappiness of such an one) had a Meeting with the offender in an Ale-house of the Town, and after the drinking a Cup of Ale or Two, and as many Doses of Brandy, the offender was absolved without any more ado. But I can tell that this was not the Temper of all of them.

To the Fourth Argument a Toleration would perpetuate the differences that are amongst us, which otherways might be obliterated. To this he Answers, First this Argument strikes against Presbyterians formerly as well as against us now, and yet (saith he) they were Tolerated and Indulged. A Man that is not acquaint with our Affairs might be tempted to believe that in the time of Prelacy Presbyterians were not in the least molested, but allowed to Worship God in their own way, without any disturbance, this is *Plain Dealing* indeed, the exorbitant Fines of Gentlemen that fell not within the Compass of the Law themselves merely because their Ladies went thro' never so privatly to hear, or invited Presbyterian Ministers to Preach or Pray is a pregnant proof of this, the calling in of Souldiers upon poor Country People and Ministers Worshipping God in Caves, Woods, and Mountains, which they were afraid to do in Houses, and slaying them on the spot, dragging others of them to prison, from whence they were sent to *America*, some of which were put into the hands of such cruel Mariners that in a Shipwrack after those of the Ship had escaped the poor Prisoners being secured and designedly under the Hatches, perished. This is another pregnant proof of the Truth, that Presbyterians were kindly Indulged, shall we call in the Highland-Host, the Grass-mercat, and the Cross of *Edinburgh*, to espouse and to bear witness to this great and incontestable Truth, so fairly laid down by our *Plain-Dealer*, nay we need not, there is something here plain enough whether our *Dealer* be so, or not. (2) He alledgeth no tract of time is likely to raze out the persuasion of *Episcopacy*, that Parents, Masters, and such as Educate Youth will not be wanting to instruct and breed up their Children, Servants and Pupils in their own Principles and Perswasion, this is indeed a fair Advertisement given to the Church to take notice of those that are Instructors of Youth, and I hope they will do it. And I am as confident on the other hand there are but few Parents and Masters of Families in *Scotland*, that are much concerned to perswade their Children and Servants of the necessity of Prelacy, and of separating from the present Established Church, and I dare say this Gentleman would be ashamed to produce the List of them they are so few. I am afraid he should be tempted to put down one and the same person 7 or 8 times under different Designations, as his Friends in *Fife* were, in making up their Address against the Government, And yet the number should be very inconsiderable. The Conformity of the Western Shires to-

wards

wards the end of King *Ch.* his Reign is not much to be bragged of, more than the kindly Indulgence and Toleration Prelatists vouchsafed Presbyterians at that time. However all that is said by the *Plain-Dealer* serves only to strengthen the Argument that a Toleration would perpetuate the differences that are amongst us, at least until the Prelatists should have a Golden opportunity to extirpate the Presbyterians, Men of a new start up Opinion as he calls it.

The fifth Argument for the inconveniency &c, viz. If a Toleration be still pressed the Introduction of Prelacy is necessarily intended &c. To this he Alledges, the inference is illogical, the product of Jealousy, and Suspicion, and peculiarly the Authors own. Good Sir, In my Opinion he needs not be ashamed of it, and as for Your Ramble from *England* to *Holland*, and from *Holland* to *France* its purely excentric, for my part I cannot extract one grain of sense out of it, and the Reason offered for the connexion of the Argument in the Letter, viz. That Presbyters must be subject unto Bishops according to their Principles, is so strong that it is yeilded, and makes our *Plain-Dealer* contrary to his usual practice to speak plain Language indeed. viz. Those Tolerated Presbyters are to be subject to their surviving *Scottish* Bishops, to whom they owe Canonical Obedience, but has he hereby shaken himself loose of the Argument? no truly. For this would be a manifest Encroachment upon the Claim of Right, Tull the Claim of Right, our *Plain-Dealer* will have it as plain as himself, and to have as many Faces and Senses as he has Interests and Ends. I thought it had been a litle dangerous for Privat Men to interpret common and Ordinary Lawes, I am sure a person of great Honour and Worth found it to be so in time of Prelacy concerning the Test. Ay but our *Plain-Dealer* ventures on the Claim of Right to explain it, and to tell the World that Prelates may Exercise their Office in *Scotland*, and that the Claim of Right, and the Lawes following thereupon, deprive them only of their Secular Encouragements, Priviledges and Revenues, and because the Author of the *Modest Reflections* took the Liberty to tell us, that every Article of the Claim of Right is not of equal Force or Authority, and went as well as the Pamphlet, without any Censure, this Gentleman advanceth his Notion too, and if it shall pass without a Challenge, a Third or Fourth may yet deal a litle more boldly with it. I desire not the hurt of any person, but I venture to say it is a disgrace to our Nation, and a manifest Reproach to Authority not to evidence so much strength and resolution as to check such insolent arrogancy as this *Plain-Dealer*, and his Fellows are guilty of, and thus you see all the Arguments advanced in the Letter against Toleration stand untouched, and with a very litle pains, the Mist and Dust, the Author hath raised about them on purpose to ecclipse their

D

their

their Light is fully dispelled, therefore those that have not a mind to be deceived, let them reconsider the said Letter and compare it, and what is here said with the *Plain-Dealing*. And I am of Opinion tergiversation and downright Jugling instead of *Plain-Dealing* on the one side or other shall be easily discovered. I need not defend what the Author of the Letter said in holding forth the discrepancy between the Case of the Prelatists in *Scotland*, and that of the Dissenters in *England*, that is abundantly done already, only in the 14 page, he alledgeth that in the time of Confusion and Bloodshed, which was truly occasioned by Prelatists and their influence, one of the Ministers could say, *the Work was going bonily on*, I shall hold this as a Calumny, or rather a piece of this Gentlemans *Plain-Dealing*, till we receive a more particular account of this, and were I enclined, I could tell him of many excellent sayings of Men Beard, of his Kidney, I'll gratify him with one at *Feaburgh* when the the Lords of the Justiciary came there in their Circuit, the Prelatical Work Minister exhorted them from the Pulpit to *make their Scarles Robs. yet more Red in the Blood of Phanasicks*, and let no Man doubt of the Truth of this bonily for I shall prove it, if put to it, But I love to reason, but not to recriminat, nor shall I say any thing farther with respect to the Indulgence granted by Tho- King *Charles the 2d.* and a Toleration granted by King *James the 7th.* mas For these have been abundantly spoke to already. But

Siderf Page 15. Our *Plain-Dealer* he pretends *Ministers are selfish in opposing a Son to Toleration, and that they speak against it, lest thereby they lose their Livelihoods:* the Bi- Nay truly Ministers are not so ignorant tho' they were as selfish as he pre- shop ostends, a Toleration will not dispossess Ministers already Established, but they Ork- oppose a Toleration because in their Judgement it would pave the way to ney in Prelacy, and so to Popery, and consequently tendeth to the ruine of the his Di- Protestant Interest in this Nation, all circumstances being considered, unal which calls aloud for Unity, Concord, and Joint Endeavours, and mu- Anno tual assistances of all that are true Protestants, and it must not be forgot 1662. that when King *James* had framed a design of reducing this poor Land to the obedience of the Pope of *Rome* a Toleration was judged a notable expedient.

Page 16. He tells us, *Presbyterian Ministers in K. Ch. the 2d. his time, had Indulgence and Toleration upon very easy Terms without any Oaths, tho' this Gentleman insinuates the quite contrary.* *Plain Dealing* indeed, the Author of the Letter had said if Presbyterian Ministers might have had Indulgence and Toleration upon their taking the Oath of Alledgance, owning the Civil Government, and Praying expressly for the King, there had not been any

any one of them turned out, so far were they from turning themselves out by their own obstinacy as this Author falsely alledgeth. And yet its well known the Government turned out none of the Prelatical Ministers, because they would not submit to Presbytry, but merely because they would not qualify themselves to the Government by Swearing Alledgance, or because they had not prayed for their *Majesties K. W. and Q. M.* And its certain *K. Ch.* his Indulgence as it was of no long continuance depending merely upon the Kings will, without any Act of Parliament for it, so it was of a very narrow extent; For besides those few Ministers that were named and allowed by the Council, none could have the freedom to Exercise their Ministry upon any Terms, without submitting to Prelacy. And therefore its strange to consider, that this *Plain-Dealer* should express himself in such General Terms, as may induce the Reader to think, Presbyterians enjoyed *Indulgence and Toleration* without any Oaths or Hardships, all the days of King *Charles the 2d.* upon very easy terms. So that whatever Title they are pleased to affix to their Books, in *Plain-Dealing*, but unaccountable and unparalleled Jugling with respect to Matters of Fact, and loathsome Repe titions and Tergiversations in point of Reason is to be found in them. Again he will have the Author of the Letter Calumnious and unreasonable in representing the Hardships Presbyterians were put to in being required to renounce their Solemn Covenants &c. But I hope the World will not so judge And I bid defiance to the Author, or any of his stamp, to show that he hath in the least gone beyond the bounds of Truth and Reason, in what he there sets down. Yea, all he wrote is so well founded upon the Acts of Parliament then made, and the cruel Executions of them, that the *Plain Dealer* found the matter so plain, that all that he could do was to Rail upon the Author by calling him Calumnious and Unreasonable, only with respect to Presbyterians their being required to Renounce their Solemn Covenants which was indeed a greivous force upon their Consciences. The *Plain Dealer* propounds some Two or Three Questions. And first he asks whether their Indulged Ministers were obliged to this as a condition to their Indulgence, to this (which is nothing to the purpose, I Answer, they were not, no more than those Prelatical Ministers that are under the Civil protection are obliged to Renounce Episcopacy. 2. Did not Presbyterians provoke the Government by their seditious practices to force them to such a Renunciation? To this I Answer, That the *Plain Dealer* shall never be able to condescend upon any Rebellion, Insurrection, or Seditious practice in any that were called Presbyterians, before they were exasperated and persecuted for adhering to their Principles, cleaving to their Ministers, and because they would not submit to Prelacy: And countenance Prelatical Preachers as is manifest by the date of

of the severe Laws made against them compared with the times of their Insurrections, and has not Solomon told us, *that Oppression will make a Wise man mad.* 3. *He asks how far were they required to renounce these Covenants? Was it not only in so far as they thought those Covenants did infer an Obligation on them to rise in Arms against the King and Government, and I appeal to the Declaration it self.* Act 2. Sess. 3. Parl. 1. Cha. 2. if they were not required particularly to affirm and declare that these Oaths whereof the one was commonly called the National Covenant: And the other Entituled, *A Solemn League and Covenant were and are in themselves unlawful Oaths &c.* And how any Presbyterian could in Conscience submit to this, I can no more tell than how the *Plain Dealer* could in credit say, that they were only required to Renounce these Covenants only in so far as they did infer an Obligation on them to rise in Arms against the King and Government. I must tell him Presbyterians judged the Oath of Supremacy as well as that of the Test unlawful, and as for that of the Declarations at *Sanchar, Lanerick, Queensferry* were they approved by Presbyterians? no surely, and consequently could only in justice militate against those that had an hand in them. As for the cutting off Souldiers, and Mr. *Pearson* Minister of *Carafearn* I justify none of these things, And I am told that to this day, and even after the strictest enquiry it is not known who they were by whom Mr. *Pearson* was Murthered, and its hard to alledge that all the Evils that befall Prelatical Ministers were acted by Presbyterians, it is well enough known a certain Prelatical Minister was Robb'd even by a Brother whom he kindly received and entertained in his House, and yet it were hard to Execute all Prelatical Ministers as Thieves and Robbers, or reckon them Men of profligate principles and Consciences because of that Brother, and it is no less so to persecute all Presbyterians because of the Miscarriage of some that go under that name, nor is it infallibly sure that every Mischief that hath befallen a Prelatical person hath a Presbyterian for its Author.

Page 17. The *Plain Dealer* is very angry with the Gentleman, because he had said in his Letter with what Credit or Conscience can the Prelatists refuse to join in Communion with the Established Church, upon the account of Government, the *Plain Dealer* owns the first Argument used by the Author of the Letter, that it was the constant and known Doctrine of Prelatical Ministers that there ought to be no separation upon account of different Modes and Forms of Government, but alleadgeth it makes nothing against them. Now to Preach in time of Prelacy and to upbraid Presbyterians and tell them that there ought to be no separation upon the account of different Forms of Government was it not to tell them and that in the name of God, and from his word (as they Alledged) that the Communion of the

the Church should not be broken either because of Prelacy or Presbytry, and doth not this make against them, who separate from the Established Church upon that account because the Government thereof is Presbyterian, if this doth not make against them, nothing can. And the bold and incoherent discourse that followeth is merely to deceive the Reader and to make him forget the Argument but not to furnish him with the least solution to it, but to pretend that Doctor *Stillingfleet* did not look upon the Government of the Church to be Ambulatory in his *Irenicum* is to assume a Liberty to call Black White, and White Black, a peice of *Plain Dealing* indeed. I shall not now consider whether the Test was a Self contradictory Oath or not, let them look to that, that Swore it, but I still assert that those who took that Oath, and can own the Queens Authority and Title, are necessarily bound to submit to Presbytry as now Established under the pain of Perjury, why do they not in that Oath Swear to own and maintain the prerogatives of the King. And did not the King claim and the Law assert it to be a prerogative and an inherent Right to the Crown to alter and change the External Government of the Church, yea and did not *K. Ch. the 2d.* by vertue of that prerogative Royal, and inherent Right to the Crown overturn Presbytry and Establish Prelacy in the 62. And therefore its plain if the same King *Ch.* had used his Royal Prerogative in ordering and disposing the External Government of the Church, and in turning it from Prelacy to Presbytry, those that took the Test would have been necessarily obliged to submit to the alteration under the pain of Perjury, and whatever that King might have done, any of his Successors may do, and the obligation of Oaths is perpetual, when they are not to a limited time as the Test was not, and therefor the Charge and Argument is incontrovertible.

Rem. p. 18. He pretends the Author of the Letter proceeds a *Ratione ad Rixas*, railing and charging us all as Enemies to the Civil Government, and adds, *but wherem doth this appear, have we been leading out multitudes of Armed Men to the Fields &c.* ----- To this I Answer, that the Author of the Letter is not so very injurious to the *Plain Dealer*, and Men of his disposition, as to fall a railing against them, for that would have been to deprive them of the only Argument they have against us, but more particularly, may not a Man charge some of the Episcopal persuasion as Enemies to the Civil Government, without railing. Did they not lead out multitudes of Armed Men to the Fields or Mountains, under the Conduct of the late Lord *Dundee* and others? Blowing the Trumpet of Sedition and Rebellion, emitting Declarations, asserting the nullity of their Titles, yea how many have I spoke with who would not so much as in their ordinary discourse Vouchsafe the Name of King and Queen to our late Gracious Sovereign.

[32]
 veraigns, and whatever seeming respect this *Plain-Dealer* and his Fellows pretend to pay to Her present Majesty, Her Title and Right being the same, that their's was; it's not to be doubted but they have the same thoughts of it. And were this Land so unhappy as to have a Competitor for the Crown in it's bosome, or a Man of Reputation and Conduct to appear for him in Fields or Mountains, a probability of the Success would lead them out to give the same evidences of Loyalty to *Queen Ann*, they gave to *K. W.* and *Q. M.* Our Author goes on in his Expostulations, *did they forlooth wage War against King or Queen, and all that serve under them, and in consequence to this, cut off these they could come at.* He Answers, *No,* but I Answer, *Yes* they did, as is evident by what is said above. Again *Did they, viz. Men of his persuasion Discharge the payment of Taxes, yes they did, Nay did they not fall in upon the Collectors of a certain Shire, and carryed off the Cels of that Shire to support an Army against the Government, and were not the Commissioners for Supply for that Shire made countable for that Cels? And was it not suspected that this pregnant instance of Loyalty and Peaceableness was given with the connivance, if not the assistance, of Men too much addicted to a jacobine-Interest in that Shire? This Plain-Dealer doth not refuse but Ministers of his persuasion do pray in their Families for the King, Queen Dowager, and the Generous Prince that maintains them.* Nay he doth not so much as declare that he was never witness to such a thing, which in my opinion he was obliged to do, to clear himself and his intimats of that heavy charge, he only tells us he cannot account for what is done in Mens private Families, nor was he ever so imperiently curious to know, it is the part of busy bodies ----- and thus it is this Gentlemans custom to fling when he is fastest girded: Nay farther the Gentleman in his Letter, having said that in their Meeting-Houses, they Pray for the King, Queen Dowager, and the Gracious Prince that maintains them, this Loyal *Plain-Dealer* is so far from refusing the charge simpliciter, that his Answer is in these words, *but that we pray thus Explicitly in Meeting-Houses, this Author will never be able to make good.* I shall make no comment upon this, for I suppose our *Plain-Dealer* speaks pretty plainly, and Loyally too. And it's as plain that the charge against him was not so very calumnious as he alledgeth, and so long as he doth not refuse that he and his Fellows do Pray *Implicitely* for *K. J.* the 8th &c. I think we need not be much concerned to prove that they do it *Explicitely*, tho' it were never so easy, and as for using *Knights of the Post* as our Author speaks, he well knows that those cannot be lent to us, their assistance is necessary and found expedient to prove sham-plots against *Presbyterians*.

of the
 797

[33]
 I am not much concerned with what is said p. 21. concerning the Addressers and Addreses to the Queen, I refer the Reader to the Gentlemans Letter for satisfaction, only in the 22. P. He pretends the Gentleman in his Letter doth stretch things too far, and the sum of all the *Plain-Dealer* there says, amounts to this, That tho' the States declared Prelacy to be an insupportable Grievance to the Nation, yet they viz. the Prelatists in calling Prelatical Government Apostolical in their Address, do not Arraign the *Claim of Right*, nor yet declare that which is the Queens Title to the Crown Unchristian, However it is plain the Author of the Letter was just, and his reasonings are exact, for to call that an Apostolick Constitution, which the Estates declared an insupportable Grievance to the Nation, is certainly to Arraign the Estates and the *Claim of Right*, and to condemn their Declaration which is the Queens Title to the Crown as Unchristian, for it must be owned, that nothing can be more Unchristian and Irreligious than to declare an *Apostolick Constitution* an *Insupportable Grievance*: And as for his attempt to explain the *Claim of Right*, he hath only thereby exposed his weakness, and rendered himself obnoxious to Censure and punishment.

Rem. P. 13. He joins with others in loading the Nation, as having accession to the Murther of *K. Cha. 1st.* and it's plain those deeds which he reckons accessory, were National Deeds, and therefor he but juggles in attributing them to a certain Party, but all these Transactions are set in their due light, and the Nation is acquitted of that horrid Crime even by Strangers, who have no great inclination to speak very favourably of this Nation in their Writings, but for direction and satisfaction, I refer the Reader to the Gentlemans Letter. However before I leave this point, I must take notice that this *Plain-Dealer* hath done the *Presbyterians* Justice, tho' he intended it not, for (sayeth he) *It is only then a Party in the Nation whom they aim at ----- who being accessary to the taking away of the Life of the King, never yet repented of, nor condemned that horrid, that bold, and insolent Sin.* Now tho' we will not own, and it can never be proven that *Presbyterians*, far less that *Presbyterian* Ministers were accessory to the taking away of the Kings Life, yet it is manifest that they did condemn that horrid, that bold, and insolent Sin, as is sufficiently evidenced by the Publick Records of the Church, as well as by many other Deeds, and Actions, and therefor if we may take this Man's word for it, the *Presbyterians* are not the Party in the Nation aimed at here by the *Plain-Dealer* and his Fellows.

As for the Gracious and repeated Assurances the Queens Majesty hath vouchsafed us, the Author of the Letter improves them to very good purpose,

[34]

pose, and he is far from preferring his humor to the satisfaction of the Queen, were it not a matter of Conscience, and that he judgeth it will be a very great satisfaction to the Queen, to be always found a strict and Religious observer of her Word, and that they do her Majesty a great dishonour that take upon them to assert, she is inclined to make any alteration in the present Establishment, which tendeth only to creat jealousies in the Hearts of her best Subjects, (where I heartily wish she may still have a great interest) he had not so spoke.

This *Plain-Dealer* has a mighty inclination to commend himself and those of his Perswasion, for their peaceable Department and inoffensive Carriage. It seems his Trumpeter is dead, and they are forced to sound their own Praise, but the worst of it is, that it turns to their shame, *they never provoked the Government to deal severely with them, not they forsooth!* And why, because the Government would not be provoked by them, nor could our Rulers be chaffed out of their mild temper by their insolent, and obstinate Behaviour. Why did not our Prelatists Ministers and People contemn and profane Fast-Days, and Thanks-giving-Days, appointed by Authority! Did not the generality of them belch out Treason with every breath in their ordinary Discourse! And in their whole Department evidence the highest contempt! But our wise and mild Governours judged Forbearance the most effectual mean to preserve the Peace: So that in this Sense they had such a *Toleration* as never any set of Men enjoyed, at any time, under any Government. And it is no Argument *that they are not evil doers, but peaceable and quiet*, as he pretends p. 17. because they did not suffer as such. It's certain this is owing merely to the mildness and prudence of the Rulers. It is no Argument that such a Man was no Traitor, because not Execute for Treason.

Rem. P. 24. This *Plain-Dealer* Alledgeth the Gentlemans Letter concludeth with frightful predictions and passionate obtestations, to induce the High Court of Parliament to oppose and refuse a *Toleration*, and then he pretends that all this is founded upon the Gentlemans *imaginary supposition that it will inevitably introduce Episcopacy.* To which I Answer, The *Plain-Dealer* takes an easy way to Answer Arguments, it is easy to call a supposition *imaginary*, but to alledge that the Author of the Letter knows very well that there is no necessary connexion between the Toleration of Prelatical Presbyters and the Exercise of Prelatical Government is somewhat surprizing, for all Men of Sense and Reflexion, must see a necessary connexion between these two according to their Principles, for there can be no Government nor order among them without Prelats. This *Plain-Dealer* needs not tell those that plead against a *Toleration* that the introduction of Prelacy is not intended for

[35]

for they will not beleive him, nor will he tell it to those that plead for a *Toleration*, for that would be contrary to what they have concerted, and make them slacken their diligence, so that I'm very sure, that if he should never so plainly tell us, that the supposition that *Toleration* is craved as a prelude to Prelacy is but *imaginary*, he will not find any thinking Person in the Nation to beleive him. It is easy to assert, That *in time of Prelacy the Government never stretched out its hand against Presbyterians, until first they lifted up the heel against it.* For it is certain the Government stretched out a very cruel hand against Presbyterians, who lifted up the heel no other ways against it, than by Preaching or Praying, and that but privately; And if this be a lifting up of the heel against the Government, and a provocation to it to deal severely with People, our Author is plainly shameless in saying as above, that he and his Fellows never provoked the Government to deal severely with them. Our Author tells us the tender hearted Prelatical Clergy *never excited the Rulers against Presbyterians, but often rescued them from their deserved punishments.* He may as well assert, That the Jesuits or Priests did not excite the Papists in Ireland to Massacre the Protestants, but did rescue them from that deserved punishment, and then complain they were unworthily required for their kindness by the the Protestants, tho' in this I do not charge all the Prelatists. He pretends *Toleration* is opposed out of hatred Presbyterians causely bear to Men of his Principles, and I do declare I bear no hatred to them, I love them and look upon them as Christians, and am disposed to perform all Christian Duties towards them; I am so far from venting Calumnies against them, that I am truly sorry, many times to find my self forced by their bold Assertions to tell necessary Truths in our own Defence, because they reflect upon them, and furnish sport to the Common Adversary; and they should have met with no opposition from me, were it not that the granting of a *Toleration* would prove an unnecessary Rending and Tearing the Church, that is but too much torn and rent in this Land already, and that every Christian is bound to maintain Unity and Concord, for tho' a mutual Forbearance and *Toleration* in lesser Points, ought to be Exercised among Christians still holding the same Communion, yet to separate and to break off Communion upon that head, cannot be allowed, if the Word of God be duly regarded.

And last of all this *Plain-Dealer* will assert, That those who plead against a *Toleration* behave insolently towards their Superiours, and that under the Person of *Esther* they threaten the Queen as *Mordecai* did her. I profess ingenuously if this be not a Calumny I am far mistaken, and I verily doubt if this *Plain-Dealer* can instance any one, I am sure I never read it,

E

it,

it, I never heard it, and therefore I cannot, I dare not believe it: And if any one has said that Presbyterian Ministers will not be blown out of their Pulpits a second time, with the breath of a Proclamation, for (I remember some such expression I have read) tho' I do not justify it, yet the meaning of it may be plainly thus; that in that particular Mans opinion Presbyterian Ministers should not slip from their Possessions so easily, till further Diligence be done against them, I have known Men charged for leaving their Possessions upon a simple Decree before the Lords, such as *Fallors* and *Tack-men*, and that by the Law they may continue their Possession until they be actually ejected, without disregard to Authority. However it ill becomes the *Plain-Dealer* and Men of his kidney, to reproach us with this, or to pretend *Men of his Perswasion both Clergy and Laity will quietly submit as well become Ministers of the Gospel of Peace, and the Faithful Disciples of the Meek and Holy Jesu.* While in the meantime they intrude upon Churches, and planted Congregations in open contempt of all Authority Ecclesiastick or Civil, and that in several places: And contrary to particular Sentences Denounced and Executed against them, yea the Authority of the Parliament is no more regarded by some of them, than if Parliamentary Sentences, as well as Acts against particular Persons, served for no other end but to be trampled upon, so that in this as well as in other things our Author Answers the Character of a *Plain-Dealer* to a wonder. I am very weary in Considering and Exposing the false Reasonings, and sad misrepresentations which I meet with in the Writings of these that are for a Toleration, and therefore am resolved to trouble my self no more. Only I heartily wish that every one would seriously consider, and make Conscience of that great Precept, which God Wrote (with His own Finger, *Thou shalt not bear false Witness against thy Neighbours.* Nor ought it to be forgot, that it is the Character of a Child of God, *he taketh not up an ill report against his Neighbour,* as well as the disposition of the wicked to *say come let us devise devices: come and let us smite with the tongue.*

F I N I S.