

"or indirectly, the prejudice or subversion of the same; and I promise that I shall follow no divisive course from the present order in the church; renouncing all Doctrines, Tenets, and opinions whatsoever contrary to or inconsistent with the said Doctrine, Worship, Discipline or Government of this Church."
"I disown all Popish, Arian, Socinian, Arminian, Erastian, and other doctrines, tenets, and opinions whatsoever, contrary to or inconsistent with the foresaid Confession of Faith."

I also ask you to bear in mind. Firstly,—That the form of Church Government, which your said Minister, Elders, and Deacons have sworn to "maintain and defend," is Presbyterian.

Secondly,—That the worship when they were so sworn, was composed—as it always must be—of two parts, namely, form and substance; and which form and substance, when they were so sworn, consisted in the sitting (the form) and singing of psalms, (the substance.) The standing (the form) and joining though not audibly with the minister in his extempore prayers, (the substance.) The sitting (the form) and hearing read by the minister a portion of the bible, (the substance.) The sitting (the form) and hearing a portion of the Word explained by the minister, which is commonly called the sermon, (the substance), and the standing (the form) and receiving the benediction, (the substance.)

Thirdly,—That the Synod (which is the only body in said Church, which can decree, or make any change in the worship, we being Presbyterians,) has not made any change in the Worship, since these persons so avowed or swore.

And fourthly,—That some few weeks since, the worship was by the Rev. D. Inglis, with the consent and approbation (I am informed) of the Session, partly changed, namely, in the *standing* and singing the last psalm of the former diet of worship, and the last psalm of the evening diet of worship, and that such change has since been continued, and is now practised in our Church.

And I ask you, thereupon, plainly and solemnly, whether the Rev. D. Inglis and your elders have performed their said oath of office in respect of said Worship and Government? Or whether he and they have not wilfully and deliberately broken the same, in thus departing from the worship as then "practised and authorized? As the Synod has not even inferentially relieved them from such their oath, if it could do so, by decreeing such a change in the worship.