

ANIMADVERSIONS ✓

ON

The REASONS of

Mr. *Alex. Creaghead's*

Receding from the

JUDICATURES

OF THIS

CHURCH,

Together with its

CONSTITUTION.

By S A M U E L B L A I R.

I am Debtor both to the Wise, and to the Unwise, Rom. I. 14.

PHILADELPHIA: Printed by WILLIAM BRADFORD, at the Sign of the BIBLE in Second-Street.

ANIMADVERSIONS

On the REASONS of Mr. *Creaghead's* Separation.

I am sensible I owe an Apology to the wiser and more judicious Part of Mankind, for giving either them or my self the Trouble of an Answer to this Performance of Mr *Creaghead*, because of its egregious palpable Weakness in all Respects; his Scope and Design in it is to justify his Separation from the *Presbyterian* Church in these Parts of the World; and when he has gathered together all he can for this Purpose, how manifestly insufficient are all his grounds for his Separation? How inconsequential and illogical are his Reasonings? And how obvious and unaccountable his Misrepresentations? So that it might indeed justly be thought that there wou'd be no need of any publick Remarks on his Reasons, and that it were but an abusing of the Publick

to offer any: But yet I find some People are as weak as Mr. *Creaghead's* Reasons are, and when I consider that I am a Debtor to the Unwise as well as to the Wise, this has determin'd me to this very disagreeable Undertaking. If what is comprehended in this Reason, be not thought sufficient for my Vindication, I own have no better, and only add, that I promise to be short, for there is no need to be tedious; and, upon such as need no help to see the Weakness of Mr. *Creaghead's* PIECE, I shall not impose so much as a desire to read these *Animadversions*, unless they please. I'm aware indeed, that those whose Advantage I immediately aim at, are under great Disadvantages for obtaining Benefit by what I shall say: Some, it may be, are very full of their groundless and unreasonable Prejudices, and so resolutely tenacious of their hasty Opinions, (which they have taken up without due Consideration, or sufficient Use of proper Means for their right Information) that they can't bear to have them in the least contradicted. And very like-

ly some such may conclude by the Time they have read thus far, that they have read enough of this Piece already, and so throw it by in a pet, or if they read on, perhaps it will be only in hopes of finding something to improve against me, and make Advantage of. Let this Notice be a Caution to such Persons to beware of being guided by such Humours; which is all I intend by it. I resolve to give no Offence to exasperate any, unless a plain speaking of the Truth do it. I resolve, with the Lord's Help, in speaking upon Things, so to bear with the rash Follies, Weaknesses, Imperfections and Corruptions of People concerning them, as not to express my self so tartly, and expose them so as the Case wou'd justly bear. Here it is very possible some heady foolish Persons may think, now we have him already, see what's here? He would bear patiently with Peoples Corruptions. Ah! Friends, you and I both must bear so with many Corruptions of others, and of good People too, if we wou'd have the Meekness and Gentleness of

CHRIST;

CHRIST; bear them with a calm Behaviour and hearty Grief. I suppose you think when you see unaccountable Follies and Corruptions in others, about Things on which you spend the chief Current of your Zeal, and which do not lye very near the Heart of Religion neither, that then you may let your Temper take fire, and burn up into Flame and Fury. O Sirs, consider, *The Wrath of Man worketh not the Righteousness of God*, Jam. 1. 20. I hope very few will feed their Prejudices, and make a Bluster with such little silly Cavils as this; but I have known too much of the Management since the Debates I am to touch at, came so much upon the Board, not to know that all possible Advice and Warning this Way is necessary in our Entrance.

I proceed now to Mr. *Creaghead's* Reasons. His first Reason pag. 25. is *Because he supposes that the Confession of Faith which was compos'd by the Rev. Assembly of Divines at Westminster, was never as yet received in this Province, either Presbyterially or Synodically, as*
the

*the Confession of our Faith, in every Article thereof; even to speak of no more at present but the 33 Articles therein contain'd * themselves.*

But ought not Mr. *Creaghead* to have been assured of this first, before he had separated from us on the Account of it, and not have proceeded on a bare Supposition. Again, if he possibly cou'd have been, and actually was perswaded that we never had receiv'd the Westminster Confession, as the Confession of our Faith, in either *Presbytery* or *Synod* in this Province; ought he not to have tried whether we wou'd do it or not, before he had separated from us on this Account? Whereas he declared to the World, in the most open & publick manner, that he separated himself from us, before ever he gave the *Presbytery* the least Account that he had any such Thing in his Thoughts: He had in this Manner separated himself several Weeks before he gave us any Reason for it; neither

did

* I hope I may be allow'd to put the Term *themselves* in place of, *as self*, to make some tolerable sense.

did we ever hear from him beforehand, that he had any such Charges against us, as he saw fit to lay before us in these Reasons, the Matter of two Months after.

But, to pass these unaccountable Branches of his Misconduct, let us consider the Reason itself; and you may observe in it as Mr. *Creaghead* lays it down, that by every *Article of the Confession of Faith*, he means every *Chapter* of it; and so calls the 33 *Chapters* the 33 *Articles*. Whereas every *Chapter* almost contains several *Articles*, all relating to some one general Head. Now whether Mr. *Creaghead* could suppose so or not, that neither *Synod* or *Presbytery* in this Province, did ever receive the Westminster Confession of Faith for the *Confession of their Faith*, in every *Chapter* of it, the Thing it self is manifestly false in fact both Ways: There never was any Scruple, that ever I hear'd of, made by any Members of the Synod, about any Part of our Confession of Faith, but only some particular Clauses in the 20th & 23d *Chap.* and those Clauses were excepted against,

in the Synods Act receiving the Confession of Faith, only in such a Sense; which, for my Part, I believe the Rev. Composers never intended in them; but, which might notwithstanding, readily be put upon them. Mr. *Creaghead* to prove what he supposes, works much upon what is called *The Synod's Preliminary Act about the Confession of Faith, made in the Year 1729.* and in p. 26. tells us, *It is plain from that Act, that the Westminster Confession of Faith was not, nor is not receiv'd in this Province as the Confession of our Faith, by any Synodical or Presbyterial Act.* It seems by this, it must be a prophetic Act, foretelling what would be until the Year 1742. But let that *Act* be thought as insufficient as it can possibly admit, and granting it was not fully sufficient for the securing of an orthodox sound Ministry; yet that is no Argument but that the Confession of Faith has been sufficiently receiv'd by other Acts: And so, in fact, it has been, by the *Synods Act* for that Purpose, I think, in the Year 1730 wherein the *Synod* declares;

All the Ministers of the Synod now present, (except one that declar'd himself not prepared) after proposing all the Scruples any of them had to make against any Articles and Expressions in the Confession of Faith, and larger and shorter Catechisms of the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, have unanimously agreed in the Solution of those Scruples, and in declaring the said Confession and Catechisms, to be the Confession of our Faith; except only some Clauses in the 20th and 23d Chapters, concerning which Clauses the Synod do unanimously declare, that they do not receive these Articles in any such Sense, as to suppose the civil Magistrate hath a controuling Power over Synods, with Respect to the Exercise of their ministerial Authority; or Power to persecute any for their Religion; or in any Sense contrary to the Protestant Succession, to the Throne of Great-Britain. Here you see the Synod have received the whole Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms, as the Confession of their Faith without any Objection or Difficulty, save only some Clauses in the 20th and 23d Chapters; which

Clauses,

Clauses, it seems the *Synod* supposed might be so understood, as maintaining, that Magistrates have a controuling Power over *Synods* in the Exercise of their Ministerial Authority, a Power to persecute Persons for their Religion, and that the *Popish Pretender* had a Right to the Throne of *Great Britain*, and in these Senses, they declare they do not receive those Clauses. And now, if the declaring against receiving those Clauses in any such Senses as these, be a good Objection against the *Synod*, let any sober Protestant, especially *Presbyterian*, judge. This controuling Power of the civil Magistrate over *Synods*, over-ruling and hindering them in the Exercise of their Ecclesiastical Authority, is a great Part of that unlawful Supremacy and headship over the Church, which the *Presbyterian Church* has always declar'd against ; and yet Mr. *Creaghead* finds fault with the *Synod* for this (*pag. 8. of his Preface*) which I am perswaded he wou'd not do if he knew what he said. In the same Page he says, " the civil Magistrate has certainly a Power to punish Persons

for entertaining erroneous Principles.” That the Magistrate has Power to punish Persons, if they will spread and teach their Heresies to the perverting of the Gospel, and poisoning the Church I do not deny, but that he may punish Persons, merely for entertaining erroneous Principles, is a groundless unreasonable Notion.

Moreover, in the Year 1736, the *Synod* declare, that they have adopted and still do adhere to the *Westminster* Confession, Catechisms and Directions, without the least Variation or Alteration, and without any regard to the Distinctions in the foremention'd Preliminary Act. It seems some People were Jealous from the first preliminary Act (without knowing or considering that the *Synod* had afterwards agreed in the Solution of all the Scruples which any of them had concerning any Articles or Expressions in the Confession of Faith, and so had unanimously adopted and received it in a fix'd determinate Manner, as before related) that the *Synod* were about to vary and Alter the Confession and Directory, and set up new Principles

Principles of Religion and Government contrary thereto. In Answer to which jealousies, the *Synod* declares, that they adhere to the *Westminster* Confession, Catechisms and Directory, without the least Variation or Alteration : Which view of the Case takes away all Mr. *Creaghead's* pretence for calling this Declaration notoriously False, (*Pag. 7. 8. of his Preface.*) Mr. *Creaghead* may readily remember that when our two *Presbyteries* were met together, *Jun 3. 1741.* after the Separation in the Synod, we declar'd and recorded, that we adhered to the *Westminster Confession of Faith, Catechisms, and Directory*, as closely and fully as ever the *Synod of Philadelphia* in any of their publick Acts and Agreements about them : He may likewise remember, that the first time our *Presbytery* met by it self, after the said Separation, at *Whiteclay-Creek*, we did unanimously agree and declare the *Westminster Confession of Faith*, and *Catechisms*, to be the Confession of our Faith, without any Consideration of, or Relation to any former Act of *Synod* whatsoever.

And

And now after all this, what thinking Person can possibly believe with Mr. *Creaghead*, that the *Westminster Confession of Faith*, has never been receiv'd by *Synod* or *Presbytery* in this Province. And for farther Satisfaction concerning us in this point, I refer to the Act of our *Presbytery* when Mr. *Creaghead* gave in these Reasons to us; which Act he has chiefly publish'd in his Preface, with a Number of very weak Remarks upon it. And to the Judicial Declaration made this same Year, by both our *Presbyteries* conjunctly, lately publish'd.

His 2d. Reason is pretty much a-kin to the 1st. And indeed had he put them both together, they had been both weak enough for one. " The 2d Reason, says he, of my receding from the present Ecclesiastical Judicatures of this Church, as they are now constituted, is, because the aforesaid abominable Act (1729) is still the very Ground and Foundation of the Church in these Parts; it being the very Terms upon which it is pretended, that the *Westminster Confession of Faith* was, and is still *Synodically* and *Presbyterially*

byterially received &c.” p. 27. 28. How little is in this Reason, sufficiently appears from what I have offer'd already. I only add here, that the Doctrine contain'd in the *Westminster Confession, Catechisms* and *Directory*, which is the Doctrine of God's Word, JESUS CHRIST himself being the chief Corner Stone, is the very Ground and Foundation of the Church in these Parts, from which Mr. *Creaghead* has been pleas'd to break off.

The “ third Reason, says he, (*pag.* 28.) of my receding or withdrawing from the present Judicatures of this Church, as they are now constituted, is, because of another corrupt *Synodical Act*, made in the Year 1734. yet unrepeal'd, which is as follows, “ We are a particular Church and not to be a Part of any particular Church in the World with which we are united, by the joint Exercise of Church Government; and are not accountable to the Judicial Enquiry of any Superiour Ecclesiastical Judicatures upon Earth. Therefore, if we do not exert the Authority inherent in us, maintaining the Purity of Gospel-Truths, it's not in the
Power

Power of any Superior Ecclesiastical Judicatures authoritatively to call us in question for our Neglect, or for our Errors or Heresies if we should be corrupted with them." This Act or Declaration (or whatever it may be call'd) of the *Synod*, or Commission of the *Synod*, is in Mr. *Creaghead's* Account very corrupt indeed. He can't perceive, if it be true; but we have renounced our Baptismal Vows in some Measure; for then and there, says he, "we were received as a part of Christ's visible Church in our native Land." He asserts it is an evident disowning of the *Westminster* Confession entirely in all the Parts of it; because it seems we cannot possibly be of one and the same Faith with another particular Church, without being a part of it, so as to be united with it in the joint Exercise of Church Government. Here is odd sort of Reasoning indeed, especially from one under the Character of a Minister of the Gospel; enough to surprize any one that has but common understanding. I am truly grieved for Mr. *Creaghead's* sake, but above all for Religion

ligions sake, that it is so expos'd to the Contempt of vain Men, by the Weakness of this Performance of his. Again he says; *in this Act, wonderful Pride is discover'd, but one step below the awful Arrogancy of the Pope of Rome, he Arrogates a Power over all civil and ecclesiastical Authority, the Synod are beyond all Ecclesiastical only.* The Ground of this Charge is the Synod's saying, *that they are a particular Church, not united with any other particular Church in the World, by the joint Exercise of Church Government; and so not accountable to the judicial Enquiry of any superior Ecclesiastical Judicatures upon Earth.* If the Synod's meaning in this Minute were, that there cou'd not possibly be any superior Judicature conven'd, according to the true Plan of Church Government, that cou'd authoritatively call this, or any other particular Church to account for Errors or Heresies, I wou'd condemn it as well as Mr. Creaghead: For doubtless one particular national Church; if it degenerates into Errors and Heresies, may regularly be call'd to account by a Ju-

C dicature

dicature made up of Church Officers commissioned for that Purpose, from several such Particular Churches; tho' such a Thing for the most part, is always impracticable to be done, by Reason of the great Distance of the Places, and on many other Accounts: But if the Meaning of the Minute be, as I think it plainly is, from the Scope and Connexion of the Words, that the *Synod* being the Representative Body, and highest Judicature of the *Presbyterian* Church in these Parts of the World, and not being united to any other particular Church, in the joint Exercise of Church Government with it, there is therefore no superior Church Judicature over this *Synod*, authoritatively to call it to account, either here or in any other particular single Church; then it is both just and True. For such particular distinct Churches not united together in the joint Exercise of Government, but having the whole governing and ordering of themselves, within themselves separately, are but equal to one another: The one has not a superior Authority over another

to

to call to it an Account, any more than one Congregational Session has such superior Authority over another Session, or one particular *Presbytery* over another *Presbytery*. To convince Mr. *Creaghead* of his mistakes here, I wou'd ask him, whether the particular Church of *Scotland* in that Kingdom, be accountable or not to any superior Judicature, of any other particular Church in the World? If he says no, then by his Rule the Church of *Scotland* is but one Step below the awful Arrogancy of the Pope of *Rome*, beyond all Ecclesiastical Authority. If he say it is inferior and accountable to some other Church, I wou'd know, which that Superior Church is, and how it came by that Prerogative, and what other Church is again Superior to it, to which it must be accountable? and so on from one to another till we come to the last Supreme Church of all; which I think will be but little *below the Arrogancy of the Pope indeed*, claiming a Supreme Jurisdiction over all the Churches in the World. Thus it is Manifest that particular Sister Churches, in dif-

ferent Countries and Nations, are equal to one another in Power and Authority, and so cannot be accountable to one another, by any Superior Authority of one over another, but must be accountable only to higher Judicatures than either of them singly, made up of the several Churches. I wou'd farther desire to know of Mr. *Creaghead*, why two particular Churches can't possibly be of the very same Faith, and both have the very same Confession of Faith, without being united together in the joint Exercise of Government, so as that one of them must have a Superiour Authority over the other, and how it comes to be a renouncing of our Baptism to remove from one such Church to another? If Mr. *Creaghead's* Reasoning here were reduced to Rule, how glaring wou'd it look. The *Synod* declare the Church in this Country, is a particular Church, not to be a part of any particular Church in the World with which it is united, by the joint Exercise of Church Government; therefore they have renounced in some Measure their Baptism. And the Reason of the
 Consequence

Consequence is, because some of them were born and baptized in *Ireland*, then and there they were received by Baptism as Members of the visible Church of Christ in their Native Land. And now, does not this well shew the Connexion between the Antecedent and Consequent in the Argument? O, amazing folly! Were it not that the Persons, for whose use I write, do not understand the Method of reasoning by artificial Rules, I might go on in the same Way and shew how ridiculously inconsequential are all his other Consequences. As to give only one Instance more this way, the *Synod* say, *they are not a Part of any particular Church in the World, with which they are united by the joint Exercise of Church Government*; therefore they are not of the same Faith with any other Church; and do disown the *Westminster Confession* entirely in all the Parts of it: And the Reason of the Consequence is, because they are not united with any other Church as a Part of it, by the joint Exercise of Government, and because the *Westminster Confession* is the Confession
of

of another Church, *viz*, the Church of *Scotland*. Now, what Connexion have any of these Propositions with one another? What hinders that two Churches cannot be of the same Faith? Why but the *Westminster* Confession may be the Confession of two Churches or of ten, as well as of one? What impossibility is there in it?

But Mr. *Craghead* finds another dreadful awful Thing in this Act yet. *By this Act*, says he, *there appears to be a real Encroachment upon the Royal Prerogatives of the Son of God, who alone has all the Power and Authority of his Church INHERENT in himself; neither ever had the best Synod or Presbytery on Earth, nor ever shall have any Power or Authority over any Part of God's Inheritance inherent in them.-----The Power or Authority that any Synod or Presbytery has, is derived from Christ, he is the Spring and Fountain, &c.* Here is some more strange sort of arguing, all from a mistake of the meaning of a Word. Alas, must Mr. *Craghead* be told at this Time of Day, what is the Meaning of the Word *Inherent*

Inherent. He plainly imagines it signifies a thing being in another preliminarily and originally, as in its Spring and Fountain, whereas it only signifies simply, a being in any Thing : And so there is an Authority of Ecclesiastical Government and Discipline, *Inherent* in every Church residing in it, and belonging to it ; which Authority is derived from Christ, the Head and Fountain of all Authority in his Church. Is it not affecting to see how rashly and confidently Mr. *Creaghead* goes on with all this lumber of Mistake and Absurdity ? Has he not by his own Rules of reasoning renounced in some Measure his Baptism, disown'd the *Westminster* Confession in all the Parts of it, and discover'd wonderful Pride, but one Step below the Pope's Arrogancy ? For has he not openly enough declar'd, that he is united to no Church in the World by the joint Exercise of Church Government, unless it be his own Session ? and that he will be accountable to no superior Judicatures on Earth ? I can be under no Temptation that I know of to justify this Act of the *Synod*, if it were

Corrupt

Corrupt and Sinful ; by the date it bears, it was made before I had any concern with the *Synod* as a Member, and I don't remember that ever I read it or heard it read, but in these Papers of Mr *Creaghead*, I'm apt to think that whatever was done this way, was occasion'd by the Affair of Mr, *Hemphill*, who at that time was Preaching most heretical false Doctrine, and met with his due reward from the *Synod*: The Act, or whatever it may be call'd, is manifestly an Argument of the *Synod* for their taking Care in such a Case, seeing there was no superior Judicature to inspect over them and call them to account for Neglect &c. And yet after all I'm informed there never was any such Thing judicially concluded upon in the *Synod*: How that is I can't tell: If it be so, Mr. *Creaghead* has only taken it upon trust from others Information. Mr. *Creaghead*'s fourth Reason is the Minute of our two *Presbyteries* conjunctly, *Aug.* 1741. upon a Paper given in to us from several private People. This minute he has publish'd at large (p. 5. 6. of his Preface) it seems he is highly displeas'd

pleas'd with this Minute, because it did not answer the Design of the chief Promoters of that Paper : These were Persons who refused Communion with us in all Church-Ordinances, on Account of their peculiar Opinions about the solemn League and Covenant ; and their main Design, as is plain from the Paper, was to get us to renew that Covenant. It is really admirable to me that such Persons will not see and consider, how fruitless and unreasonable it wou'd be for a few private People themselves alone, to renew and swear to that Covenant, which was a League and Covenant between three Kingdoms, mutually entred into by them, for the settling and establishing of one uniform Religion in them all, this was the End and Design of it ; and wou'd our swearing it by ourselves attain this End ? Certainly no. Could such an Action of a few private Persons ratify and confirm a League and Covenant-Agreement between several Nations ? Moreover the aforesaid principal Managers about that Paper, were upon a Plan ; which I am since satisfied, some, whom

D

they

they got to join them in subscribing it, were not aware of, viz, of renouncing and disclaiming all Subjection and Obedience to the Present civil Government over us, and all Church Communion with such as will not join with them therein; which are very sinful antisciptural Extravagancies. And now, if Mr. C. will be displeas'd with us, for discountenancing such Procedures as these we cannot help it. Mr. C. appears to be but an indifferent Historian as well as Logician; when he tells us, pag 32. *That the generallity, both of Ministers and People in Charles IIId's Reign, took the Oaths of Supremacy, Abjuration, and all the sinful Oaths then impos'd on Presbyterians:* For the Thing it self is false in Fact. And how unjust and unreasonable is his saying, *That, we are treading in the very same Steps, and holding on the very same Course (or rather worse) of Apostacy, Backsliding and Defection, that such Ministers and People did tread in, who comply'd with all the Defections in that Reign?* One that will say this, for any thing I see, may say any Thing that's contrary to all Experience.

Do we affirm and swear by solemn Oath, that the King's Majesty is the only supreme Governor in all Causes, as well Ecclesiastical as Civil? Do we Subject our selves to be governed by Diocesan Bishops in our ministerial Office? If we do none of these Things, how are we treading in the very same Steps with such as did them? If these Things were required of us by Authority, as they were in that bloody Period, I trust several wou'd now, thro' Grace, as well as then, yield up their Lives before they wou'd contradict their Consciences, and betray the Interests of Christ's Church? But Mr. C. I find, in his Preface, has an Argument *ad hominem* to prove us guilty of all the Apostacy, Persecution and Blood-shed carried on at that Time. Our *Presbytery* had said in their Minute, about the *Solemn League and Covenant*, that the Breaking of it, after it was entred into with that Establishment of a Prelatical, or Episcopal Church-Government contrary to it, and that furious Persecution and shedding of the Blood of the Saints that ensued upon it, were very crying and

awfully aggravated Sins before God, for which we have still Reason to fear the awful Stroaks of his Righteous Judgments. Upon this Mr. C. offers an Argument to this Purpose, (*pag. 20 of his Preface*) *If we have still Reason to fear the Stroke of Justice for those evils, then we are some way guilty of them, or else God must be charged with injustice.* As if it were contrary to the Justice of God, that such as are innocent of the Crimes, for which publick national Strokes are inflicted, should, notwithstanding, be involved in the common Calamity; and, as if God could not in Justice, inflict judicical Strokes, for the Sins of a former Generation, upon a following Generation without their being guilty of all the very same Sins with the former, tho' they might be guilty of other Sins as Provoking. Who the many among us are, pretending to be *Presbyterians*, as he says, that avowedly Vindicate the complying of Ministers and People with that dreadful Apostacy I know not; for my Part, I never met with one such, and hope I never shall.

His 5th Reason, he says, is because he
imagines

Imagines that neither the Government nor Discipline of the Church is rightly managed by us. And he proceeds to give his Instances of this Mismanagement; and first, *that when we were thrust out by a part of the Synod, we did not then begin to consider something of our Principles, and of some Plan that we would adhere to in the Government of the Church.* This is really an odd Story too! As if we had had our Principles yet to seek at that time of Day: As if we had then to begin to consider of them, what they should be. When we were unjustly and arbitrarily thrust out by a part of the Synod, we had no new set of Principles, nor any new Plan of Church Government then to devise; we were settled in these Things long before that; we then declared our Adherence still to the *Westminster* Confession of Faith, Catechisms and Directory, as before related; we declar'd it to be our Duty in those Circumstances, as Ministers and Rulers in God's House, to carry on the Government of the Church according to the Rules of *Presbyterian* Government; and for that purpose, settled

tled all the Members of our two *Presbyteries* respectively, and appointed both *Presbyteries* to meet together statedly, as our highest Judicature inform of a *Synod* ; as may be seen in our Declaration this present Year, now publish'd. Mr. C. Charges us with another Piece of mismanagement, *This Year I think*, says he, *we were entirely to blame, because, altho' we had appointed a Synodical meeting, we trifled away our Time doing nothing until the generality of People were quite wearied out &c.* Mr. C. knows well enough that we had agreed before, at the Meeting of the *Synod* that Year to enter our complaint against those who had protested against us, and to claim our Right as Members of the *Synod*, which appear'd to be reasonable and needful, particularly for our own Vindication, the which, when the *Synod* met, we accordingly did ; and because, for the Prosecution of this Affair, and waiting the Issue of it, we cou'd not Judicially meet by our selves according to Appointment, till a few Days after the appointed Time, hence is this Charge of Mr.

Creaghead

Creaghead. And now how Groundless it is, let the World judge? For a fuller understanding of this Matter I refer to the above-mention'd Declaration.

What are these Irregularities of Mr. *Rowland*, and how little Church-Discipline is exercised towards him for them, all which are so evident to Mr. C. I do not know: But I know tis easy to make things of this kind very evident to such as are under the Government of Prejudice, tho' never so groundless. As another Instance of corrupt Management, he says, when it was told that one of our Presbytery had said, *that whosoever swore unto the Directory, he or they were perjured, yet this must be buried and brought to no trial* How little is in this Reflection will presently appear: When this matter was told before the *Presbytery*, the Member who shou'd have express'd himself so, was not present; and it was probably suppos'd that the Conversation between said Member, and one or two other Men, might have been (which I find since to have been indeed the Case) about Swearing to observe every particular Prescription

Prescription and Sentence within the Directory; some of which Prescriptions cou'd not now, in our Time and Circumstances be practis'd; and Instances of this sort were given, and therefore it was tho't proper to refer the Person or Persons dissatisfied, to speak with that Member before the next meeting of the *Presbytery*, to see if they cou'd not get Satisfaction in the matter which they were dissatisfied about; which if they cou'd not obtain that Way, then they might bring the matter to a judicial hearing. And now, what Ground is there in this for a Charge of Corruption in the Management of Government and Discipline? If Mr. C. thinks that he can swear to perform and practise every particular Direction and Sentence in the Directory without perjuring himself afterwards, I wish he wou'd allow himself to think the Matter over again, without rash Humour: if he so swear, he must either perjure himself, in the Common Acceptation of the Word, or else he must pray for such as are dead; for therein it is directed to pray for the Comforting of the afflicted

QUEEN of *Bohemia*, Sister to King *Charles*, and for the Restitution and Establishment of the Illustrious Prince *Charles*, Elector Palatine of the Rhine, to all his Dominions and Dignities; both which Persons are now dead. It is truly strange that some Persons will not see, that some Things which may be proper and duty in one Time and Circumstance, in other Times and Circumstances may be Un-
 suitable and Impracticable. Farther, if Mr. C. so Swears to the Directory, he must pray “*for all in Authority, especially for the KING’S Majesty, that GOD would make him rich in Blessings, both in his Person and Government, &c.*” which I doubt Mr. C. will not readily do. He may moreover consider, whether he observes this Direction viz. *Because the Prayer which Christ taught his Disciples is not only a pattern of Prayer, but itself a most Comprehensive Prayer; we recommend it also to be used in the Prayers of the Church.*” and whether he always Marries People in Places appointed by Authority for publick Worship, according to the Directory.

Now if any one shou'd assert, from what I have said on this Case, that I have said that the Directory enjoyns us to pray for the Dead, what a Perverision would this be ? and what an evil Disposition wou'd it discover ? And yet I don't much expect to pass free of as unjust Reflections.

Mr. *Creaghead's* last Charge of Mismanagement in Discipline against us, is, *That we did not sufficiently Censure one of our Members, for not attending several of our Presbyteries and Appointments.* Surely he has a good Will to bring in Instances of Corrupt Management against us, and is very scarce of them too, when he brings in such a one as this. How Strange and Lamentable is it, that we shou'd meet with such Treatment from Mr. *Creaghead* ? It were easy to remove the Reproach he tries to cast upon us here, but indeed I do not think it worth the Pains, it is a poor Reason for breaking off Communion if it were ever so True.

Mr. C. for a sixth Reason of his Separation, tells us, *No such thing has been obtain'd*

tain'd as to get us judicially to tell, what Part or Parts of the Westminster Confession we own and Maintain, or what Parts we disown and deny; what I have offer'd on his first Reason fully Answers this. How unjust is it in Mr. C. to talk at this rate, as if we deny'd Part of the Confession of Faith, and wou'd not tell what Part that was, but endeavour'd to hide some false Principles, so that for what any Body knew, we might be as gross Hereticks as any in the World? He admires, he says, what Principles we are generally of; but I'm sure I admire more how Mr. C. cou'd say so, for he can't be Ignorant what Principles we are of; and he knows that we Maintain and Preach the true Gospel of Jesus Christ, whatever unreasonable Prejudice and Humour leads him to say. And to the same spring of Humour and Prejudice I must attribute his saying, That several Ministers give dreadful Hints of their Mind concerning the Confession. As to the Ministers of our two Presbyteries, I'm well satisfied these dreadful Hints are just only his own dreadful Chimara's and Fancies.

His seventh Reason is, *because*, he says, *we in Words deny Part of the Directory, and our Obligation to the Covenants consider'd as Covenants.* It is really pretty hard to understand his meaning here, what he means by denying Part of the Directory; and harder yet to understand what he means by denying our Obligation to the Covenants considered as Covenants. As to the Scheme and Pattern laid down in the *Westminster Directory* for the Worship of God, and Government and Discipline of the Church, we deny no Part of it; as may be seen at large in our late Declaration. We say, indeed, there are some Directions in the Directory, such as are merely accidental to the standing Plan, for Worship and Government, which were suitable to the State and Time that the Churches in the three Kingdoms were then in, which are not so now; some of which I have already mention'd upon his 5th Reason: And if Mr. C. will call this a denying Part of the Directory, we can't help it; but I am sure it is improper enough to call it so: And if this be denying it, he

he must own that he denies part of it himself, as I have shew'd before. Nay, according to his Principles, I think he must really and properly deny a Part of it, which directs to pray for all in Authority, especially for the King's Majesty, &c. According to his Principles he cannot think that this Direction was right or suitable in that Time and Circumstance, because that King whom the *Wistminster* Assembly directed to be so acknowledged and prayed for, viz. King CHARLES 1st, never took the *Solemn League and Covenant*, but always appeared averse to it. And now judge who it is that properly denies Part of the Directory, Mr. *Creaghead* or we. We Profess and Maintain the self same Religion which was engaged to by the Kingdoms of *Scotland* and *England* in the *Solemn League and Covenant* in all the Parts of it, in Doctrine, Worship, Government and Discipline, as the true Religion of Jesus Christ in all these Parts of it. And how do we then deny, and endeavour to overthrow, as he says, the whole covenanted Reformation, when

when we profess and maintain the very Thing? And how can Mr. C. justify his Separation from us, when we Maintain the very same Religion, which he Professes to be for? If his meaning, in our being obliged to the Covenants consider'd as Covenants, be, that we are obliged to profess and adhere to this Religion in all its foremention'd Branches, by our Progenitors engaging themselves to it in those Covenants; surely either this, or the contrary Opinion about this Matter, is but a Circumstance about Religion, not of such Weight or Moment as to rent and divide the Church upon: While it is the true Religion that such as be of this Opinion, believe they are this way obliged to: and such as may be of the other Opinion, believe they are obliged to the very same Religion by the Authority of God in his Word. In this Case the same Religion is profess'd by both, & both may be equally conscientious and steadfast in their adherence to it, if the authority of God be of sufficient weight, which sure Mr. C. will not deny. Let Mr. C. then consider whether

it

it is Religion itself, or meerly a Circumstance concerning it that he is so hot about, as to endeavour to rent the Church in pieces for it.

And now I am come to his eighth and last Reason, which, he says, *flows from a Letter which goes under Mr. Gilbert Tennent's Name, publish'd lately in the News-Papers.* This Letter Mr. C. very much preverts, and discovers very much of a prejudiced Spirit upon it. When Mr. *Tennent* found that such a Letter of his was publish'd, and so misconstrued by many, he publish'd an explication of it to remove such misunderstanding; which I shall here insert, as sufficiently answering all Mr. *Creaghead's* Exceptions. It is as follows,

Mr. Franklin,

F*Orasmuch as a Letter of mine to Mr. Dickenson the last of February, together with a Postscript, lately printed in the Boston weekly News-Paper, has occasioned various Reflections, I have thought it not improper (being thereto excited by some Friends) to shew my Intention in some Passages contained therein, which are*
more

more liable to Misconstruction. I profess that when I wrote the aforesaid Letter and Postscript, I had not the least Thought of their Publication; neither have I at any Time consented thereto; and truly the Postscript was wrote in much Haste.

As to my Confession of Mismanagement in the Affair of Debate with the Synod, it respected only the Defects which I conceived attended my Manner of Performing, what I did then and do still look upon to be Duty. I was not then, nor have not been since, convinced that the Matter or Substance of what I contended for was wrong; and the Words of the Letter considered in their Connection, will easily bear this Sense.

As to the Postscript, altho' I question not Mr. Davenport's Piety and Integrity, and hope that he has been an Instrument of special Good to divers Persons; yet I cannot approve of some of his Methods of Proceeding (according to the Representation which many give of them) and, particularly, all the Instances in the Postscript, are in my Opinion very exceptionable and of hurtful Tendency.

It seems to me very unreasonable that a-
ny

nothing should be made a Term of Communion which cannot certainly be known by the Church; and such doubtless, are Men's gracious Experiences, the secret Recesses of the Heart and Springs of Action, are only open to the all penetrating Eye of God: Yet seeing a probable Knowledge of Men's States towards God, may be attained by an Examination of Men's Principles, Experiences and Practice, Ministers no doubt ought to enquire into the State of their Flock, and deal faithfully and discretely with Persons in a private Way, according as Things appear to them.

As to the Practice of setting up separate Meetings, upon the supposed Unregeneracy of the Pastors of Places; it is, in my Judgment, of unhappy Consequence to the Church's Peace and Purity, when the Ministers, supposed to be unconverted, are sound in Principle, regular in Practice and Favourers of the Work of God.

But when the Ministers conspire to blacken and oppose habitually the late memorable Revival of God's Work in this Land, and Brand the Whole of it with Terms of the utmost Contempt and Ignominy: Then I see not how any that fear God can sit contentedly

tentedly under their Ministrations (if they persist as aforesaid) without becoming accessory to their crimson Guilt.

Altho' there be no Probability of unconverted Ministers being near so serviceable to the Salvation of Mankind, as Persons of another Character; yet, doubtless, the sovereign God makes their labours of some Use, at Times, for the Instruction and Reformation of Mankind.

As to the Practice of openly exposing Ministers, sound in Doctrine, blameless in Life, and Favourers of God's Work (who are supposed by some to be unconverted) in publick Discourses, in their own Pulpits, by calling of them by their Names, pronouncing Sentence against their internal State and exhorting their People to forsake their Ministry; this I think is a very extraordinary and unaccountable Method of Proceeding, without any Precedent that I know of in Scripture or Church History; it directly tends to tear the Body of Christ in Pieces and to procure a manifold and pregnant Injury to all the valuable Interests of sincere Religion.

As to the Practice of sending out unlearned Men into the Ministry, in ordinary
Cases

Cases, upon the Supposition of their Piety, it has been always, and still is my Sentiment concerning it, that it justly deserves the Character given it in the Postscript.

Likewise, I cannot perceive either Decency or Expediency, in singing in the Streets; but on the contrary, it seems to minister Occasion to the Adversaries of Religion to revile and blaspheme.

In fine, altho I freely own the absolute Necessity of supernatural Illumination and divine Energy, in order to the saving Instruction of Men's Minds and Renovation of their Hearts; yet I cannot but disclaim all Pretence to immediate Inspiration or objective Revelation, all following of immediate Impulses without Consulting the Word of God, and the Dictates of right Reason, as an enthusiastical and perilous Ignis Fatuus, which may lead its deluded Votaries into the strangest Absurdities in Opinion, and most enormous Evils in Practice.

G. TENNENT.

New-Brunswick,
August 19. 1742.

P. S. N. B. *The Postscript of the Letter to Mr. Dickinson, was occasioned by a Report of Mr. Davenport's extraordinary Conduct, and had a direct Reference thereto. It may be also observ'd, that there are several Words misprinted in the aforesaid Letter and Postscript, such as Pickists for Pietists; base, for Basis; of such, for to such; clear View, for clearer View; the last Errata considerably alters the Sense.*

G. T.

Now after this Explication which Mr. T. has given of his own Letter I need say no more upon it in answer to Mr. C. only that I know Mr. C. saw this Explication long before he published these his Reasons; so that one wou'd think he cou'd hardly miss knowing that he wronged Mr. T. in what he had said upon his Letter; and yet he publish'd what he had drawn up upon it without Alteration. And moreover, altho, Mr. C. brings in this Letter as one of the Reasons of his breaking off from our Communion, yet in reality it was
not

not any of the Reasons on which he broke off, for he had done it openly enough before ever he saw or knew any thing of such a Letter. I shall only add this one Enquiry to Mr. C. about it, *whether he thinks that to be the right Way of managing the Government and Discipline of the Church, to start and fly off from Communion when ever he supposes a Member to have done amiss, without ever attempting to bring the Matter to a judicial Tryal?*

And now I have gone through all Mr. C's Reasons for his separating from us, and *valeant quantum valere possunt*, let all the Weight be allow'd them that reasonably can be, and let any considerate sober Person judge whether he had sufficient Reason and Cause to do as he has done. And whether it be Right in the Sight of God to go with him into the same groundless Separation. O Sirs, consider the many pressing Injunctions of Christ and his Apostles to Unity and Brotherly Love among his People. How displeasing it is to our Dear Lord, and injurious to his Interests, causelessly to rent
and

and tear his Church in Pieces. How it mars the Benefit and Success of the preached Gospel, and hinders the mutual Comfort and Usefulness of God's People to one another, nay, makes them rather Hurtful and grievous to each other, and Oh, how does it please and harden the Enemies of vital Godliness. Indeed the hurt of it to Christ's Interest, and our own Souls cannot be express'd. Behold with Lamentation and Grief of Heart the sad Effects of it which your Eyes may see. Come and lament with me while I go on to observe, that altho' Mr. C. in his Reasons only speaks of receding and withdrawing from our Judicatures, yet he has not only withdrawn from being a Member of our Judicatures, but refuses all Christian Communion with us in any Holy Ordinances, and endeavours with all his Force to perswade People that it is a dreadful Sin to hear any of us preach the Gospel. What unjust, false and horrible representations does he make of us! As very corrupt in the Principles of
 Religion

Religion without being able to shew one Doctrine that we are corrupt in, as base Time servers, joyned with the Whore, and one Body with the Romish Harlot, that we can hum and haw about Conviction and Conversion, that they will say, *why is not the Lord with us? But how can the Lord be with them, when they are profess'd Enemies to him?* Thus, by one Dash, he denies all that Work to be of God which he has been pleased to carry on by our Ministry; and by such Methods as these he endeavours to raise poor credulous and rash Hearers to a warm Abhorrence of all Communion, less or more, with God's Servants and People. The Names and Characters which he and some of his Communion are pleased to bestow upon us, I shall not please our common Adversaries with relating; and oh, that I could bury it all in the Dust forever; but alas, it cannot be hid: The Words of the Famous Mr. *Haliburton* on his dying Bed (who died in the Year 1712) whose Praise is in the Church for his Learning but above all for his great grace and Piety)

Piety) respecting Rents and Divisions, are worthy our Consideration. Upon Occasion of an Oath that was then going thro', he thus expresses himself, (see the Memoirs of his Life pag. 230) " As to the Matter of the Oath, " let every one be fully perswaded in his " own Mind. As these who are clear " shou'd guard against every Thing " that may endanger the Peace of the " Church, so likewise others who " are not clear, cannot get over the " Difficultys, and cannot in Conscience " and Duty comply; they are bound " in Conscience not only to abstain " from separating, but laboriously to convince their People that it strikes " at the Root of Church Communion. " If Ministers go on in separating Courses, the Result of it will be, People " will be taken up with the Publick " and forget private Religion; whoever " they are that do so, they will have " an Accession to this: We shall have " People running about seeking to have " their Ears gratified that love not the " Power of Godliness: We'll get a publick
 " lick