

**SOME TREASURE
FETCHED OUT OF RUBBISH**

by

John Cotton

**SOME TREASURE
FETCHED OUT OF RUBBISH.**

by

John Cotton

Quinta Press

Quinta Press, Meadow View, Weston Rhyn, Oswestry, Shropshire, England,
SY10 7RN

The format of this volume is copyright
© 2019 Quinta Press

Transcribed from British Library copy on EEBO, Wing (2nd ed., 1994)/C6459

www.quintapress.com

For proof-reading purposes the line breaks are in the same place as the original,
hence the stretched text

[[?????]] indicates unreadable text in the original.

SOME
TREASURE

Fetch'd out of

RUBBISH:

OR,

Three short but seasonable Treatises (found in an heap of featured Papers), which Providence hath reserved for their Service who desire to be instructed, from the Word of God, concerning the Imposition and Use of *Significant Ceremonies* in the Worship of God. *viz.*

- I. A Discourse upon 1 *Cor.* 14:40. *Let all things be done decently and in Order.* Tending to search but the Truth in this Question, *viz.* Whether it be lawful for *Church-Governors* to command indifferent decent things in the Administration of God's Worship?
- II. An Enquiry, Whether the Church may not, in the Celebration of the Sacrament, use other Rites significant than those expressed in the Scripture, or add to them of her own Authority?
- III. Three Arguments, Syllogistically propounded and prosecuted against the *Surplice*: The *Cross* in Baptism: And *Kneeling* in the Act of receiving the Lord's Supper.

Every Word of God is pure: Add not unto his Word, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a Liar, Prov. 30:5, 6.

Prove all things, hold fast that which is good: Abstain from all appearance of evil, 1 *Thes.* 5:21, 22.

Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind: For whatsoever is not of Faith is sin, Rom. 14:5,-23.

LONDON, Printed in the Year, 1660.

To the Reader.

THese ensuing Treatises were found hid by the Walls, and covered with dust, in the study of an old Non-Conformist, (there being diverse Copies of each, under several unknown hands:) And as Armour, Treasure, and other things useful, hidden in the time of our late Wars, have since been brought forth for profitable Employment; The like is hoped of these Papers (which have so long been kept in darkness), if seriously perused by men of sober minds. The filings of Gold are precious and the Charge of Christ of considerable, Joh. 6:12. Gather up the Fragments that are left, that nothing be lost: Which Speech of his, may both warrant and encourage the collecting and Publishing of the previous divine Truths penned by God's faithful Ambassadors, for the edification of his Church.

Mr John Cotton, that faithful servant of Christ, (famous in both Englands) was the known Author of the first Discourse, and (as it's verily believed) of the second also.

Mr. Robert Nichols studiously composed the third, who was a man, though less known, yet deservedly famous for his great Abilities and profitable Ministry in Cheshire, for many years, where his memory is still very precious.

When Reverend Dr Morton was Bishop of Chester, he required in writing of those Ministers in his Diocese who did not conform to the Ceremonies, the Reasons of this their refusal: Thereupon these three Arguments were by Mr Nichols presented unto him, attested by his own hand, and afterwards defended in dispute with that learned Bishop before many Witnesses; The Bishop being hereby convinced of the good man's Ability and Ingenuity, was his friend to his dying day.

The publishing of these Papers is, for the preventing of the imposition and practice of sapless superstitious Ceremonies; which good end now designed may hopefully be effected, if the Lord will give men herein concerned to study these Controversies with unbiassed hearts.

It is notorious, that the pressing of these Ceremonies in former times, occasioned woeful Divisions in the Church of Christ, with much affliction unto men, famous both for their parts and piety in their Generations, and men of truly tender Consciences and unblameable Conversation: And it is much to be questioned, whether ever any real spiritual advantage, come to Christian Soul by the pressing or the observing of them.

If the Lord would grant that Issue unto this Publication which is sincerely intended and heartily pray for, many thanks would be given unto his Majesty, through Jesus Christ, with comfort unto them that love Truth and Peace.

A

DISCOURSE

UPON

I Cor. 14:40. *Let all things be done
decently and in Order.*

Tending to search out the Truth
in this

QUESTION,

(viz.)

*Whether it be lawful for Church-
Governors, to command indiffe-
rent decent things in the Admi-
nistration of God's Worship.*



ALL which that place holdeth forth touching this Point, may be summed up (for ought I can discern) in these particulars.

1. That the whole Church and every Member thereof, are to perform all the Duties of God's Worship in a decent and orderly manner.
2. What the Church and Members thereof are to do in this

kind, that the Church-Governors may and ought to see it to be done.

3. It being the duty of Church-Governors to see that all things be done decently and orderly in the Congregation: it is therefore their part in eminent measure to be able to discern and judge what is decent and undecent, orderly or disorderly.

When I say it is their part, I mean, it is their duty; their Place and Authority required it: Not that they always have a Power or Spirit of discerning, to judge aright in this case. For it seemeth the High-Priests and Prophets, yea, and *David* himself, all of them thought it decent to bring back the Ark of God upon a new Cart; which afterwards *David* himself saw, and confessed it was not done after due order, 1 *Chron.* 15:13.

From whence it appeareth (since they also are subject to errors in this kind) that it will not be safe for them to judge; and declare the decency of things by no better Rule than their own Will and Pleasure; but by such Rules as the Holy Ghost directs us unto in this case, which are Scripture, Nature, Civil Custom, (yea, and I willingly admit the lawful Custom of the Church or Congregation, in which a man liveth, for to judge of decency;) by all these Rules, we have Warrant in Scripture, 1 *Cor.* 11:14, 16. & 14:33.

And indeed, they who are to approve, themselves, in all their proceedings (as *Paul* did, and all Church-Ministers, ought to do,) to every Man's Conscience in the sight of God; It is not for them to give the ground of their proceedings, only from their own Will and Pleasure, but from such Rules as every good Conscience may see approvable.

4. This place in hand holdeth forth also this further Truth, That what things the Church seeth (by the former Rules) to be indifferent and decent, or which Church-Government shall declare so to be, those things may lawfully be done.

For the further clearing hereof, and the better discerning of the Power of Church-Governors in these matters: It may be observed that of decent things lawful to be done in God's Church, some things are

1. Indifferent and decent, As to preach in a Gown or Cloak, whereof the one is no more necessary or expedient than the other,

1 Expedient and decent; As to abide in single life, or to enter

into Marriage; of which, though Marriage in time of Perfection be indifferent, yet singleness is much more expedient to prevent trouble in the Flesh.

3. Necessary and decent; either, always, as a Woman to keep silence in the Church, or at least, *Hic & nunc*, so as the neglect thereof would be uncomely to the light of Nature, Scripture, Custom: As a Woman to be veiled in the Congregation in the *Eastern Countries*: So, to abstain from Blood, whilst the eating of it was offensive to the Jew.

Now, of such things as are necessary and decent, Church-Governors have Power to give Order and Commandment, as did the *Synod at Jerusalem*, touching those things they called necessary, (to wit, necessary during the time of the offence of the Jew, which was necessary to be avoided) *Act. 15:28*.

Of such things as are expedient and decent, the Church-Governours have Power to declare the decency and expediency of them; yea, and to advise and persuade the practice thereof, but yet not to give an Order or Law to bind the People thereunto, further than themselves shall find it decent and expedient for themselves. Thus in Point of abiding in single Life, in time of the Churches distress, the Apostle gave his Judgment and Advice *1 Cor. 7:25, 40.* and persuaded to it, for avoiding trouble in the Flesh, *Ver. 26, 28.* But would not bind them to it, neither in Point of Conscience, nor of outward practice, as having no Commandment for it from the Lord, *Ver. 25.* In which respect, he calleth such a Commandment, if he had given it, *a snare, Ver. 35.* And herein the Power of Church-Governors falleth far short of the Authority of Civil Magistrates, who may in civil matters make binding Laws for any thing expedient to public weal, which Subjects are readily to submit unto, *1 Pet. 2:13.*

Object. But it may be objected: *Paul* had Power to command *Philemon* that which was convenient; therefore he might make a Law commanding the Church, expedient decent things.

Answer. It followeth not. For 1. It is one thing to give a Command for one thing, another to make a Law to bind him always to do the like. 2. It's one thing to command a particular Person, who may owe himself to a Church-Governor (as *Philemon* did to *Paul*); another, to command, yea, to give a standing Commandment, a binding Law to a whole Church, to whom he profeseth himself a Ser-

2 *Cor.* 4:6. over whom he hath no Authority, but stewardly, or œconomical, to wit, when he speaks in his Master's Name, not in his own. The Steward in a Family hath not power over his Master's Spouse, but when he speaks his Master's commands and directions, not his own. But of such things, as are only indifferent and decent, I do not find in Scripture that ever Church-Governors did advise and persuade them, much less charge and command them, least of all make Laws to determine them. And that this place in hand (1 *Cor.* 14:40.) doth not give them any such Power (though it be much urged to this end), may appear from these Reasons.

1. The place speaks not of indifferent decent things, but of necessary decent things, the neglect whereof was undecent by the light of Nature, and Scripture, and Custom; As for men to pray with long hair, Women bare-headed; and for Women to speak in the Congregation; and for many men to speak at once.

2. The words of the place run not thus, Let all decent things be done; or, Let all things judged and declared by the Church to be decent, be done; but thus, *Let all things* (to wit, that are done in the Church, whether Prayer, or Prophesying, or other Ordinance of God,) *be done decently*; or in that decent manner which Church-Governors will appoint, or in some other: That the Apostle limiteth not, but only requireth, that all be done decently; which if it be so done, his Rule here prescribed, is followed and fulfilled.

3. The same may appear out of this place by this Argument: If this place of the Apostle did give Power and Authority to Church-Governors to command indifferent decent things, then he that should transgress the Commandment of the Church, should also transgress the Commandment of the Apostle: As, look what Order or Acts of Justice any Civil Governor doth by the Commission of the King, he that violates such Acts, or transgresseth such Orders, transgresseth also Against the Commission of the King. But it appeareth to be otherwise. in this case; If. the Church-Governors command a Minister to preach always in a Gown (it being indifferent and decent so to do), he that shall now and then preach in a Cloak transgresseth the Command of the Church, but not of the Apostle. For he that preacheth in a Cloak preacheth also decently, which is all that the Rule of the Apostle requireth in this Point,

But because this Point is of great Consequence, both for Church-Governors and others to be truly informed in; give me leave to clear the same from some other Arguments. That it is not in the Power of Church-Governors to command indifferent decent things by Order of Law.

1. That which exceedeth the bounds of Apostolical Authority, and streighteneth the bounds of Christian Liberty, that is not in the Power of any Church-Governor.

But to command indifferent decent things by Order of Law exceedeth &c.

The former appeared from the Apostle's Commission granted to them, *Matth.* 28:20. where our Saviour giveth them Commission to *teach all Nations to observe all things whatsoever he hath commanded them.* Now, all things whatsoever Christ hath commanded them, are necessary, not indifferent, for the People to observe.

If therefore the Apostles, over and above the Commandments of Christ (which are necessary), should teach the People to observe indifferent things also which Christ hath not commanded, they should exceed the bounds of their Commission.

It will be in vain to except: Our Saviour speaketh here only of matters of Doctrine and Faith, not Government and Order, unless it could be proved that our Saviour did else-where enlarge this Commission, and gave them a more illimited Power in matters of Government and Order, or Indifferency; which (for ought I see) no man goeth about to do, unless it be from this place of the Epistle to the *Corinthians* which hath already been cleared from such meaning.

As for the second part of the Assumption, That to command indifferent decent things streighteneth the bounds of Christian Liberty, is of it self evident: For whereas (for example) a single Man or Woman are at Liberty to marry where they will, *1 Cor.* 7:30. If the Apostle had bound them from Marriage by any Commandment of his, he had streightened and deprived them of this Liberty.

Object. It is wont to be objected against this, That Christian Liberty standeth not in the freedom of outward Actions, but in the freedom of Conscience. As long therefore as there is no doctrinal necessity put upon the Conscience to limit the use; of outward things,

Christian Liberty is preserved, though the use and practice of outward things be limited.

Answ. Whereto I answer, The Apostle in this case leaveth the People of God at liberty, not only in point of Conscience for lawfulness to marry or not to marry, but even in outward action and practice; *Let him do* (saith he) *what he will, he sinneth not, let them be married.*

For a second Reason it may be this: They who are not to judge or censure one another in differences about circumstantial things, or matters of indifferency; they may not make a binding Law, that all men shall be of one mind, or of one practice in such things: But the former is true, *Rom. 14:3. Let not him that eateth, despise him that eateth not, &c.*

Object. If it be said, The place only speaks of private Christians, not of Church-Governors.

Answ. The place speaks of all Christians, public and private, seeing it reserveth and referreth the Judgment of our Brethren, in such things, nor to public Persons, but only to Christ: in the 4th, & 10th Verses.

3. They who did accommodate themselves in the use of indifferent things, according to the judgment and practice of all Christians, wheresoever they came; they did not make any laws to bind Christians to follow their Judgment and Practice in the life of things indifferent:

But the Apostles of Christ did accommodate themselves in the use of indifferent things according to the Judgment and Practice of the Christians wheresoever they came. As appeareth from the Apostle's Example, *1 Cor. 9:20, 21, 22. To the Jews I became as a Jew, &c.*

Object. But it may be said, Though the Apostles chose rather to use their Liberty than their Authority, in these things indifferent, wheresoever they came; yet, if they had pleased, they might have used Apostolical Authority, binding all Christians to their Judgment and Practice in such things.

Answ. 1. Doubtless, if they had received any such Authority, they would in some place, at some time or other, have claimed it, and practised it. A Sword never used, rusteth in the Scabbard: And *frustra est potentia quæ venit in actum*, is a true Axiom, whether we speak of δύναμις or ἐξουσία.

2. The Apostle himself cleareth this Point, when he confesseth, he did thus accommodate himself even to the weakness of Christians, lest he should abuse his Authority in the Gospel, *Ver.* 18, 19, 20. Oh that such Church-Governors, as plead their succession from the Apostles, and do challenge in sundry passage; of Government Apostolical Authority, would also be pleased to study and emulate an Apostolical Spirit.

For a fourth Argument, let it be this: If the Apostles, and Presbyter's, and Brethren at *Jerusalem*, did reach their Authority no further, than to lay upon the Disciples necks the yoke and burden of necessary things (and that only during the time while they continued necessary); then may not any succeeding Synod reach their Authority, to lay upon the Church Commandments and Canons of indifferent things: For the Synod at *Jerusalem* the pattern and precedent of all succeeding Synods; For *primum in unoq; genere est mensura reliquarum*. And our Saviour teacheth us to confute Alterations from Primitive Patterns, with this $\gamma\nu\omega\mu\eta$, *Nou sic fuit ab initio*.

But the Synod at *Jerusalem* reached their Authority no further than to lay a Commandment upon the Disciples only touching *necessary things*, Act. 15:28. Necessary I say, either in themselves, as abstaining from Fornication; or at least in respect of present offence, as Abstinence from blood, &c.

5. Let me conclude with this Argument, taken from the Apostle *Paul* his enter-course with the Apostle *Peter*. If the Apostle *Peter* was to be blamed for compelling the Gentiles by his example to observe the indifferent Ceremonies of the Jews; then other Church-Governors will be to blame, for compelling Christians by Law, and by grievous Censures to observe the Ceremonies in Question, though they were indifferent:

But the Apostle *Paul* telleth us, *Peter* was to be blamed in this case, *Gal.* 2:11, 14.

I suppose, No man will here except, as is wont to be excepted, against such Arguments as plead for the refusing of our Ceremonies, upon such grounds as *Paul* urged against yielding to the Jewish Ceremonies, as they were urged by the false Apostles, (*viz.*) with Opinion of necessity unto Salvation. For *Peter's* yielding at that time to the Jewish Ceremonies, was not out of opinion of their necessity to Salvation, but only out of fear of offence, and care to prevent it, *Ver.* 12.

The sum of all this, will lead us by the hand one, step further: If it be a sin in Church-Governors to command, especially upon so strict penalty, indifferent decent things; it shall be a sin also in Ministers and other private Christians to subscribe *ex animo*, and to yield Obedience to such Commands; although the Ceremonies commanded were indeed as good as they be pretended, (which, I believe, are not indifferent decent things.) For, doth not such voluntary Subscription and Conformity to them build up our Church-Governors; yea, and with them the Sovereign Civil Magistrate also in this confidence, that such Commandments are as well lawfully given by them, as received and obeyed by us? Now, to build up or edify a Brother unto sin, is no better than to offend a Brother: For the proper definition of an Offence, is, That which *edifies a Brother unto sin*, as the original word expresseth it, 1 *Cor.* 8:10. And so to sin against my Brother, is to wound his Conscience; yea, (and as much as in me lieth) to cause him to perish for whom Christ died, which is no better than spiritual Murder, even the Murder of his Soul.

Now, if thus to edify my Brother unto sin, be so heinous an Offence; how much more heinous an Offence is it, to edify our Governors to the giving and urging of such Commandments; yea, to the sharp censuring of all others; as refractory and factious Persons, who choose rather to undergo the loss of the greatest Comforts they enjoy in this World, than to wound the Consciences either of themselves or their Governors.

It is true, by forbearing Obedience to these Commandments we offend the Spirits of our Governors, and make them to be (though causelessly) offended with us; but by yielding Obedience to these things; we should offend their Consciences in edifying them unto Sin, and provoke the Lord to be offended with them and us. It is not for Christians, much less for Ministers, to redeem our peace and liberty at so dear a price, as the hazard of the blood of so many precious Souls; especially of our Governors in highest place.

Now, I shall proceed to answer another great Question for clearing the Point in hand.

Quest. May not the Church, in the Celebration of the Sacraments, use other Rites significative than those expressed in the Scriptures, or add to them of her own Authority?

Answ. No, but she is to rest in the use of those Seals God hath appointed: For all signs of men's devising cannot teach or stir up true devotion, but delude, and nourish Superstition, Besides, to do any thing which doth derogate from the Seal of Kings, and their Prerogative therein, we know how dangerous it is in the Commonwealth; so certainly, to join Seals with God's Seals in his Church, is a Point will hardly be answered. It beseemeth us to acknowledge God so wise, in the Signs that he hath chosen, as to hold it presumption for any to imitate him in devising of the like: For example, none might devise an Oil like his, nor an Altar besides his; none a fire like the fire that he hath chosen; yea, in his works themselves, he is not magnified as he deserveth, till we confess, None is able to come after him; and till we say, *Who is able to do the like?* Again, where man deviseth new signs, the signs of God are vilified, as if they were from an Human Spirit; yea, as if they were less fit and convenient: And whereas Man is carnal, blind, and impotent, and yet a lover of his own devices (no less than *Pigmalion* of his own Picture); if he should be suffered to invent new Signs, they would be carnal and not spiritual; dead, having no Power) dark, veiling the brightness of the Sacraments: and yet more loved and delighted in, than the Sacraments themselves. For example, a Temple built *Garezim* (like the Temple of *Jerusalem*) overtopped the Temple; And to what fame arose a Temple which *Onias* built in *Heliopolis*. like to that of the Lord's in *Jury*?

What our heavenly King delivereth his People must be marked with no other form or print save that which is framed in his Word, and in his own Sacraments: And however God permitted the an-

Exod. 30:38.
Lev. 17:3.
Lev. 10:1.
Exod. 3:14.

Calv. *opusc. de Necess. Reform.* pag. 59.
Joseph. *Antiq. lib. 15. cap. 8.*
Ægesip. *lib. 2. cap. 13.*

cient Fathers to fail in here in some particulars, against their general doctrine; yet they ever disallowed and abhorred the changing of signs instituted by God, and the devising of others determined to signify the same thing, that was sealed by the Sacraments. The memory of the *Barsamans* and *Semidalitæ* is abhorred, for that instead of Bread they used Meal, even as others are utterly condemned for bringing in Grapes instead of Wine: The *Arminians* added fodd[[[?????]]] meat to the Bread and Wine of the Lord's Supper: The *Aquarii* changed Wine into Water: The *Artotyritæ* added Cheese to the Bread in the Supper, upon an imitation of ancient times, when the fruits of the Earth, and the fruits of the Cattle were wont to be offered to the Lord: Others added Honey to the Wine in the Supper, and some Milk: But all these are condemned, because they are not in the Institution.

Q. These Heretics and Sects condemned, brought in their devised signs as parts of the Sacraments, which is a thing to be condemned: But what say you of signs devised by human Authority, and annexed to the Sacraments, not as parts, but for signification only?

A. Signs annexed to the Sacraments for signification, to declare or teach what God promiseth to man, or what duty man oweth to God, are parts of the Sacraments, no more than some of the former; and the Reasons brought to condemn them, to cashier and cast out these also.

1. For if he be not devout but presumptuous who administereth otherwise than he hath *received of Lord*, then must all strange signs be abandoned which hath not been seen and approved of God: The charge of the Lord to his People is this, *You shall do my Judgements and keep my Ordinances to walk therein*; the meaning is plainly this, Ye shall observe all mine Ordinances, Moral and Ceremonial, and them only; as the words of this law is explained by the Apostle.

All things which are written in the Book of the Law. And him thou shalt serve, is expounded by our Saviour, *Him only thou shalt serve*, more expressly the same Commandment is repeated in other places: *What things soever I command you observe to do it, then shalt not add unto it, nor diminish from it*; To what might they not add? neither to the Law Moral not Ceremonial, as the Word signifieth, and all Circumstances of the Text do convince; For in the former of those places, *Israel* is exhorted to hearken unto the Statutes and Ordinances of the Lord; under which two words (often

Danes. in *Aug. de hæc.* Cap. 64.
 Concil. Bracarenens. 3. cap. 1.
 Concil. Constantin. 6. in *Trullo* cap. 99.
Aug. de hæres. cap. 28.
 Can. *Apest.* c. 3.
 Decret. *par.* 3. dist. 2. cap. 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7.
 Concil. Const. 6. in *Trullo.* cap. 32.
 Lamb. Dan. in *Aug. de hæc.* cap. 18. & 64.
 Concil. *Antisiodorens.* can. 8.

Lev. 18:4.
 Deut. 27:26.
 Gal. 3:10.
 Deut. 6:13.
 Mat. 4:10.
 Deut. 12:32.
 Deut. 4:1, 2.
 Zanch. *d. Scrip.* q. 8. *prop.* 1.
 Co. s. 2 *Arg.*
 Exod. 12:24, 43. & 27:21.
 & 29:9. & 30:21.
 Deut. 4:1.

joined together) are comprised all duties of the Law moral and ceremonial: and thereupon immediately follow these words, *Ye shall not add unto the Word (or things) which I commanded unto you.* The same is more clear in the second place: for having recited many Precepts Ceremonial, and some few Moral; he concludeth, *Whatsoever I command you to observe, take heed to observe it, &c.* And *Moses* himself faithfully in this performed the charge of God; for having received a Commandment from him to make all things pertaining to the Tabernacle, according to the pattern shewed in the Mount, he presumed not to add one pin to that was shewed him, but strictly followed his Sampler in every point. And if *Moses* durst not challenge authority of himself to ordain Sacramental rite, and annex them to the holy Ordinances of the Lord, how shall we be assured that the Church hath any liberty herein? what reason can be given why that should be warrantable in this age of the Church, and in that unlawful? If the Church will presume to claim any such Prerogative, it is necessary she produce the Charter wherein the Lord hath confirmed such a Privilege unto her, which before he denied to that his Faithful servant, with whom he was pleased to speak familiarly, and in most friendly manner. The worthy Reformers of Religion, who lived in the Church of the *Jews* after the days of *Moses*, knew no such grant, for they kept themselves precisely to the Law of the Lord by the hand of *Moses*, not turning there-from in any thing, without special and extraordinary inspiration. *David* gave to *Solomon* his son, the pattern of all that he had by the Spirit, of the Courts of the house of the Lord, of all the Chambers round about, &c. And *Hezekiah* set the Levites in the house of the Lord, with Cymbals, with Psalteries, and with Harps, according to the commandment of *David*, and of *Gad* the King's Seer, and *Nathan* the Prophet, for so was the Commandment of the Lord by his Prophets. Ask the Scripture whether ever the godly Kings among the *Jews* had any such Authority to bring in any special Action or Ceremony into the service of God without special warrant; Search the Scriptures about this matter, and if the answer [*Nay*] to this demand, let us take heed to our selves, that we presume not beyond commission. Out of those places before cited; the Papists grant, the perfection of the Word of God may well be concluded: Our Writers do substantially prove the sufficiency of the Scripture in matter necessary to Salvation, because we are forbidden to add ought

Deut. 4:8, 40.
Deut. 5:1. and
6:1. and 12:1.

Mal. 4:4.
Lev. 18:5. and
19:37. and 26:
22, 18, 22.

Deut. 4:1, 2.
Exod. 25:9,
40. and 27:19.

Exod. 39:42, 43.

1 Chron. 28:
12, 19.

2 Chron. 19:
25.

to the Word written (for of that the Text is meant), or to take ought from it; and by the same reason, the sufficiency of the Scripture; in matters Ceremonial, is established; for the places must be understood of Ceremonies no less then other things; *Zanchius* thus urgeth this argument; And lest any Papist (saith he) should except and say, Neither do we think it lawful to add to those things which pertain to Internal, and so to Spiritual piety and worship of God; but only the Controversy is of external Ceremonies; I pray you, consider of what things the Lord speaketh in that Chapter, *Deut. 4*: Of what Ceremonies, sacred Rites, and Judicial Laws; for in the Hebrew, it saith thus, *Hear now, O Israel, the Statutes, and the Judgements*. That word *Hachukim* doth properly signify Ceremonious Rites of worship: Therefore the Lord would teach, that nothing is to be added, not only to the Moral Precepts, and internal worship, but also to the Ceremonial Rites and Institutions; which may be further confirmed against our Adversaries, by the Authority of the vulgar Translation, Interpreting it in *Deut. 4:5*. Ceremonies; And the Opinion of *Stapleton*, who making answer to that place alleged by our Divines, to confirm the perfection of Scripture against unwritten traditions; saith, It is especially to be understood of the Ceremonies. This is acknowledged by *D. Whiteg*. God (saith he) in the old Law to his people, prescribed perfect and absolute Laws, not only Moral and Judicial, but Ceremonial also; neither was there the least thing to be done in the Church omitted in the Law; And therefore for them at that time, and during that State, it was not lawful to add any thing, nor take any thing away, no not in Ceremonies and civil Laws. The Jews (saith another) had a Prescription of particular Rites, most fitly agreeing to the Polity of their Church and Common-wealth. But what? hath God left no greater liberty to the Church in the time of the Gospel, to ordain significant Ceremonies, than was before given unto the Synagogue of the *Jews*? No surely, both the Jewish and Christian Church are tied to the direction of the Scriptures, without which they might not presume to do any thing in these matters: How can these places be alleged with truth of reason against our Adversaries, to prove the perfection of Scripture in opposition to unwritten Traditions. If the Church have authority now to ordain Ceremonies without direction of the Word, which then she had not: easily might they reply, That that Injunction did not concern us at this

De scrip. q. 8.
prop. 1.

Relect. prin.
sid. doct. cont.
4. q. 3. art. 3.
arg. 10.
Answ. to the
Adm. pag. 30.

Bell. de Pont.
Rom. l. 4. c. 17.

day, seeing more liberty is given out touching the Institution of external Rites pertaining to the worship of God, then was granted to the *Jews*. And if we may add without warrant of the Word, what, and where they might not: Surely the Scripture was a perfect rule to them: In another manner than it is to us, *Zanchius* therefore objecting in the name of the Papists, That if these places must be understood of the Ceremonial Law, then it pertaineth not to us, inasmuch as the Ceremonial Laws are now changed: maketh answer, That that Precept doth pertain to us, which is manifest (saith he) if you consider the end of the Commandment; What end? That we should obey those things, and those things only that God hath commanded, adding nothing, detracting nothing. Therefore when the same God hath by his Son given Precepts concerning Ceremonies of the New Testament, and willeth us simply to obey them; the force of that Precept remains, Thou shalt *add nothing, diminish nothing*. Moreover Christ himself plainly commandeth the same, *Baptize them into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe whatsoever I have commanded*. What is this, but ye shall not add or diminish. Again, what is that that the Apostle saith, *I have received of the Lord, what I have delivered unto you*: but that it is not lawful to add nor diminish? Then he concludes, Therefore the force of the Precept in *Deuteronomy*, of not adding or diminishing any thing in the Precepts of God, doth remain perpetual, even concerning Ceremonies, and holy Rites, and pertains to us. The *Jews* had liberty in certain matters of order pertaining to the service of God, as we now have. In matter of Ceremonies we are tied to the Word of God, as they were. We have no Ceremonies but two, the Ceremonies or Sacraments of Baptism, and the Lord's Supper; and we have as certain direction to celebrate them, as they had to celebrate their Ceremonies; and fewer and less difficulties can arise of ours, than of theirs; we have no special hour, place, or manner of celebration assigned for them; the like may be said of many Jewish Ceremonies, What hour had they for their ordinary and daily Sacrifices? was not it left to the order of the Church what places were appointed in their several dwellings to hear the Word of God Preached continually, when, they came not to *Jerusalem*. The Word was commanded to be Preached, but no mention made in what particular method, what manner, of place, Pulpit, Seat, or Chair, they should

Matth. 28:19, 20.

Zanch. de secundo præc. tit. de ext. cult. q. 1. Tam. igitur nobis non licet addere his vel detrudere quam etiam non licebat Judæis addere vel detrudere do illis.

Jun. et Trem. in act 13. 15.

have, and yet they had these: they had also forms of Burial and Marriage, though nothing be commanded concerning them: The liberty of the Christian Church standeth in freedom from the burden of Jewish Ceremonies, not in the power to ordain new Rites at her pleasure, when those which God himself instituted are abolished; for then should our condition in the time of the Gospel be far worse in many respects then theirs was in the time of the Law: for whereas it is the virtue of a good Law, to leave as little undetermined, and without the compass of the Law, as may be. If we have no Word for divers things, wherein the *Jews* had particular direction; there was greater perfection in the Law given unto them, then in the Word which is left to the Christian Church. Again, the Ordinances of God, which are ever behoveful, are not so burdensome, as are the unprofitable inventions of men; it is far better to bear the yoke of God, then to be in subjection unto the mere pleasure of sinful men. And then, If the Church of the *Jews* was to admit of no ceremonies, but what was prescribed unto her of the Lord; whereas the Christian Church is to stand to the Arbitrement of her guides and Governors: the Bondage and Infancy of the Jewish, is much to be preferred before the liberty and ripeness of the Christian Church. It is replied, that the adding and diminishing spoken of, doth not mean addition of preservation, but addition of corruption; like as the fraudulent Coiner of Moneys doth not corrupt the King's Coin, either by adding baser metal unto it, or by clipping any silver from it, and in both kinds he is a Traitor. How little doth this differ from the Jesuits gloss upon this Text: God commands (saith he) nothing to be added to his Precept to corrupt it, but not some things which may perfect it. Can human devised Rites preserve the Ordinances of God from corruptions; or rather are not all such additions manifest corruptions? When God hath given to *Moses* particular determinations of all symbolical Rites pertaining to his worship, had it not been an addition of corruption in him, if upon his own head he had annexed any devised significative Rites unto them. *Bellarmino* himself grants, it had been; when in his third answer, he labours (but to small purpose) to put this difference betwixt the state of the old and New Testament;† That in the one, all Rites pertaining to the worship of God, were particularly determined, but not in the other. And when the Jesuite confesseth in his first answer to that Argument ur-

Beza annot. in act. 6.

Arist. ad Theod. Ra. 1.3.

Calv. opus. repons. versipel. pag. 413.

Bell de effect. Sac. 1. 2. c. 32. Bell. de Mon. 1. 2. c. 13. arg. 9. resp. & pont. rem. lib. 4. cap. 17, Chrysost. hom. 52. in Matth. cited by D. Whitak. de sc. q. 9. c. 14. † Petitur principium, quia et hoc ipso contraria est quælibet nova lex quod divina addit; quandequidem iste sibi addi vetat. Tilen. de por. 1. 4. c. 17. not. 11. vise Lubbert. de Pap. Rom. 1. 8. cap. 10.

ged by our Divines, against human Laws binding Conscience; that it is unlawful to add to the things, commanded; As, to sacrifice two lambs, when God hath commanded only one; doth he not grant of necessary Consequence, that when God hath appointed that Baptism should be administered with Water, it is unlawful to add thereto Oil, Cream, Salt, Spittle, and such like? Moreover, to give Man Authority to add Rites of Information to the holy Ordinance of God; what is it but to prefer the folly of Man before the Wisdom of God, as though his sacred Institutions must borrow reverence or defence from humane Forgeries:

Jun. ani. in *Bel. de Pont.* Rom. lib. 4. cap. 17.

Doth not this Distinction open a wide gap to let in manifold Abuses into God's Worship, under the colour of Addition of Preservation? Doth it not much impair the perfection of Scripture, when Rites Sacramental, tending to preserve the purity and due regard of Christ's Institutions, shall be esteemed lawful in the immediate Worship of God, when they find no footing to Hand on in the Word of God: The Synagogue of *Rome* doth not maintain her Addition to be of absolute necessity, or essential parts of the Sacraments, but instituted of the Church for signification and preservation; and yet they are justly censured as unlawful, and contrary to the Authority of the Holy Scripture. The Lord chargeth that we do not add, that so we may preserve it.

D. *Lambard.*
l. 4. dist. 3. c. 1.
D. *Sp.* pag. 32.
D. *Cov.* against
Per. pag. 113.
D. *Whitg.* Ans.
Adm. page. 32.
Preserve, or
keep carefully
that which is
committed to
our trust.
1 Tim. 6:10.
Cafet. interprets
this place thus;
*Inhibetur addi-
tio, etiam præ-
textu Custodi-
endi man-
data Dei.*
Se *Calv.* in
Mat. 15.

This Argument might here be shut up, but that to prevent some Objections, it is good to enquire what is an Addition to the Word. The Patrons of significant Ceremonies say, An unlawful Addition to any of Christ's Sacraments is only that which either participates there within all or at least in the chief and proper ends thereof, or is added for Complement thereof, as necessary, and so, unchangeable. To add to the Word, is to ordain somewhat as a thing absolutely necessary, and pertaining to the Essence of Worship: Those add, to the Word.

1. Who teach or decree any thing, either in matters of Faith or Ceremonies, contrary to the Word.

2. Those that make any thing necessary to Salvation not contained in the Word.

3. Such as put any Religion or Opinion of merit in any thing that they themselves have invented, besides the Word of God.

Last of all, They add to the Word, which forbid that thing for a thing of it self unlawful, which God doth not forbid; and

make that sin which God doth not make sin.

But in all these definitions, that is left out which *Moses* meant specially to comprehend, which is, not to do more nor to do less than he had commanded: Every unlawful Tradition is contrary to the Word, which forbiddeth all such Additions. But as the Word contrary in strict sense, is opposite to that which is besides the Word, it reacheth not (with the other particulars added to it,) to express what is an Addition prohibited. The Lord Jesus is the sole Doctor of his Church, whose Office it is to teach by word and sign, and therefore whatsoever is devised by Man to instruct by outward resemblance, and to admonish by striking the senses by way of Representation; that is an unwarrantable Addition. God is the only Sealer of his Promises, and Signifier of his Will, by things sensible in the Sacrament, and by words similitudinary in the Scripture; to him it appertained to determine what signs must be used to signify. In the time of the Law, when signs reigned, none were lawful but such as were shewed in the pattern upon the Mount; much more in the time of the Gospel, when shadows are abolished, what God hath not instituted is to be abandoned; *Moses* durst not add of his own head to those signs that were appointed of the Lord, though to ends inferior; as profitable only to signify, not to exhibit; as matters of expediency to explain and declare what was represented, not of absolute necessity: And what had been presumption in him, is intolerable in us, being delivered from the Pedagogy of the Law: In those things God hath precisely determined; those actions, the whole form whereof God hath of purpose set down to be observed, we may not otherwise do than exactly as he hath commanded. Herein, what is not expressed; or by good consequence enjoined, is to be held unwarrantable: In this case, the devising of new Rites to signify the truths caught in Scripture, or sealed in the Sacraments, cannot be deemed less than an unlawful Addition; upon this ground our Divines have cast Images out of the Church, not only for teaching ill, but for teaching at all; because God alloweth no Teacher but himself, nor means of teaching but his holy Word and Sacraments, And when the Son of God hath instituted the Sacraments, and he hath commanded them to be administered in certain Rites, instituted of himself; It is a very hard Question (saith *Chemnitius*) whether Man be permitted to add others over and above, under any pretence Dr *Willet* reasoneth thus

Tho: Aquin.
pag. 3. q. 60.
Cajetan. *ibid.*
Cereminalis
lex perfecta in
Sc. traditur in
libris Mosis, ubi
nulla Ceremina
ne minutissima
quidem præter-
missa est.
Wh. de Sc. q. 6.
cap. 14.
Quod uni Ju-
daorum populo
per Mosen dili-
genter satis præ-
scripta essent,
&c.
Jansen. cond.
cap. 120.

Babing, in com.
2. pag. 95.

Exam. Conc.
Trid. part. 2.
tit. de. rit. Bap.

against the Rites of Popish Confirmation: All of them we superstitious, having mystical and typical significations and shadows, which agree not with the Nature of the Gospel; for all shadows are now past, the Body being come: It is contrary to the Rule of the Gospel there should be such Types, Shadows, and Significations brought into the Service of God. Therefore we dare not allow of these descriptions of unlawful Additions before mentioned, not only because they cannot be justified by Scripture, as all good Expositions Theological must and ought; but also the whole current of Scripture plainly sheweth it to be too strict, as may appear in part by that which hath been already said, and remaineth to be proved more at large hereafter: *Unde jus prodit, interpretatio quoq; procedat. Decret, Grego. lib. 5. Tit. 39. cap. 31. Innocent. 3. Quis legum Ænigmata solvere idoneus esse videtur, nisi is cui soli Legislatores esse concessum est. Cod. lib. 1. Tit. 14. leg. p. & 10, 11. & Tit. 17.*

2. As in matters of Faith, so in matters of Ceremonies significative pertaining to the Worship of God, an Argument doth hold from the Negative, to disallow what is not found in the Scriptures expressly, or by good consequence: As to say, such a thing is not expressed or revealed in the word; therefore it is no matter of Faith, nor such as a man is bound necessarily to believe: such a sign is not warranted by the Scripture, therefore it is not to be used in the Worship of God. Thus the Prophet *Jeremiah* reasoneth more than once against the idolatrous men of *Judah*, who burned their Sons and Daughters in the fire to *Baal*; *The Lord did not command you*, he spake no such thing, *neither came it into his mind, Therefore this ye ought not to have done.* The thing he reproved was not only not commanded, but forbidden, and that expressly; yet the Prophet chooseth rather to charge them with the fault of making a Law unto themselves, than the crime of transgressing a Law which God had made. For when the Lord himself had once precisely set down a form of executing that wherein we are to serve him; the fault appeareth greater to do that which we are not, than not to do that which we are commanded: In this we seem to charge the Law with hardness only, in that with foolishness: In this we shew our selves to be weak and unapt to be Doers of his Will, in that we take upon us to be Controllers of his Wisdom: In this we fly to perform the thing which God seeth meet, convenient, and good, in that we pre-

Willets Cont.
14. q. 1. par. 5.
pag. 719.
Col. 2:17

Id. Cont. 12. q.
8. Arg. 1. pag.
504.

Jer. 7:31. &
19:5

Hook. Eccles.
Pol. lib. 2. Sect.
6.

sume to see whit is meter and convenienter better than God himself: For these and such like Reasons, though the sin of *Judah* was directly prohibited; yet it pleased the Lord by his Prophet to reprehend it, for that he commanded them not so to do. From these places some Divines do prove the perfection of Scripture against the Papists; Others, that in the Point of God's Worship, the Argument holdeth from the Negative for the Substance of it: And by the same Reason we may conclude, that no Ceremony significant may be admitted in the Worship of God, which carry not the stamp of divine approbation; for the ground of the Prophet's Argument will bear all alike. The purpose of God was to teach his People, both unto whom they should offer Sacrifice, and what Sacrifice was to be sacrificed; therefore no Sacrifice is to be offered which God hath not commanded: The Lord hath determined how he will be served; therefore upon our own Will and Pleasure we must not add any thing unto it for Substance, or take ought there-from: And the Lord also hath appointed and determined what outward Signs shall be used to teach, signify; or represent by Analogy or Proportion. Therefore, no Sign is to have place in his Worship, which cannot shew descent from above: The Lord, expounding the Use of the Fringes that he commanded the *Israelites* to make in the borders of their Garments, faith, *It shall be to them for a Sign, that they may look upon it; and remember all the Commandments of the Lord, and do them; and that ye seek not after your own hearts, and your own eyes, after which you use to go a whoring.* Therefore he willeth, that for ever they remember all his precepts, even those that concern Ceremonies or external Worship; and on the contrary, he will not that either in Ceremonies or external Worship they hear their own heart, or institute those things that seem good unto them in their own eyes, or follow them; Nay, in the Worship of God, to follow that which is pleasing to us, is to run a whoring from God, because we follow them in the heat of adulterous Love. It may be some will answer, that Ceremonies of absolute necessity, wherein the Substance of God's Worship consisteth, and which absolutely binds Conscience, must be instituted of God; but not those that are appointed only for signification, and as things in themselves free and indifferent, because these may be profitable to put men in mind of their duties to cherish Faith, and recall from sin. But what ground is there in Scripture for this distinction; where is the liberty gran-

Dr Reynolds.
thes.
Gatak, of Lots
cap. S. 16.

Numb. 15:38, 39.

*Nilil oporteat
in rebus divinis
sacere, sine Dei
Verbo.* Bell. de
Sac. lib. 1. cap.
19.

ed in the one, denied in the other kind of Ceremonies; In Philosophy no distinction is to be allowed, which Reason doth not confirm: In Theology, what hath not evident foundation in the Scripture; themselves, what is not native and taken out of them, is to be held counterfeit and adulterate: The Rule is, where the Law distinguisheth not, we must not distinguish; it is not sufficient therefore so to distinguish, unless it can be shewed (which yet hath not been done) that the distinction hath footing in the Word of God, The Papists and *Lutherans* do in this manner plead for the Use of Images in their Churches; Images are Lay-men's Books, by them they are put in mind of the Death and Passion of Christ; they may see more at once represented by them than they can read in many hours. What Answer do our Divines return unto them but this, That the Word and Sacraments were appointed of Christ to teach, and that to add to them is presumptuous against the Lord, injurious unto his Ordinances; that teaching to the Eye is sufficiently performed by the Sacraments, and that the Lord, for Instruction of his People, commanded his Ministers to preach, not to paint. Faith, saith *Zanchius*, is to be promoted; but by what means, such as God hath ordained, *viz.* The Word and the Sacraments: God would have us to be taught divine things, and all men as well vulgar as others to know things belonging to their Salvation; But whence or of what Instructors? Of those that he hath given to be Teachers unto us, not of those that do please ourselves: He hath given unto us the Book of the Creatures, whence we may know many things of God: He hath given us the Book of the Scripture, which he would have continually to be read, and to be explained in the Church; What canst thou desire more? He hath given Sacraments, Glasses of divine mysteries: He hath instituted us a Ministry, and charged us to exercise our selves daily in the Law of God; Ought not these Books and Teachers to be sufficient for us? Now, a significant Ceremony is an Image, or a Representation to teach by linking the sense; and what is said against Images, must necessarily hold against them also; so that either we must take part with the *Lutherans* and Papists against the Worthies of our Church, or acknowledge the former distinction to be vain, and of none effect. Nay, let this distinction be of any weight, and the Papists must be acquitted in their Oil, Cream, Salt, Spittle, Crosses, Lights, Tapers, and the rest of their rotten Customs, wherewith they

Sicut ovm autum quodcu q[[????]] fueris extra templum non est sanctificatum.
 Whit. *de Pont.*
 q. 1. c. 3. & 8. q. 2. c. 2. & q. 4. c. 1. S. 2.
 Orig. in Matt's Hom. 25.

Conc. Seno-
 sense.
 Harm. Conf.
 Helver. cap. 4.
 fol. Synt. Tom.
 2. l. 6. 7. 19. in
 secundo præc.
 Par. in Gen. 28:
 18.
 De secundo
 præc. tir. de
 Imag. c. 15.
 resp. ad Arg. 9.
 & 10.
 Faith cometh
 by hearing, not
 by seeing or
 gazing.
 Jew. art. ador.
 div. 10.
 Mart. in 1 Reg.
 7.
 Gualter in
Heb. 2:18.

have besmeared and defiled the Ordinances of God; for none of these be held by them to be of absolute necessity.

A second Answer there is given to this Argument, of no more strength than the former, *viz.* that to devise Signs of spiritual things is unwarrantable, but not to ordain Ceremonies that shadow forth some moral duty which Man oweth to God: But this is barely spoken, not proved by any passage of holy Writ, and may as easily be cast off as it is brought forth. The Scripture doth not teach it lawful for Man to devise mystical Signs appropriated to the solemn Worship of God, to represent moral duties; when it forbideth by any devised Sign of that Nature to shadow forth spiritual duties, and what we learn not thence in matters of this kind, we dare no: receive. When the Lord was pleased to instruct his Church by Types and Figures; he himself appointed not only those that did prefigure Christ, but such also as served by their signification to teach moral duties: All mystical Rites the Lord himself precisely prescribed, laying a strict charge upon *Moses*, to make all things according to the pattern shewed him; which Rule was religiously observed by all religious and worthy Reformers of Religion afterwards, not one adventuring without special direction from the Word of God, to add any thing thereto, or alter ought therein.

Again, duties moral and spiritual are parts of God's inward worship; and Ceremony, ordained to teach either of them by mystical Representation, are parts of his outward Worship and Service; and so the matter is one, whether the Sign doth shadow forth a moral or spiritual duty; for it is not the particular good thing signified by the Sign, but the Institution of it to that end, that makes the Worship true or false: If it be appointed of God, it is true Worship, let the signification be moral or spiritual; if of men, it is false Worship, whatsoever it be set a-part to represent or teach, in our intention in the solemn Worship of God. In defence of Images it is objected, that *Paulinus Nolanus* Bishop commanded the History of the Old and New Testament to be painted in his Church, and that to this end, that the People might be drawn from surfeiting and drunkenness, when they met together to banquet in that place, being busied in viewing and beholding Images: Our Divines reply, that the Authority of man ought not to seem any thing against the plain and manifest Word of God; and *Nolanus* and his follow-

Exod. 25:9, 38,
39. & 39:42,
43.
1 Chro. 28:12,
19.
2 Chro. 29:25.
1 Chro. 24:19.
2 Chro. 28:14.

Ste Jewel's
Apol. par. 5.
cap. 3. div. 1. 2.

ers did offend the more grievously, that they adventured to do that which the former Fathers did always disallow: whereby we see what the judgment of Ancient and Modern Divines is, touching Images set up in the Church, to represent or put in mind of Moral duties. And if Images must be abolished; significant signs of men's devising, by the same reason, remain under condemnation: for they are Images, that is, certain figures having relation to the exemplar, or certain pictures with relation of representations.

Martyr. part. 2.
c. 5. S. 23.

3. No Act, Ordinance, nor Institution, contrary to a general Negative Commandment, is lawful, unless that Act, Ordinance, or Institution be in special warranted by the Word of God; for the Scripture should not be sufficient to make the man of God, that is, the Minister or Prophet, perfect to every good work, if an Act in special might be lawful without particular approbation, which is in general condemned as unjust and evil. If we find, that holy men of God did some particular things, which were generally forbidden in the Law; as *Samuel* built an Altar at *Ramath*, *Elias* the Prophet on Mount *Carmel*; when by the Law it was not lawful to offer any Sacrifice, but before the Lord, in the place which he should choose. We must know, they did this by special direction, and extraordinary instinct. The Lawyers say, That a particular doth derogate from the general: And in these places, where a special fact doth not agree with a general Precept, there the Scripture is not repugnant unto it self; but by the special, it is derogated from the general. But though it was lawful for, them that had such an extraordinary Commandment contrary to the Law, at what time it pleased God after that manner to make known his pleasure, to do what was so required of them; yet now the reason is not like, since God speaketh unto us by his Word, according to which we must walk and worship him, and affordeth not that special privilege to us, that he did to them. For God is free, subject to no Law; he commandeth us, not himself; he prescribeth a general Law, not to himself, but to us, which it is never lawful to transgress, unless there be peculiar warrant from God for it. But the use and institution of Ceremonies, signifying resemblance in the solemn worship of God, is contrary to a general Negative Commandment; for the second Commandment forbidding the making, of any graven Image, or the likeness of any thing in heaven above, or in the earth beneath; doth also prohibit all outward forms devised by men for Religious use

1 Sam. 7:17.
1 King 18:32.
Deut. 12:5, 6,
7, 13, 14.

Generi per
speciam dero-
gatur. Sext. de
lib. 5. tit. de
regulis Juris
33. 33. Digest. 1.
50. tit. 17.
regul. 80.

Zanch. de se-
cundo præc.

in the service of God; It being a thing peculiar to the Lord, to prescribe how his will and worship shall be taught, as what worship shall be given unto him. By the letter of the Precept only, the making of graven Images, or Similitudes; and the adoration of them is condemned; but under that particular, we are charged to forge nothing of our own heads, in Ceremonies, or Rites significant, but to be content with those Ceremonies, and that outward Worship which God is pleased to prescribe or, appoint; whether they be Sacraments, Sacrifices, or other holy things: This to be the scope of that Commandment, is made evident many ways.

First, by the exposition that is given thereof in other passages of holy Writ: It is an unquestionable truth, that the true meaning of every Precept is to be collected out of the writings of the Prophets and Apostles; and what we find in them commanded or forbidden, is to be referred to some one or more of these ten Commandments, though it be not expressly mentioned in any one of them. Now then in ths Law we read, That *Moses* was commanded to do all things. *according to the pattern shewed in the Mount*, without allowance to add *one pin* for resemblance or shadow upon his own head.

To what Commandment can this charge be referred, but to the second: And must it not then condemn all significant Ceremonies forged by men unto themselves for the service of God; *Nadab* and *Abihu* are smitten with death, for presuming to offer with *strange fire*, which God commanded not; whence Divines observe, that the external Worship of God is precisely to be exercised according to the Prescription of God; and that we may not depart one hair breadth from his holy Institution upon any good intent; this their fact was contrary to the second Commandment; and is it not manifest then that we are thereby enjoined, neither to alter what God hath instituted, nor to devise of our own heads what he never appointed. What Precept did *Ahaz* transgress in commanding an Altar for burnt offering to be made after the pattern of the Altar at *Damascus*, but the second? or by what reason can it be reduced unto it, unless we shall acknowledge that all things appointed by God in his service, must carefully be observed without addition or deduction, and that all devices of men for worship, and instruction, are utterly unlawful.

Secondly, The words of the Commandment do shew no less;

Levit. 10:1.
Numb. 3:4.
Lev. 1:7. & 6:
12. & 9:24.
Pisc. obs. in
Lev. 10:2.

for the former word *Pesel* doth signify any thing hewn, graven, cut or carved, which is translated by the Greek, an Idol; the *Caldee* Paraphrase, an Image; and the *Thargum*, called *Jonathans*, an Image or figure; under which name, all other sorts are implied, as Molten or Painted Images, or the like. The other word *Temanah*, is in signification, a similitude or figure, and is opened by *Moses*, by *Semal*, and *Tabinth*, words of the same signification, *Deut.* 4:16. So that all Portraitures, Shapes, Resemblances, and Forms of things, Natural, or Artificial, Real, or Imaginary, devised by man for Religious use, worship, or instruction, are forbidden both by the scope, and letter of the Commandment. And if the words were not of that large signification, yet seeing all vices of the same kind are forbidden where one is expressly mentioned; when material, cut or carved Images are prohibited, there all representations, material, aerial, real, imaginary, proper, and tropical, are condemned; For it is not the matter of the thing, but the form or application that is against the Precept, which is one and the same in representations of what kind soever, in Pictures, proper, Metonymical, and Metaphorical: It matters not whether the Image be a thing truly existent, formed of any visible matter, Brass, Wood, or Stone; or whether it have no other being but in the mind of men. If it be an Image devised by men for Religious use, it cometh under the sentence of the Law: if we ask the consent, of learned Interpreters, they generally agree herein. Thus they reason against the Image of the Crucifix stamped upon the Popish hoast: the manifest Law of God disalloweth all Images made for the cause of Religion, after what sort soever; but Christ crucified set before our eyes in the Word and Sacraments, is life and Salvation. When our Adversaries allege in defence of Images, That *Solomon* in his Temple erected Cherubims on the Mercy-seat, where God was worshipped: To this our Divines answer, That these Cherubims were erected by the special Commandment of God, who had prescribed both the form of them, and the place where they should be set. For God commanded *Moses* to make the Ark, and the Propitiatory or Mercy-seat, which was the Cover of the Ark, according to the fashion that he had shewed him; withal, he appointed him to make two Cherubims, one at the one end of the Mercy-seat, and the other at the other end; so that with their wings stretched out, they should cover the Mercy-seat. According to this Command-

Deut. 7:5. & 2:3.
Deut. 7:25.
Esay 16:17.
Hos. 13:2.
Ezek. 8:10.
Deut. 27:15.
Esay 30:22.
Numb. 12:8.
Psal. 17:15.

Martin de Sac.
 tract. 5. cap. 6.

Abbot against
 Bishop. tract of
 Imag. SS. 8.
 Will. Cont. 9.
 q. r. Art. 2.
 also the second
 Answ.

ment *Moses* did, but what was done with these Cherubims which *Moses* set up, it is uncertain; but this is most sure, that *Solomon* by virtue of the same Commandment, and to observe that which by *Moses* was prescribed, made two *Cherubims* to stand in the same place, as the other did, and to the same use. Inasmuch then as God had by the Law directed in what sort this should be done, *Solomon* needed no further special direction for the doing of it, but had Trespas against God, if, being appointed to build an house unto God, he had not done it according to such rules as the Law before had li- mitted for the doing of it. It is fitly answered (saith *Martyr*) That God gave the Law, not to himself, but unto us; so then we must follow the same, neither, may we bring him into order; if he other- whiles would do any thing of special Prerogative, he must be differ- ed to do after his own will, but we must obey the Law that is made. Those special Precepts of God (saith *Ursinus*) did as much derogate from the second Commandment concerning Images, as that singular Commandment in times past given unto *Abraham* concerning the offering of his Son *Isaac*, may be said to have detracted from the sixth Precept of the Decalogue. Of old, *Tertullian* returned the same Answer to the like Objection; “Well and good, (saith he) “one and the same God, both by his general Law forbad any Image “to be made, and also by his extraordinary and special Command- “ment, willed an Image of a Serpent to be made; If thou be obe- “dient to the same God, thou has this Law, Make no Image; but “if thou have regard to the Image of the Serpent that was after- “ward made by *Moses*, then do thou as *Moses* did. Make not any “Image against the Law, unless God command thee, as he did “*Moses*.”

They add further, that they were types of spiritual things; which now have not place in the Church of God: Certainly (saith *Martyr*) these Images had some figurative meaning: But they were not set forth, as an example for us to follow; and seeing they were external things, and had the Word added to them, they were (after a sort) Sacraments of those times: and it is only God, and not man, that can make Sacraments. And in Conclusion, they shut up their Answer with this, That we must attempt nothing without the Com- mandment and Warrant of God: For it is to be noted, That *So- lomon*, and *Moses*, which made the Cherubins, durst not make any other, they only made that which was commanded unto them by

1 Reg. 8:5, 6.

Com. places,
part, 2. cap. 5.
S. 26.

Ursin. tom. de
Imag. pag. 43.

Tert. de Idolat.

Ubi supra.

Martin. de
2. præc. pag.
166.
Martyr. ubi
supra.

God: They painted not upon the Walls the acts of *Abraham*, nor the doings of, *Adam*, *Moses*, or others of the Fathers. By all this they sufficiently declare, That, in their judgments, the erecting of Images in the Temple for signification only, without special Warrant from God, is a breach and violation of the holy Law and Commandment of God. And in their Expositions upon this Commandment, they teach, That it condemneth all counterfeit means of God's Worship, and requireth the observation of Rites and Ceremonies prescribed by the Lord; in which only we ought to rest: For it becomes us not to think our selves wiser than God; (who would not have his Church to be instructed with dumb signs; but with the lively preaching of the Word: The Sacraments are Images in the eyes of all the Learned, and unlawful by this Commandment, not; God himself commanded them. What? Are they unlawful only as seals, and not as visible signs of God's Will and Pleasure? Yes; as signs also; for a sign signifying by resemblance, and an Image, are equivalent, and in largeness of sense but one; and a sign is a sign from him that hath a power to institute it. The affirmative part enjoyneth obedience to all the Worship appointed by God; all which was significative, *Heb.* 8:5. & 8:1. But by the nature of the affirmative, we learn: Therefore we may conclude, that the institution of significant Ceremonies, is directly contrary to the Moral Law of God; and, without his warrant, is utterly unlawful.

4. *Whatsoever is not of faith, is sin.* But significant Ceremonies not approved of God in his Word, cannot be instituted or used in faith. Man hath a twofold light given him for his guidance and direction, Natural Reason; and Supernatural Instruction; and what cannot be determined by the former, must be warranted by the other; otherwise it is, unlawful, and consequently not of Faith: But natural reason cannot determine what Ceremonies significant are meet and fit to be used in the solemn Worship of God: For man hath neither power nor authority to bless, nor liberty to annex any such forged or devised sign to be the holy Institution, nor wisdom so discern what is fit and acceptable in that kind. He that is of authority to institute a sign to be the teacher of my understanding, Now, man of himself can give no power to any Symbolical sign of

Urs. tom. 2. de
divis. decalog.
Fulk Rejoyn.
against Mar-
tial.
Perk. Arm.
aurea.
Martin. ubi.
supra.
Lumb. l. 4. dist.
1. T. Aquin.
pag. 3. q. 83.
art. 1. Jewels
Apol. Angl.
pag. 37.

*The quality of
the Negative.*
Nullum enim
signum sensi-
bil. potest esse
causa gratiæ,
nec illam in-
fallibiliter sig-
nare, nisi ex
Domini insti-
tutione. *Bell.*
de Sac. l. 1.
c. 11.
Arqui in Sa-
cramntis sig-
nificare gra-
tiam est eidem
Sacramentali-
ter conferre.
Chem. de Sac.
l. 3. c. 8.

Har. Confess. Wittenbreg. tit. de consecrar. aquæ salis. Martyr. Com. Places. p. 4. c. 9. Sect. 5. Jun. de cuit. Sanct. l. 3. c. 7. 11, 12.

Zepp. de Sacram. l. 3. c. 12. Greg. 2.

Matth. 15:8.

Col. 2:23.

Levit. 10:1.
Deut. 1:18. &
17:3.
1 Reg. 16:14.
2 Reg. 17:26.

his devising, to produce such effects: For the virtue of things comes either from the Word of God put forth in the first Creation, or from his after-institution, or from the Churches impetration; which obtaineth by prayer those effects of things to which they serve by God's Creation and Institution; not any creating or new conception of things to supernatural uses; So that what force or virtue to ends, or purposes supernatural, God hath not put into the creature that man by his institution cannot communicate unto it. Things natural, have indeed by creation an aptness in them to represent spiritual; and some agreement with them; But the determination of them to this purpose, the blessing of them in this use, is from Him only that gave them their first being. Man cannot give any blessing to his devises: Nor hath he any warrant to beg God's blessing upon them: for God will not be effectual by Traditions or human Ceremonies, but by the order and meant appointed by Himself; according to that, *They worship me in vain by the Precepts of men*: Therefore such human ceremonies can work no true devotion, no motions of heart pleasing to God, not confirmation of faith, or serious repentance; but only have an opinion of wisdom in voluntary worship.

Again: What understanding is there in man, to assure him that be may lawfully annex signs of his own devising to the Word and Sacraments, which God hath ordained for the full instruction of his Church? God hath disallowed the institution of new rites not commanded: as *Achaz* and *Manasses* building new Altars in the house of the Lord, are reprehended for it. And is there any wit of man that can devise how we should follow them in that kind; or in general do as they did; and not incur the same rebuke? As the sin of the Angels that fell, and the *Sodomites*, was one in kind, though different in its special nature; So is the sin of building an Altar, and devising Sacramental rites in the worship of God. Is it not our duty to acknowledge God so wise and gracious in the signs that he hath chosen; as to hold it presumption for any man to imitate him in devising of the like? Are not the Sacraments the seals of the heavenly King? and can any new Print be added to the real of a King, without high Treason? What Master of a Family in his house, What Prince in his Dominion, would grant power to any one, to change, alter, or reform any thing upon his own pleasure? The signs which the Lord hath instituted for the instruction

of his Church, are sufficient and do better serve for the purpose than any that man can devise: Therefore it is needless to forge any other; yea, it is a vilifying of the wisdom of God. It is easy to shew, that the godly Learned in all Ages have disliked the devising of new signs; howsoever, who men they have failed in some particulars, and ignorantly gone against what in general they soundly taught: He is too partial, as will not acknowledge this in the Fathers themselves, who did substantially maintain the perfection of Scripture, and the necessity of celebrating Divine Mysteries according to the precise institution delivered unto them: and yet gave more power and virtue to vain inventions, and urged the necessity of Traditions, further than the Truth would permit; or can stand with their own doctrine and positions truly laid down in other places of their Writings. It is well known, the Papists have miserably corrupted the Simplicity of God's Ordinances, by their sinful, vain, and idle Ceremonies; yet some sparkles of this truth doth shine amongst them: *Bellarmino* would prove, that the Jews did not only desire a corporal sign of the true God, because then they had no need to make a Calf; for they had a Cloud and a Pillar, which did lead them better than the Calf, which must be carried: In this reason, though weak and simple (for human vanity doth many things both needless, and unlawful; else had their Oil, Cream, Salt, Spittle, *Agnes Dei*, never been devised) this truth is contained, That where God hath ordained signs profitable and sufficient for the information of his Church, It is needless and vain for men to devise and constitute others, or more, for that end and purpose. Again, the Ceremonies which were ordained by God himself, for the information of his Church by their signification, are now ceased; and cannot be continued without sin: and what warrant then hath any man, upon his own will and pleasure to institute or ordain significant Ceremonies in the time of the Gospel.

When the Church was an infant, kept under the Rudiments of the Law, she was to be taught only by those shadows and figures that God prescribed: And now, in the brightness of the Gospel when all figures, shadows, veil, adumbrations; whether signifying things present or to come, be done away: Shall we think the light of reason sufficient to direct, without the guidance of Scripture in things present or to come, be done away: Shall we think the light matter of Rites and Ceremonies, appropriated to the solemn Worship of God for the Instruction of his People? Were the old fi-

De Eccl.
triumph. l. 2.
c. 13.
Sect. *At hoc.*

Si populo
Christiano
Apostoli Cere-
monias vel Ri-
tus divinitus
traditos impo-
nere noluerunt;
quis, oro sancti-
mentis obtrud-
det illi adin-
ventiones ad-
inventas hu-
manitus.
Confess. Hel-
vet. cap. 27.
Conf. Wit-
temb. tit. de
Baptis.
Calv. opusc.
pag. 59.

Whitak. de Pont.
Rom. q. 7. c. 3.
Art. 6. Idem.
cont. Dura. l.
9. Sect. 59. p.
826.
Rainold. Conf.
with Hart. c. 8.
d. 4. p. 50. lin.
30.
Vrsib. tom. 2.
tit. de Imag.
1 Cor. 11:23.
Mat. 28:19, 28.
Acts 10:47.
Whitak. cont.
Dur. Lib. 5.
Sect. 21. & l.
10. Sect. 21. &
l. 8. Sect. 65.

Jer.10:14. &
51:17.

Isa. 8:20.
Jer. 8:9.

Col. 2:13.

gures taken away, that there might be place for new? Were Divine abolished, that Human might succeed? Well then, may our Adversaries triumph over the Force; that are sent forth against their Superstitions; burdensome, Jewish, vain, and heathenish Rites and Customs. Our Writers dispute thus against them: We must have no other signs in Baptism, than such as the Scripture warranteth; They allege that of the Apostle, *What I have received of the Lord, that do I deliver*; That of our Saviour, *Go and Baptize, teaching them to observe whatsoever I command you*; That of Peter *Can any forbid Water that these be not Baptized*; And generally, the practice of Christ and his Apostles: But if Ceremonies significant be lawful, which have only Warrant or Approbation from the will or wit of Man; then must all these reasons stoop to the Oil, Cream, Salt, Lights, and Spittle, in use amongst them; for all these have as much reason and shew of Wisdom to Warrant them, as any other can that are simply of man's devising: And, what Understanding or Judgement can man have of himself to discern how, or by what means God will be Worshipped? None at all. For the Scripture testifieth that every man is brutish by his own knowledge, nor more able to discern what in this case is fit and acceptable; than a blind man is to judge of Colours; that there is no light in them that speak not according to the Scripture, no wisdom in them that reject the Word of the Lord: There is a certain light engraven in the hearts of men by Nature, whereby they know somewhat concerning God; as, that there is a God, that he is wise, just, good and bountiful, the Governor of all things; and they discern some things pertaining to justice, equity, temperance, honest commerce and dealing with men: but they are utterly ignorant how, or by what means God will be served, what he will bless for the Instruction of his People. We see and know by experience, That is most perilous, unprofitable, and disallowed of God, that doth best sort with our vain conceptions: Carnal Observations, such as, *Touch not, taste not, handle not*; have a shew of wisdom in voluntary Religion, and carry a glorious shew of holiness to our seeming; when the Word of God discovereth them to be fruitless, distasteful, odious. Whence grew the first contempt of God's Ordinances, the pollution of holy things with carnal Customs, that are according to this World; and not according to godliness; the corruptions of the Truth with manifold Superstitions and Idolatries; but from a fond admiration of Rites

and Customs devised by others, or taken up upon our own Heads; which being once admitted into the Worship of My did multiply and increase till they had obscured, if not clean coveted and abolished the simplicity and glory of God's Ordinances, (as bad weeds overgrow the Corn) and secretly stolen the heart away from all due reverence and respect to the word of Life, and seals of our Salvation. For as a man is blind, carnal, impotent; and yet a Lover of his own devices: So are the signs devised by him, dark, veiling the brightness of the Gospel; carnally: spiritual; dead without Power; and yet better affected, more delighted in, than the Sacraments themselves. No sooner was the sign of the Cross added unto Baptism, and made a sign like to the Lord's; but it presently became greater than the Water which was Christ's sign, and that in the Eyes of them who so advanced it. Moreover, admit Reason for an Umpire in this matter, and Images cannot be kept out of the Church: for no means is more profitable to inform the mind, confirm the memory, and move the affection, than is the sight of a Picture artificially made, cut, or carved; if a man may believe himself, or give credit to his imagination: If the Will of God be not unto us instead of all reasons, we shall be hardly drawn to dislike that manner of teaching or worshipping. A man that is enlightened with the knowledge of God's Will, and the mystery of Salvation; may lawfully in his meditations make use of diverse Creatures or Things, that are apt and fit to represent Spiritual things unto him: but he must not take upon him to determine them to be used as signs for such an end and purpose; for having no promise of God to come by that course, he can expect no blessing from God in that practice, but the contrary: Seeing therefore man is himself ignorant and unwise, neither able to receive the things the Spirit, nor discern that which pertaineth to the Kingdom of Christ; (nor yet being enlightened with the knowledge of the Truth according to godliness, to devise any fit or acceptable means whereby God should be worshipped, or his People taught in the ways of holiness): It followeth, That in the worship of God, signs not approved of him in his Word, cannot be instituted or used in Faith, and consequently are to be held unlawful.

5. Christ Jesus, the great Doctor of his Church, being called of his heavenly Father to teach to us perfectly, and at once, the whole Counsel of God, and the things that did pertain to the

Mat. 23:8, 10.
Joh. 4:25.
Acts 1:3.

Kingdom of God to the end of the World, was faithful in all his House, as was *Moses*; and made known unto his Disciples whatsoever he received of his Father. But *Moses* prescribed the, form of God's-worship in every particular Ceremony significant; and brought in none, no not one into the Church, which the Lord himself did not institute, giving charge to the Church of the Jews, That they should neither add thereto, nor take ought therefrom. Therefore our Saviour Christ also taught his Disciples what Ceremonies significant ought to be used in the Church of God, to whose Ordinance nothing must be added, from whose Institution nothing ought to be diminished: The old Testament was indeed delivered unto one People only of the World; The Commission of the Gospel was *Go teach all Nations*. But the liberty of Instituting Rites significant was no greater to the Christian Church, than to the Church of the Jews: They had a prescription of particular Ceremonies, moft fitly agreeing to the polity of their Church and Common-wealth, and dispensaotion of those times: So, hath the Christian Church also: to which we are as precisely bound, as ever was the Church of the Jews to the Ordinances appointed for that time and state, as hath been shewed before; in Circumstantial matter, concerning Time, Place, and Order of divine Service; And several Christian Churches have liberty according to the general Rules of Scripture to constitute what is most agreeable to the condition of the Country, and doth best tend to Edification: And in these things the Jews had Authority no less than the others. In Ceremonies and Rites significant annexed to the Worship of God, the Jews were tied to the written Law of *Moses* and the Prophets; nor may any thing be attempted lawfully by the Christian Church in things of this Nature, more than was or ought to have been by them. Though men be as different almost in Nature as in Nations and Languages, yet must they of necessity submit themselves to the use of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, which two Ceremonies only are commanded by Divine precept; and are to be received of all Christians, that in truth and foundness profess the Gospel. And seeing Christ, Instituted no signs but these, the Apostles commended no other to the several Churches planted and dressed by them: What necessity is there, that difference of People to which the Gospel is now preached, should Infer a liberty of inventing new Signs or Rites never seen or allowed of Christ?' Those that God prescribed for the Jews

Heb. 3:2, 5.

Joh. 15:15.

Exod. 25:9, 38,
39, 40, and 27:
19, & 39, 42,
43.

Deut. 12:32.

Vis. Jua. Am-
mad. in Bell.
lib. 4. de pont.
Cap. 17.

were fit for that Time, and for that People, none else might be devised; those that Christ hath ordained for all Churches are sufficient; most fit for them; what shall be brought in besides and annexed to them, doth want both his Approbation and Blessing: As *Moses* was faithful in the House of God *as a Servant*, both in things real and ritual, as some distinguish; So was Christ also, *as a Son*. Neither did his faithfulness stand in removing the Law of Jewish Ceremonies, and disburdening all Christians from the use of them; but in prescribing Laws and Ordinances, whereby the Church is to be ordered and instituted until his second coming, and that as particularly and expressly as *Moses* had done unto the *Israelites*. To stand upon comparison betwixt *Moses* and *Christ* in perfection or real faithfulness, (as some call it) is not to this purpose; for his perfection is one thing, his faithfulness another: and whom He did exceed in perfectness, He did every way equalize in faithfulness In the House of God: He did not only teach a more excellent Doctrine than *Moses*, but more full and perfect: He did not only antiquate what Ceremonies were to be shadows of good things to come, and figures of man's Redemption by his Sacrifice upon the Cross; but he ordained also, with what visible Signs and Tokens his Church should be nourished, and assured of his love and favour: As he died to bring Life to mankind, raised up himself from Death, ascended, entered within the Veil, and hath taken possession of the heavenly Mansion for us: So did he give direction to his Apostles, and in them to all Churches; by what Statutes and Laws his People should be Covered, by what Signs and Ceremonies they should taught and confirmed in Faith. Do we then leave nothing to the Arbitrament of the Church? Nothing; but what was left to the Power and Authority of the Jewish Church: for we have a Canon as perfect, a direction as exact and particular as ever they had. Many honourable witnesses of God's truth have judiciously observed, That Christ in holy Scripture hath not singularly and specially prescribed concerning external Discipline and Ceremonies, for that he foresaw these things were to depend upon the occasions and opportunities of times, which must be determined by general Rules given for direction in these cases; whose Judgment we embrace with reverence, & acknowledge consonant to the words of wholesome Doctrine, so it be understood according to their true intent and meaning, Of matters merely accidental, circumstantial, or natural

concerning Discipline or Worship: But thence to infer a liberty to ordain in substantial matters of Discipline & significative Ceremonies whatsoever shall seem good in our own eyes, without the approbation and warrant of God's Word, is more than the Learned grant, or the Truth it self will permit: As touching the Church (saith *Martyr*) she altereth not her form. It is always one manner of Common wealth, & nothing is hid from the undemanding of God the Author of the Laws. The Lord of the house was not inferior to the servant in fidelity: What our Saviour Christ heard and saw of the Father; that be manifested to his Disciples, charging them to teach the Church to observe it: What they received of the Lord, that they delivered in great simplicity, without any addition of new doctrine to his Doctrine, or of devised symbolical signs to his Signs; never once intimating in their Epistles or Writings, any liberty that the Church should have to multiply Rites or Ceremonies for mystical signification, and to annex them to the holy things of God. And when we can neither hear from *Moses*, Christ, nor his Apostles, that the forging and inventing of such observations is allowed before God; what warrant can we have to bear us out therein? If Cities and Towns—Corporate plead Immunities and Exemptions from the Law, and assume to themselves authority to make Decrees of this or that sort: being impleaded by the King's Attorney for it; either they must shew their Charter to warrantize such Privileges, or incur Censure for their sauciness and presumption: So they that challenge privilege to devise significant Rites in the Worship of God, and annex them to the Signs which God Himself hath established, must either shew their Charter signed with the authentic Seal of the Court of Heaven, or be cast in Judgment when they be impleaded at his Bar.

6. If God be the only Teacher of his Church to instruct it by Word and Sign, then no Ceremonies significant may be admitted, into the solemn Worship of God for doctrine and instruction, but such as bear his stamp, are marked with his Seal, are warranted by, holy Scripture: For the chaste Spouse of Christ, who knows the voice of her Beloved, will not acknowledge unwritten Traditions for the Word of God: But God is the only Teacher of his Church both by Word and Sign, As the doctrine which is taught must be from above, so the means whereby it is taught must be of God: both he that teacheth new doctrines, and he that deviseth strange

Loc. Com-
part. I. c. II.
Sect. II.

Jam. 4:12.
Matth. 23:8.
Act. 3:32.

means to instruct the people of God in the knowledge of the truth according to godliness, doth run upon his own head. It is a truth without controversy; That as to forgive sins, receive into favour, and bless with spiritual blessings in Jesus Christ, is proper to the Lord alone; so it is his peculiar, to institute signs and seals of his Covenant and Mercy. For none can sign a Lease, who hath not power to let and demise it: nor annex a seal to any promise, that hath not authority to make it, and to confer the good promised. But it seems as lawful to devise new seals of Divine promises, as Symbolical signs of spiritual duties: seeing to teach the way to heaven, and to prescribe what service man should perform to God; doth belong to him that hath Power and Sovereignty of life and death, who is able to save and to destroy. And if we may be bold to invent signs to teach man his duty; and link them to the means of God's Worship, so long as they signify no other thing but what the Scripture teacheth. Why may we not bring in signs also to assure us of the truth of God's promises, when nothing is thereby assured and sealed, but what is promised in the written Word. As the Duty taught, and the Promise confirmed, are both from one Supreme; so the sign of Instruction, and the seal of Confirmation, do challenge the same author, require the same authority. This will the better appear, if we shall consider, That signs do not become seals by any special institution; whereby they are distinguished from signs in regard of the efficient cause, With respect of the thing that they are appointed to sign or signify: Signs of Divine promises are seals, true or false; vain or behooveful, even from this, that they are determined to signify such a thing, whether the Institution be of God or Man. Signs of mans duty, be signs only, from what author soever they have their ordination. The reason is, because duties are only taught, not assured as duties; but promises represented by sign's are thereby sealed. What is a seal, but a sign sealing up a thing promised; or a print whereby a thing promised by Covenant is signed. Therefore if the Church may not presume to add new seals to the promises of God, but is bound to rest contented with them that are commended unto her by the Lord himself, She may not devise symbolical signs in the worship of God, for the instruction of her children in the ways of holiness. It may further be added, That a sign is a visible word: and therefore if no voice must be heard in the Congregation but the Lord's alone; no teaching signs

Mic. 7:16.
Hos. 14:1.

Essay. 7:14.
& 38:7.

Jewel. Treat.
of the Sacr.

Bellar. de Sacr.
l. 1. cap. 24.
Sect. de Sacr.

Basting. Cate.
q.66. of the
Sacram.

must be admitted in his worship, but such as he, hath licensed to speak and stand in place. *Polanus* saith, Those things are impious, which are directly opposed to the Commandment of God; of which sort are many Traditions of the Papists; as, the abuse of the Lords Supper, the Mass, Invocation of dead men, worshipping of Images, the law concerning Single life, Festival days dedicated to Saints, Images made for religious uses, that is, that they might serve for the use of Religion, either that they might be worshipped, or that holy things might be represented by them, or that God be worshipped by them: For God willeth not this end of Images, but will have all men taught by his Word; *Monumenta autem quibus res divina representatur sunt sola Sacramenta, non picta, aut ficta, aut sculpta, sed administrata et usurpata legitime*. In the Book of Homilies, all human devised signs are condemned in Baptism) because no signs should burden the Church, save those which the Lord hath left, which are not burdensome. D. *Fulk* demandeth of the *Rhemists*, How is the sign of the Cross a convenient memorial of Christ's death, which is not ordained of Christ, nor taught by the Apostles to be such? *Lambertus Danaus*, is resolute; It is blasphemy (saith he) to think that any outward thing may be made a sign in the Church of any thing that is spiritual; unless it be expressly ordained in the Word, and commanded by God himself to be used to that end. *Bucer* condemned them that devise any sign for religious use: And this the Schoolmen themselves saw and taught: It pertaineth only to the signifier to determine what signs must be used to signify.

7. The Scripture is the sole and sufficient Rule of all immediate worship, internal or external, moral or ceremonial, as it is evident by the whole tenor of God's Word, and the general Confession of all Protestant Divines. The Lord never left it to the will and arbitrament of man, to worship him as seemed good in his own eyes: But in all Ages of the World, and states of the Church, he still prescribed how he would be served. The duty that *Adam* owed in the state of Innocency, must be paid according to the prescription: he was taught in what he should shew his obedience, what time he should set apart as a solemn day of rest; the like may be, said of all the worship he was to perform. After the Fall, was any worship allowed, which was not commanded? We read not of any express Commandement that the Fathers had to offer Sacrifice, or to ob-

Syntag tom. 2
l. 6. c. 38.

Hom. for *Whit-*
suntide, part.
2.
Fulk against
Rhem. in *Luc.*
14. Sect. 5.

Cont. Bell. de
cult. Sanct.
l. 3. c. 7.

Levit. 10:1.
Jer. 7:31.
Deut. 12:31,
32.
Col. 2:23.

serve the difference of demand unclean beasts. But without question, they received particular instructions from the Lord, touching these things, either by the inspiration of his Spirit, or some Word, or both: For the Scripture saith, *God had respect unto Abel, and his sacrifice*; But sacrifice and burnt-offerings could not please him, if they had not been offered in faith and obedience. Again, *By faith Abel offered a greater sacrifice than Cain; without which it is impossible to please God*. But faith presupposeth revelation, and obedience a Commandement. In other Ages of the Church it is most clear and evident, that the Lord shewed to his Church the whole form of worship, wherewith for that time he would be served, unto which they might not add; from which they might not detract the least jot or tittle. The Prophets, our Saviour Christ, the Apostles, do sharply reprehend all Rites devised by man for religious use, though carrying never so great a shew of wisdom, humility and care: which they would never have done, if will-worship had not been unlawful, and displeasing unto God. To spend many words in the confirmation of this Point is superfluous, since it is a truth generally received by all Protestant Divines, That Ceremonies are unlawful, when they be imposed, urged, or used with opinion of holiness, necessity or worship. But to prevent mistaking, it will be expedient here to shew, what Worship is, and what warrant each part thereof must have from God. The Hebrew word, *Habad*, which signifies to Serve, is commonly used for all that service, good and bad, which is given either to the true God, or Idols; which two kinds of worship as they agree in one common nature of Worship or Service, so do they in their general or common nature, though they be opposite in their special nature, objects, and adjuncts: contraries we know must consent in some third, as virtue and vice, hot and cold, black and white: the same is to be held of Divine worship true and false. For service comprehending under it worship true and false, as the parts thereof, at least analogical; of necessity the common nature of worship must agree to them both, else how could the service of Idols, or false-worship of the true God, be called Worship: This hath been wisely observed in other cases not unlike, by our learned Writers against the common Adversary. *Bellarmino* would prove, That the offering of Incense and sweet Odours, is not a Sacrifice in the New Testament; because it is not offered by the Priest only, not only to the Lord. Our Divines reply, That there are many Sacrifices, to which that definition of Sacrifices cannot

Gen. 4:4, 5.
Psal. 50:9, 10.
Heb. 11:7.
Heb. 11:6.

Levit. 10:1.
Jer. 7:31.
Col. 2:23.
Matth. 15:9.
Esay 29:13.
Deut. 4:17, 19,
& 6:13. & 11:
13, 16. & 17:
3. & 13:2. &
10:12. & 28:
14, 47. & 12:
30. & 29:26.
& 31:20.
Exod. 20:5.
& 10:26.
& 12:30.
Judg. 10:10.
2 Sam. 16:
19.
2 Reg. 10:
18, 19, 21, 22.
& 17:33.
& 21:28.
1 Chr. 28:19.
2 Chro. 30:
23.
Jer. 8:2.
Mal. 3:14,
15.
Rainold. in-
cense. Apoc.
tom. 2.
p. 244.

agree, *viz.* profane Sacrifices which are offered by them that are no Priests; to devils and not to God; after a manner devised, not prescribed by God: and therefore seeing that of Sacrifices some be holy, and some profane, in the definition of a sacrifice in general, those things only are to be put, which are common to both kinds, In like manner, when there is a true and false worship; an holy and profane service, those things only are to be put in the definition of worship, which agree to both kinds. Divine worship taken in that latitude of sense as to comprehend the service of God true and false, (for to speak of the worship of false gods, is impertinent) is an action or work commanded by Divine Authority, instituted by man, or devised upon our own heads, whereby God is worshipped, his promises are sealed; or obedience to his Will is taught. All actions that man performeth unto man, are not parts of civil worship: but every act that man performeth directly or immediately to God, is a part of Divine worship, and ought merely to concern his glory: For it is impossible to conceive how the creature, who is infinite degrees inferior to the Creator in excellency, and altogether unable to return the least good back again to Him for the infinite blessings he hath received from him, should perform any act immediately unto him but worship. A work commanded, is not large enough to comprehend the whole nature of worship, but doth distinguish true worship from false, as the uprightness of the heart doth sincere worship from hypocritical and counterfeit. To say Man is a reasonable creature always enjoying sound health, is not the definition of Man, but of a sound man; because there be many, subject to infirmities and diseases, who yet be men: So to define Worship to be a work commanded of God, is to shew what lawful and holy Worship is, not what worship in general: For many things are worship which God never required, That Worship is true which God commandeth: that false, which man deviseth: that sincere that proceedeth from an honest heart, a good conscience, and faith unfained: that hypocritical, which cometh from an halting, divided, double heart, or is performed by the outward man alone: But truth and sincerity being special adjuncts of worship appointed and commanded of God, cannot come within the definition of worship in general. And as the means that God hath appointed to seal his promises or teach obedience, be acts of divine service: So the means that man shall devise or in-

Zanch. de re-
demp. in se-
cundum prec.
Par. dradiaph.
pag. 90.

Essay 29:13.
Matthew 15:9.

Psal. 78:34,
35.

vent of himself for that end and purpose, must needs be worship also. If God be worshipped when obedience is taught by the preaching of the Gospel, or his promises sealed by the use of the Sacraments: When the same duty is taught by visible signs, or the promise confirmed by new devised seals, he is worshipped and honoured: for every action whereby God is worshipped, is worship; and every work whereby obedience is taught, is obedience or service. From hence it appears, that the definition of essential worship, to be, [That which is necessarily required to God's service, so as that the contrariety thereof must needs displease him] is too short, as that which agreeth not to all worship, but only to that which is true and ordained of God: For we know, many Traditions, Customs, and Ceremonial observations are obtruded upon the Churches as worship, the contrary whereof would please, and not displease God. Were not the precepts of men reprehended by the Prophet *Esay* the Pharisaiical washings taxed by Christ, and other Ceremonial observations condemned by the Apostle *Paul*, as matters of worship, though false and erroneous? How could there be any will-worship, if all worship were necessarily required of God? Neither are those Ceremonies only to be reputed essential parts of worship, that be urged with opinion of Sanctity, Necessity, Efficacy, whether true or false: but those signs also that are devised to be means of spiritual instruction by their notable and mystical signification: It being a part and means of his worship, to teach his worship. To place the worship of God in Faith, Hope, and Love only, and not in external Rites and Ceremonies, is contrary to Truth and Reason. For then the Ceremonies of the Law, & the Sacraments of the New Testament must be reputed no parts of God's essential worship, which is most absurd. The Papists are accused by the Learned of out side, to place the Worship of God in their vain Traditions and Observations. What worship do they in end, only accessory and accidental, as some call it? No, but essential and substantial: and yet they speak of Rites and Ceremonies, which by the Canons and Constitutions of that Synagogue, are not remained to be of absolute necessity to salvation; as they plainly Profess, and our Divines acknowledge: Whereby it is not hard to gather, what is meant by essential or substantial worship; that it stands not only in internal duties, but also in external Rite; and Ceremonies which are acknowledged to be of no absolute necessity.

Esay 29:13.
Matth. 15:9.
Mar. 7:7.
Col. 1:13.

Calv. Inst.
 l. 4. c. 10.
 Sect. 9. 12.

Now the better to conceive what warrant every part of God's service must have from the Scripture, three things are to be distinguished in it.

The first is the essential worship it self, whether, concerning man's duty, or the means of his Instruction.

The second, the natural Ceremonies, or voluntary compositions or gestures of the body, as are with moderate deliberation used to shadow forth the hidden motions, affections, and dispositions of the mind, that are begotten by the consideration of God's excellent Greatness, Majesty, Goodness, Love, &c.

The third, is the circumstances, and order of performance (which is by some called accidental, or accessory, worship), such as concern time, place, person, and manner of performance; all which are required in the celebration of God's worship. Thus Divines make a difference (and that necessarily) betwixt the substance of worship, and the things annexed to it as necessary circumstances. And as we must distinguish the substantial means of worship from the external testifications of inward devotion by natural Ceremonies; so must they be distinguished from bare and naked circumstances of time, place, and manner of celebrating divine Mysteries: for circumstances are merely accessories to worship, no parts thereof, if we speak properly, according to the ordinary acceptation of the word, in Classical Authors. But the gestures of the body made, and purposely framed to shadow forth the hidden affection of the Soul, are external acts of adoration and worship. The true worshippers of God are distinguished from Idolaters by this, that they had not *bowed the knee to Baal*. Kissing, bowing to an Image, is condemned as a service of the Idol; and the whole worship of God is oft-times signified by the terms of kissing, bowing, kneeling adoring, falling down before him. In the Old Testament, the worship of God is noted by this word, *Corah*, which signifieth the bending of the knees, or hams; *Kadad*, which signifieth to bow, or nod the head; *Sagad*, almost of the same signification; *Schapel*, *Schachah*, and *Shacack*, which signify to bow the whole body, and sometimes to fall flat upon the ground. In the New Testament, God's Worship is noted by these words, $\gamma\omicron\nu\nu\pi\epsilon\tau\acute{\epsilon}\omega$, which signifieth to bow the knee; and $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\kappa\upsilon\nu\acute{\epsilon}\omega$, which is to worship by kissing, and casting down himself at the knees of another. What? that to adore, is to give honour with the gesture of the body, as well as with the mind

1 King. 19:18.
Hos. 13:2.
Ezek. 18:6.

Psal. 2:12.
Esay 45:23.
Phil. 2:9, 10.
Ephes. 3:24.
Joh. 4:20, 21.
1 Reg. 8:54.
Ezr. 9:5.
Deut. 4:19.
Psal. 95:5.
Matth. 17:14.
Matth. 2:1, 11.

or Words: *Priscianus*, and *Nonnius*, derive the word *Adoratio* of *Ador*, which signifieth fine flour, or corn whereof fine Cakes were made, which the *Romans* used in their Sacrifices. *Valla* derives it of *oro*, but yet he saith, *Adore nihilominus sie ore fieri*; not, *sine flexu genuum ac gestu corporis*.

It implieth in it three acts; first, An apprehension of the excellency of that which is adored.

Secondly, An act of the Will, desiring to do something to testify our acknowledgment of this greatness, and our subjection and inferiority.

Thirdly, An outward act expressing the same.

The two former are internal, the laft is outward, bringing that to light that was hid in the heart; but the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin Words, signifying adoration, do note an external humiliation, and either a probation of the whole body, or of some part, *viz.* the head, or the bending of the knee, or killing of the hands, to shadow forth and express the internal affection of the heart, which is the Soul and life of external worship. But if it be demanded what warrant these things must have from the Word of God, the answer is direct.

First, The actions of worship it self, whatsoever are not prescribed and appointed of God, they are forbidden; for concerning them, nothing may be added, diminished, or changed, but all things must be done according to Divine Institution.

Secondly, Natural Ceremonies or Signs (as they are called), which are but inward demonstration? of the secret disposition of the heart, are sufficiently warranted by the light of Nature, and the Word of God, though they be not required as absolutely necessary, nor particularly prescribed, as be the substantial means of worship. And though no precise gesture be of absolute necessity in any part of God's worship; yet are these Ceremonies so far Divine, that it is not in the power of any Church in the World, altogether to prohibit them.

Thirdly, Arbitrary Ceremonies concerning time, place, and manner of celebrating Divine Mysteries, are in the power of the Church, to be ordered as she shall judge to be most convenient, and tending to edification; provided that all her Ordinances be squared according to the general rules of direction laid down in the Word of God, and nothing be done contrary to the integrity of Doctrine, the

Bell. de sacr.
l. 2. c. 29. sect.
secund. part.
Quædam sunt
ab ipsa natura
&c.

Calv. Inst. l. 4.
c. 30. sect. 30.

simplicity of Christian Religion, the edification of the Church, good order, and the rules of love: and in all this, nothing is affirmed, but what is taught and maintained by Protestant Divines against the common Adversaries of God's Grace and truth; but sign; signifying by proportion annexed to the solemn worship of God, are parts of his worship, not accessory, but substantial; proper, not accidental, in the sense before explained, For Ceremonies significant are visible words (as *Augustine* calleth the Sacraments) teaching Doctrine true or false, as in signification they consent or dissent from the Word of God; and of necessity the Doctrine taught Word, and Sign, must agree in one common nature. What is it is to say the Sacraments are visible words, but that they are Signs, Images, Similitudes, Types, visible Anti-types of the Words; or that the Sacraments as Signs, do represent that to the eyes, which words bring to the ears?

Now the public reading of Scripture for the edification of the Church, is acknowledged to be a part of God's Worship; so is the Preaching, explaining, and applying of the Word; the text being the same for substance with the exposition; And if to teach by word be a worship of God; to teach by sign, whether significative by the appointment of God, or declaratory by the invention of man, is worship also, when they teach one thing in use public and religious.

Again, all Actions whereby spiritual Duties are taught in God's solemn Worship, are Acts whereby God is Worshipped, and all Acts whereby God is Worshipped in his solemn Service, is Worship as all Actions whereby he is obeyed, is Obedience. But significant Ceremonies do teach spiritual Duties in the Worship of God; and consequently God is Worshipped by them, and they are Worship. Moreover, the Jewish Ceremonies Instituted by God, and Ceremonies significative devised by Men, and annexed to the solemn Worship of God, do agree in the same common nature and use; both appropriated to the Worship of God, both outward shadows of mystical signification to teach spiritual Duties; But the use of Jewish Ceremonies in the solemn Worship of God, was a part of his true and immediate Worship and Service: Therefore others also must be apart of his Worship; for agreeing with them in common nature and use, they must needs consent in the common Nature of Worship, though they differ in their Adjuncts,

Cont. Faust. 1.
19. cap. 16. et
Tract. in lo.
80. et de Trin.
l. 3. c. 4.

Ursin. tom. 2.
ad Flac. Sect.
resp. pag. 1433.

Ut enim. voca-
lis oratio est
cultus, quia est
signum menta-
lis; ita adora-
tio erit cultus,
quia est sig-
num interæ
adorationis.
Bell. de sacr.
l. 2. c. 3.
prop. 5.

true and false, as they dissent in their special Institution; the one taking their Original from God, the other springing from Man's brain. The commandment of God, and the special instituted signification of a Ceremony, makes it not barely to be Worship, but false and erroneous: Incense offered to the true God according to his prescription to an holy end, was an holy Sacrifice, pleasing and acceptable; Incense offered to Saints without direction from God, is a Sacrifice also, because both these are one in the common nature of a Sacrifice, but false and profane. Circumcision, abstinence from Blood, and other legal Rites according to the prescription of the Law, was an immediate Worship of God; but now to obtain in like manner, and for the same end, is Superstitious. Now, to take up the use of legal Rites, is Will-worship; because they are not required at our hands: A thing in it self indifferent, being commanded of God for some special end and purpose, becomes a necessary and immediate part of his Worship, though it was not so before; but if any man upon his own head shall use it to such ends to which it is not appointed, or with the same opinion, of holiness and necessity; he stands guilty of devised Worship. It had been simply indifferent to offer a Lamb speckled or unspeckled in Sacrifice, had not the Lord determined they should bring one without spot for an oblation; but if to the same end for which God ordained it should be without spot; any man had presumed to appoint or offer a Lamb without spot; in so doing, he had forged a Worship unto himself: This is no new piece of Doctrine, but what hath been acknowledged, and is maintained by our Divines against the Adversaries. Lastly, signs Sacramental are parts of God's Worship: But significant signs by analogy or proportion, are Sacramental; as shall be shewed in the next Argument.

8. No signs Sacramental are warrantable or lawful, but what are instituted of God, and approved in his Word; *Paul* saith, *He received of the Lord, what he delivered to the Church of Corinth, touching the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper*, 1 Cor. 11:13. which must be understood of all other also: *The Baptism of John, was it from Heaven or of Men?* It was not from Men, but God. He is the Ordainer of all Sacraments, new or old; Our Divines maintain

Martyr speaking against the popish Addition of Salt in Baptism; saith, So then that which is added to Baptism, is self-worship; and no lawful and sincere Administration of Baptism, *Martyr. Com. pl. part. 4. cap. 8. 5.* In Institutions which are means to an end, the respect of the end is also required to the end; but a right end not so.

Gen. 9:13. & 17, 19.
Willet Con. 24. q. 4. Arg. 2.
Divinum et interteum non esset misterium, si quicquam ex te adderes. Chrys. homl. 7. in 1 Corinth.
Bell. de Sacr. l. 1. c. 9. 14. & de Script. l. 4. c. 5. *Christus in Ecclesia solus potest Sacramenta constituere.* Mald. in Matth. 26:11.
Zepper. de sacra. lib. 1.
 The Sacraments were ordained to move, lead, and Instruct our dull and heavy hearts, by sensible Creatures, that so our negligence in not hearing or marking the Word of God might be amended.
Jewel's Treatise of the sacraments.

against the *Romanists*, That the Sacraments are expressly commanded of God in holy Scripture, and that in the Institution of a Sacrament these must be express mention of the material parts thereof, as it was in the Institution of Baptism and the Lord's Supper; yea, the Papists themselves acknowledge that Ceremonies Sacramental, must be Instituted by Authority, divine, not human; though they refuse to be judged in this by the Scripture, and fly to unwritten Traditions, which blasphemously they make to be one part of the word of God, in authority equal to the holy Scripture: But signs appointed to signify by analogy or proportion, & annexed to the solemn Worship of God, are Sacramental. The ancients define a Sacrament to be, A visible sign or form of an invisible Grace, A sign not natural, but voluntary; not indicant, but analogical; teaching or shadowing by representation: So they call a Sacrament, a visible Word, as in Scripture they are termed Signs or Memorials. In modern Writers, the name Sacrament is given to the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil; to the Altars, Sacrifices, Cherubins, Lights, and all Ceremonies ordained for signification in time of the Law; as well as to the Rainbow, Manna, the Rock, the Red-Sea, Circumcision, and the Paschal-Lamb: Some of which were instituted to teach Man his Duty, as others to seal and confirm the Promise of God, or if all of them were seals of some spiritual Promises, they were all Signs of some spiritual Duty, and Sacramental in both respects. Whence we may conclude, That the common nature of a Sacrament doth agree to signs determined by representation to teach any duty that man oweth to God (his absolute Sovereign, and merciful Father in Christ Jesus) whether Supematural or Moral. The Precepts contained in the Book of Life, are, and do set forth the mind of God unto us, no less than the Promises made therein; nor can any reason be given, why the representation of some spiritual Duty [for all Duties that man is to perform unto God in Christ are spiritual Duties,] by a mystical Rite, should not as properly pertain to the nature of a Sacrament; as the shadowing or sealing of some spiritual Promise. What the Word doth bring to the ear, that the Sacrament

Quaquam ne professei quidem fidei. Nam attendum non tantum quid velit qui profitetur, sed etiam quid acceptum sit ei, apud quem oportet professionem fieri. Ch. de Sacr. lib. 1. cap. 8. *ursin. com.* 2. pag. 1630.

doth exhibit to the other senses: The whole Scripture doth testify, That from the beginning of the World, the Lord did intend this in Instituting Ceremonies, that they should represent those things to the Eyes of men, which his heavenly Word doth offer to their Ears. But commandments are part of the Word as well as Promises; The Will of God manifesting, what he will do for us, is a mystery; so is it prescribing what Service he will have from us, and a visible, corporal, material element determined to teach either of them, or both, is a sign Sacramental and mystical, expressing some sacred mystery to the Eye, as the Word doth to the sense which receiveth the Voice. We know no more what Service God will have a Christian perform unto his Highness, then we do what good he would have men to expect from him by a lively Faith; and it seems altogether as lawful for man to devise signs for the confirmation of his Faith, as to admonish and teach his Duty. What difference can be made betwixt an addition to the means of instruction appointed of God, and to the means of our assurance prescribed by him: The commandments and the Promises are so knit together, that it cannot be conceived how a sign should be appointed to teach man his Duty, and not to assure him of some good from God in the use thereof: For God's[[?????]] Will is made known by Covenant, wherein he freely binds[[?????]] himself to bless us upon condition of sincere and faithful Obedience,[[?????]] as he obligeth us to be obedient to his Commandments that we may be blessed; and the signs added to the Word do teach both, as in the Word it self both parts are published. Again, it is one proper end of the Sacraments by sinking the senses by outward representative Elements to teach the understanding, help the memory, stir up the affections, and excite devotion: But for this end also are significant Rites devised, unless we shall confess them to be vain, idle, fruitless, absurd and senseless, And thus agreeing with Sacraments in their nature and end; of necessity they must be confessed to be Ceremonies Sacramental: The Scripture doth not so distinguish betwixt Signs & Seals, or signs significative & obsignant; as to make the one Sacramental, not the other: rather under the name sign it expresseth the nature of a Sacrament, which consisteth in the analogy & proportion which is bewixt a sign determined to signify, and the thing signified. The signs which it hath pleased God to add to his Covenant, are not bare, naked, empty shadows, but lively Seals of divine Grace Promised, & effectual Teachers of man's duty; signs of man's duty, Signs and Seals both of God's

Signa cum ad res divinas adlibentur Sacramenta vocantur. Aug. de Doctr. Chr. lib. 3. cap. 6. & ad Max. Ep. 5.

special favour and mercy in Christ Jesus, and in both respects Sacraments. Some signs are ordained merely to assure and confirm unto us the Promises which God hath been pleased to make; Some both to teach visibly what the Lord requireth and commandeth in his holy Truth, and to confirm, our Faith in what he hath promised in his Holy Word: but all are Sacraments in each respect, and what is a Seal, but a visible sign annexed to a Promise to certify or assure it: And how can a sign be added to it but, it must certify or confirm? Even from hence that it is set to the Promise by him who hath Authority to make it, and Power to make it good, it is a Seal: So that the Word *Seal* doth rather note the special nature and end of some Signs as they are referred to the Promises ratified & assured by them, than express the common nature of a Sacrament. In orthodox Writers a Sign of God's Promise, and a Seal of his Will and Pleasure; are put for one and the same: And whether we look to the truth of the thing it self, or the Arguments which are brought to prove the lawfulness of devising symbolical and analogical Signs; we shall find it as lawful to devise Signs obsignant of God's Promises, as significative of his pleasure and man's duty: For to be a Teacher of the Understanding, and Exciter of Devotion, requireth power supernatural, no less than to be a confirmer[[?????]] of the heart; and he that hath Authority to ordain means [[?????]] for any of these ends, can bless them for all; he that [[?????]] appoint them for any one, can do it so none, they being all supepnatural; exceeding the power of any Creature: Man hath as much power to seal what he cannot bestow, as, to teach by his own Sign, that which he cannot bless to that end. The Institution of means serving for the spiritual Instruction of the Church, pertaineth to him that blesseth them; to him it belongeth to ordain Seals of his Promises, that can confer the Grace promised, and both these are peculiar to one alone, the Lord of All. The arguments that are alleged to demonstrate the liberty of the Church, to Institute and devise significant Ceremonies, do speak for power to otdim Signs obsignant, if they conclude any thing at all. *Solomon* [they say] built a brazen altar, and set it besides the Altar of the Lord, offering thereon burnt Offerings: Here is a human Invention, a new Ceremony, having necessary relation to Worship in Sacrificing: And was not the Altar, appointed for burnt-offering, an essential part of God's Worship in time of the Law? was it not a Type and Sign obsignant of Christ and his Grace? was not this Altar erected

Ursia. Catech.
q. 65. explic. 1.
Gen. 9:12.
By the Sacra-
ment man is
bound to God;
and by the
same, God
vouchsafeth to
bind himself to
man. *Jewel's*
Treatise of the
Sacrament.
See 1 Cor. 9:1.
2 Tim. 2:19.
Apo. 7. 2 & 9:4.
Math. 27:66.
Vis. Ursie. tom.
2. pag. 1614.
& 1668.
Ursie pag.
1673.

2 King. 18:22.
Apo. 6:9.
Heb. 13:10.
Math. 23:19.
with Joh. 17:17.
Exod. 24:4.

by *Solomon* for the same principal and special end and use, for which God hath ordained the Brazen Altar to be erected? An Altar was a principal Instrument of divine Service (saith *Martyr*). The Altar in the Temple was a figure of Christ's only singular true Sacrifice once offered, and never can be sacrificed again, saith *Fulk* out of *Augustine*.

Now, if the Church, in the time of the Gospel, may take upon her to devise new significant Signs in God's Worship, from this Example of *Solomon*, and that such as be in kind different from them that are instituted of him; She may challenge Power to ordain Signs, to ordain obsignant Signs of Christ, and his Grace, essential parts of God's immediate Worship, and in their proper and peculiar ends, one with Baptism and the Lord's Supper; as that Altar served to the same purpose that the other did, which was builded by the express Commandment of the Lord. Again, it is very usual with Writers, protestant and Popish, to call external Ceremonies signifying holy things, by the name of Sacraments, Sacramentals, or Sacramental Actions.

It is objected, If signification be a principal part of a Sacrament, then all the Moral Signs used in the Levitical Worship; as namely, Bells, Layers, Lights, Candlesticks, and other Ceremonial Instruments, even unto the very Snuffers of the Tabernacle, should (things taking their denomination from the principal parts) be properly deemed Sacraments: And the like may be said of Hog's Flesh, from touching the Corpse of the dead, from Linsey-wolsey Apparel, and a hundred such others, whereby diverse Moralities are signified, but no Sacrament implied; but this nothing infringeth the strength of the former Reasons. For the Ceremonies of the Law were either taken to figure out the Truth of things, or consumed for the Nature of the Figures, not for the Figure of things; which were only annexed to the Figures, but of themselves did not figure of point out any spiritual things: Of this sort were many things pertaining to the Tabernacle, Ark, Altars, and Sacrifices; which did not by themselves typify any thing, but only pertain to the material constitution of the Type: And amongst them are the Snuffers and Tongs of the Tabernacle to be reckoned; for it cannot be shewed that of themselves they were ordained to represent any mystical Promise or spiritual Duty, but did only belong as necessary Ornaments to the Service of the Tabernacle. Therefore

Jun. Annor in Exod. 24:4.
Par. in Gen. 12: 7.
Mart. loc. com. part. 4. cap. 12. Sect. 21. *Polan.* Synt. tom. 2. lib. 9. cap. 36. *Fulk* against *Rhem.* in *Mat.* 23:19, 8, 7. *Beza* Epist. 8. *Zepper.* de *Sacr.* 1. 2. *Maldon.* in *Jo.* 20. *Rhem.* in 1 *Tim.* 4:14, 18. *Martyr* thus resoneth against the Popish Consecration of Holy-water; It is not the condition of men to institute Sacraments at their own pleasure, because that is proper to God alone, and to none besides him; for Sacraments be Instruments of the Holy Ghost. *Mart.* loc. com. p. 4. c. 9. *Juni.* Annot. in Exod 25. *Assumpta ad veritatem rerum figurandam sunt consumpta, noa propter figuram rerum sed propter Naturam signaturatum.*

we may exclude them from the number of Sacraments, and yet hold the common Nature of a Sacrament to consist in proportion betwixt the Sign determined to signify, and the thing signified. Secondly, amongst the Signs here degraded, as unworthy the Name, and not participating in the Nature of the Sacraments; such are mentioned as did seal and assure spiritual promises, and not barely teach or signify moral duties; The Candlesticks and Lights, did they not signify the light of the Divine Word, and Holy Scripture, by the power of God's holy Spirit enlightening the Church of God? The washings in the Law, did not they seal the purging away of Sin by the Blood of Christ, and that we being Sprinkled in our hearts from an evil Confidence, and washed in our bodies with pure water, might draw near with a true heart, in full assurance of Faith? The High-Priest was a Type of Christ, our Mediator, and the Bells of Gold that were placed upon the Ephod did shadow forth the Voice of Christ, which was to be heard of the People in his Teaching and Instruction. Wherefore, if a Sacrament be a Sign of God's Grace or free Promise, the Lavers, Lights, Bells, Candlesticks used in the Levitical Worship may truly be called Sacraments: And by Authority from the Apostle, calling things that pertained to the Service of the Tabernacle, *Example, Shadows, and Figures of heavenly things*; worthy Divines have not spared to call them Sacraments: Thus writteth *Augustine, Ideo multis Sacramentis visibilibus onerati sunt, quo servili jugo premerentur in observationibus ciborum, & in Sacrificiis animalium, & in aliis innumerabilibus, quæ tamen signa erant rerum spiritualium ad Dominum Jesum Christum, & ad Ecclesiam pertinentium.* Thirdly, we find the Name Sacrament given to those Signs pertaining to the Levitical Worship, which of all others (if in truth that Title may be given unto any) might most properly be called Moral, by signification of Man's spiritual Duty and Obedience: The Shew-Bread, called in Hebrew, *Bread of faces*, or of *presence*; because the Loaves or Cakes were to be set before the Face or in the Presence of God continually; and, the Bread of ordering and disposition, because they were disposed in certain order and time: In Greek, the Bread of Proposition; and, in a contrary order, The proposition of Bread or Cakes; Did it not signify the Office of the godly, that they should continually before God, receive his Commandments, and sanctify themselves to his Obedience: As the Ark signified the presence of God in his Church, so his Table with the

Psal. 119:105.
Prov. 6:21.
2 Pet. 1:19.
Rev. 4:5.

Heb. 10:22.
Psal. 26:6.

Exod. 28:2.

Heb. 9:2.

Heb. 8:5. & 9:
24.

De Catech. rud.
c. 20.

Exod. 25:30.
& 39:36.
1 Chron. 9:32.
and 23:29.

Mat. 12:4.
Mar. 2:26.
Heb. 9:2.

twelve Cakes signified the Multitude of the faithful presented unto God in his Church, continually serving him; It may be, this placing of the Shew-bread before the Ark might signify, that the Lord hath his Church continually in his light, and doth take care thereof: But the principal thing taught thereby was, the sincerity and purity of them that walk in the Light, and present themselves before God: What duty soever Man oweth to God, it is to be performed by virtue of the Covenant that he hath made with Man: and so the Signs of God's Promise do imply Man's Duty, and the Signs of Man's Duty do imply God's Promise, though some do signify the one; some, the other. And from this we learn, what is a Sacrament in general, *viz.* A Sign Analogical of God's Will and Pleasure; whether teaching what he requires, or representing and sealing what he promiseth; True Sacraments are Signs and Seals instituted of God to signify his Will, add confirm his Promises: But divine Institution is to be removed from the definition of a Sacrament in general, as that which doth distinguish true from false, and not explicate the common nature of the thing.

The distinction that some make of Signs moral, signifying the spiritual Obedience which Man oweth unto God, and mystical or sacramental, representing and confirming the Promises of God, is not to be received: For Signs teaching to the Eye by representation, what the Word bringeth to the Ear, are Sacraments signifying the same thing that the Word doth, as hath been shewed before. But Signs analogical must be distinguished from negative Precepts, forbidding the use of this or that in it self indifferent. Jewish abstinence from diverse Meats legally unclean, to shew that they were separated from other Nations, to be a peculiar People unto the Lord, cannot properly be called a Sign signifying by resemblance; For God in that Law seemeth not so much to respect the Nature of those living Creatures prohibited to be eaten; but by this external Sign he would have his People to be discerned and separated from all other People. And if this figurative commanded Abstinence should be deemed sacramental, what error is therein committed? As by such Abstinence the *Israelites* professed themselves to be the peculiar People of God, separated from all idolatrous Nations round about them; so did the Lord by this Commandment signify and assure, that he had taken them to Covenant, and made choice of them to be his pe-

*Sacramenta-
sunt visibilia
signa, quibus
doctrina illa
declaratur &
obsignatur.*
Mart. de Sact.
l. 1. c. 2. q. 8.

Act. 1:15, 16,
17, 28.
Juni. Annot. in
Lev. 11.

Lev. 11:44. peculiar Treasure. The reason whereby this commanded Abstinence is urged, doth confirm thus much, *I am the Lord your God, ye shall therefore sanctify your selves, and ye shall be holy, for I am holy; neither shall you defile your selves with any manner of creeping thing that creepeth upon the Earth: For I am the Lord that brought you up out of the Land of Ægypt to be your God.*

These figurative Ordiances then were Signs of the Covenant, teaching what duty man owed to God, and assuring back again what favour they had with God: And when the Apostle, speaketh of Levitical Service, which stood only in Meats, and Drinks, and diverse warnings, and carnal Ordinances, imposed on them until the time of Reformation, calleth them figures for the time then present; doth he not in effect say they were Sacraments? The Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil, is called a Sacrament, or a Sacramental Precept, by many excellent and worthy Divines, as it did signify to Man, that he would have experience of good, so long as he continued in Obedience, and of evil or misery if he did disobey; and as it was a Sign whereby he was admonished of his mutability, and tried in his Obedience: But if forbearance of the Tree of Knowledge was an Act Sacramental, much more Abstinence from such Meats as by the Law were forbidden unto the *Israelites*. Nor shall we need to fear the force of the Jesuite, insulting over Protestants by this Objection; *viz.* If Sacraments be only Signs, then the Crucifix is a better Sign to signify the death of Christ than the Sacraments. For we acknowledge but Sacraments not bare Signs of God's Promise, or significations of Man's Duty; but holy Seals of what he promiseth to us, and we by stipulation promise back again unto him. And this the Jesuit himself doth and cannot but acknowledge, howsoever impudently against Conscience he imputes unto us his own device for our Doctrine: But we may further tell this Romish Proctor, that a Crucifix made to teach by proportion or resemblance, that Christ died for our sins; or that God gave his Son to suffer death for our Redemption, is a Sacrament, or a sacramental Sign, signifying by special Representation, though false and erroneous, because it is devised by man, not ordained by God: The greatest Defenders of mystical Signs, distinguish them into moral and sacramental; which differ (say they) from the former, both as the Sacramental are significant by special Representation, and as they are obsignant by ratifying and applying of God's Cove-

Lev. 11:44.

Heb. 8:9, 10.

Beza in Heb. 9: 10.

Kechem. Theol. lib. 2. c. 2. Polan. Synt. lib. 6. cap. 44. Chaimer. panstrat. tom. 4. lib. 1. cap. 7. Si neq; propter se, neq; ex sua nature, certe & propter aliud & ex Institutione.

nant of Grace unto us! And from this we may gather, that Spiritual signs, which signify, by representation, the promise of God (as the Crucifix doth) are Sacramental, else is the distinction it self faulty, and the difference which is made betwixt signs Moral, and Sacramental. And yet we make not Signification the principal part of those special Sacraments of the Old or New Testament, which it pleased God to add to his gracious and free Covenant; but Spiritual signification is so proper to the Sacraments, that whatsoever sign is ordained to signify and represent any such promise, it is thereby made a Sacrament. The Cherubims in the Law, are called Types, and Sacraments of those times; in all reason, the Crucifix is in that sense to be deemed a Sacrament of these times; but vain and false, because it is destitute of Divine approbation. And what advantage hath the Jesuite gotten by this wise dispute? he hath notably discovered their impudent boldness, in preferring their own sinful devices, before the sacred Ordinances of God; and their notorious presumption in attempting that which they cannot but acknowledge to be proper to the Lord alone.

9. Experience testifieth, that signs significant devised by men, have been the seeds, sparkles, and instruments of divers errors, superstitutions, and Idolatries; but they never did, or shall do, good in the Church of God. The bravery and excess that is seen in Popish Temples, doth affect, move, and draw the eye, but is of no worth to true Piety, devotion, and motions of mind, pleasing to God. It hath been shewed before, and is further to be proved afterward, that no true Piety or sincere devotion of mind can be stirred up in us by human Traditions.

10. And lest this truth confirmed by so many Arguments out of the Word of God, should yet be cast off upon suspicion of novelty, of not relish savourly to some palates for want of the sauce of human Authority; It shall not be amiss to produce the testimonies of worthy Divines, to shew what hath been their Judgment in this point. *Calvin* saith, *Nulla doctrina, nullum sacrum signum debet inferi pias admitti, nisi à Deo profecta esse constet; nec est in hominum arbitria quicquam excudere.* *Fulk* against the *Rhemists*, “The true Church of Christ submitteth her self to the Doctrine of Christ and his Apostles in all things, and is content with those Ceremonies Which Christ and his Apostles by his Commandment have left unto us. Dr *Raynolds* speaking of Popish significant Rites hath

Whitak. de Sc.
q. 6. c. 14. arg.
ult.
Calv. opusc. de
Necess. refor.
pag. 59, 60.

In Matth. 21:
25. vis. Calv.
resp. ad versipell.
opusc.
pag. 413.
In Tim. 4:14.
SS. 18.

Censur. Apoc.
tom. 2. præl.
243.

these words, *Simplcius multo veteres, quanquam et ipsi nimium peccarunt o usmidi mysteriis excogitandis, ut omnes propemodum ritus in Sacramenta converterent; non quin possint omnia quæ uspiam oculis usurpamus, merito suggerere nobis ansam earum rerum miditandarum, quæ faciunt ad pietatem; sed, quod magna religione cavendum est in ecclesia, ne convertamus in marem Sacramentorum interpretationibus hujusmode, ut perm sceamus instituta humana cum institutis ipsius Christi, atq; ita horum auctoritatem communiemus commentis hominum.* Paræus saith,

In Heb. 8:5.

Quicquid etiam Sacramentis dvinis ornatus, vel perfectionis significationis angustioris gratia effingitur, qualia sexcenta circa Baptismum et Eucharistiam habet papatus, exorcismos, sal, sputum, chrisma, &c. to totum tanquam mane et evanidum oraeulo hoc improbatur. Dr Willes

Synopsis in 12.
Con.: q. 8.
Non potest ul-
lus homo insti-
tuere Cære-
mam, adquam
sequeretur gra-
tia Sp. Sancti.
l. 2 cap. 24.

speaking of the Ceremonies and Rites of Baptism, saith, “It is contrary to the rule of the Gospel, that there should be such types, shadows, significations, brought into the service of God, as the Papists make in Baptism; for seeing we have the body which is Christ, all such shadows ought to be abolished; In one Sacrament thet (*sc*, the Papists) have forged and found out many, as their Chrism, Oil, Salt, Spittle, &c. None of these Ceremonies were used when Christ himself was Baptized; which notwithstanding had been most fit, considering the worthiness of his person, which was Baptized; neither did Christ give any such thing in charge to his Disciples, but biddeth them only Preach and Baptize *In the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.* Nor yet were any

Act. 10:4.

such Ceremonies in use in the Apostles’ times. St *Peter* saith, *Can any man forbid Water, that these should not be Baptized.* He calleth not for Oil, Salt, Spittle, or any such thing, but Water only. And a little after he produceth the witness of two Martyrs against these Ceremonies. *Thomas Hanks*, “I deny (saith he) in Baptism all

Act. and Mon.
Hauk. 1. Ex-
am, Ann. 1555.

“things invented by man, as your Oil, Cream, Salt, Spittle, Candle, Conjuring of Water. *John Denly*, holy Martyr. The *Eunuch* said to *Philip*, *See here is Water.* We do not read, he asked for any Cream, Oil, Spittle, Conjured Water; for it seemeth that *Philip* had preached no such thing unto him. *Calvin* saith, *Unde colligimus, partem reverentiæ quæ illi defertur, in eo esse positam, dum in eo colendo simpliciter quod mandat, nullas nostras miscendo inventiones sequimur.* That he speaketh of devised sybolical signs, it is evident by the instances he giveth in that, and the two Sections follow-

Act. and Mon.
Denl. ans. to
art. 6. Anno
1555.

ing. *Martyr*, “Seeing God is altogether the wisest, he hath no

[[?????]]
[[?????]]

“need that we should your imagination, or endeavour, prepare
 “Instruments for him. And afterwards in the same Chapter;
 “Neither can they easily escape, which embrace exorcisms, but
 “that of one Sacrament they make many, seeing they make so many
 “Signs, which they will have to be accounted holy; adding Oil, Spit-
 “tle, Exsufflations, and such like. So as one Sacrament of Bap-
 tism doth degenerate into many. Neither must they be heard, when,
 to the intent to mock the simple, they feign a difference between
 Sacraments and Sacramentals, which is altogether sophistical; for
 distinctions are to be received gladly, but those to be such as are ta-
 ken out of the very nature of the things, because they bring much
 light to Controversies; but those distinctions which spring out of
 the brain of Sophisters, only for the shifting off of Arguments, are
 altogether to be refused. The Judgement of the Church of *Wittem-
 berg* is thus set down in the Harmony of Confessions, *Nec licet vel
 veteres ritus legis restaurare, vel novos comminisci ad adumbrandam ve-
 ritatem Evangelio jam patefactam et illustratam: quales sunt, interdiu
 accendere cereot, ad significandam lucem Evangelii; aut uti vexillis cru-
 cibus, ad significandam victoriam Christi per crucem; quod genus est
 universa panoplia vestium Missalium, quam aiunt adumbrate totans Pas-
 sionem Christi; et multa id genus alia. Multo minus licet instituire Cæ-
 remonias aut sacra, quorum meritis expientur peccata, et accipiatur reg-
 ium cælorum: Nam de priori illo genere Cæremoniæ et Sacrorum,
 Christus ex Isaia concionatur; Frustra, inquit, colunt me, docentes do-
 ctrinus, præcepta hominum: et Paulus, Nequis vos judicet in cibo aut po-
 us aut in parte diei festi, &c.* The Church of *France* and the *Low-
 Countries*, in their observations upon the Confession of the Church
 of *Saxony*, write thus, *Ac perinde ne mysticos quidem ukkos, alioqui non
 imios; ut qui, &c. Sed in hoc capite* (saith *Cham.* speaking of Popish Rites
 in Baptism) *merito damnamus, qui ea addiderunt, quibus mysteria af-
 finxerint, propeiasq; significaciones; et quidem eorum affectuum, qui per-
 tinent ad aquam Baptism, &c.* The Judgment of *Beza* is well
 known, and more than once uttered by himself; *Sacramentis* (saith
 he) *prout devinitus sunt ab unico nostro legislatore ordinata, quicquam vel
 detrudere, act multo magis novas figuras vel umbras ullas in Ecclesiam
 invehere, nefariam esse audaciam, ex verbo Dei omnes ἐθηλοθηρησκείας,
 tam expresse damnantis, et ignem externum olim altari suo inferre prohi-
 bentis, affirmamus. Hæc nostra est de Spirituali cultu divino sententia,
 his Christi verbis consentanea; nisi sublatat, licet divinius institu-*

Sect. 16.

Confes. Wit-
temb. tit. de
Cærem. Eccl.Sect. 17. ad.
Confess. Sax.
Obs. 1.
Tom. 4. de
Bapt. lib. 5.
cap. 16. sect. 27.
Annot. maj. in
Jo. 4:23.

tas, Mosaicus figuras et umbras arbitramur, ut alia ab hominibus illarum loco substituerentur. Junius assenteth unto the former; Quod si ad usum instituere non potest quisquam, profecto nequam ad significationem homo legitime potest adhibere, nisi humano et arrogante instituto, ne in privato quidem, quanto minus in Ecclesia Dei et publica administratione ipsius. Danæus is of the same mind. It is Blasphemy to think that any outward thing may be made a Sign in the Church, unless it be expressly ordained in the Word, and commanded by God himself to be used unto that end. Junias again professeth his judgement in this matter; Res autem alias, ac non necessarias, neq; ordini convenientes, si votet quisquam instituere; eum non pervicaciter velimus oppugnare, sed tria tamen cum animo suo expendat cupimus. Primus, qua autoritate exemplove adductus, sanctam Dei Ecclesiam et simplicitatem mysteriorum Christi (Cujus solius vocem agnoscunt et sequuntur oves quia solius audiri mandavit pater Jo. 10. 27.) circumvestiendam esse putet humanis traditionibus quas repudiat Christus. Secundum, quem ad finem res æquius foret alias Ecclesias is conformari quæ verbum Dei accedum proxime ex consilio Cypriani, quam has se illis ad ungeri; si ut honestiora sint omnia, quid simplicitate Christi honestius, quid honestate simplicius? si voluntatem, Esto sane: at illud Tertulliani cogitandum, Voluntatem Dei esse necessitatem summam, nec Dei Ecclesiam in divinis rebus voluntatibus humanis obligari. Tertium, quis tandem ex humanis traditionibus consequatur, ut diuturna ostendit experientia.

Of the Surplice.

There is a fourfold distinction of Attire. 1. Natural. 2. Civil. 3. Ecclesiastical by Divine instruction. 4. Ecclesiastical by human appointment.

The Natural is such, by which the difference of Sexes, of Male, and Female is professed; this is Moral and perpetual, *deut.* 22:5.

This Civil is, when for ease, speedier dispatch of some civil business, ornament, or politic differencing of degree in Office, Age, trade, &c. diversity of habit is used; and this is Arbitrary, and lawful, so that the rules of modesty be observed. *Whitgift def. of*

De cult. Sacr.
l. 3. c. 7. 11,
12, 13.

Cont. Bell. de
cult. Sac. l. 3.
cap. 5.

Eccles. l. 3.
cap. 5.

Attire or vestiments may be distinguished into four sorts.

Calv. harm. in
lib. Mos. expos.
7. Precept. and
others.
Dr Reynolds
of the overthrow
of Stage-plays,
pag. 10.

answ. to admini. tract. 7. cap. 3. divis. 1. pag. 264. Hooker Ecclesiast. Polic. lib. 5. S. 78. pag. 424.

Those are Ecclesiastical by Divine Institution which the Lord, and law-giver of his Church ordained to be used by Priests and Levites in the solemn worship of God, and in the place of Ceremonies: these vestments continued necessary in use, until the abolition of the Levitical Rites, and then determined.

Exod. 28:12, 29, 30, 40, 41, 43.

Such are Ecclesiastical by human institution, as man of his own head hath appropriated to Religious worship, or solemn Ecclesiastical use. Of this sort and kind I take the Surplice to be, and therefore do make question of the lawfulness thereof. My argument against it I dispose in this form.

Argum. All Vestments appropriated to the solemn Worship of God, and appointed for signification of spiritual Duties by the Will of Man, without Warrant out of the Word of God, are unlawful.

Argum.

But the Surplice is a Vestment appropriated to the solemn, Worship of God, and appointed for the signification of spiritual Duties, by the Will of Man, without Warrant out of the Word of God. Therefore it is unlawful.

The truth of the Proposition may be cleared by these Reasons following.

Propos. proved by six Reasons.

1. All such Vestments as the Proposition speaketh of, are an external form of Worship; both because that in their common nature or kind, they agree with the Levitical Vestments, which I suppose will not be denied to have been parts of their external Worship, as well as other Rites among them. *Homil. against peril of Idolatry, part. 3. fol. 55.* saith, All outward Jewish Rites wherewith God was honoured in the Temple, were *Cultus*. For what good definition can be given of Worship, which may not be predicated and affirmed of those Rites? To be instituted of God, or of Man, doth not vary the common nature of Worship, but distinguish it into true and false, in which Adjuncts the common nature of Worship doth not consist. Also, would not Vestments to of mystical signification appropriated to solemn Worship, be Jewish in special, not in common nature only, if the Most High should Authorize them? And if they be Worship, and devised by Man, then they are Will-worship which God condemneth.

2. If this *Major* be not true, what should hinder, but that man may bring many of the Ceremonies of the Law of *Moses* into the

Church of the new Testament; for if one Jewish Rite may be brought 'in, why not any. It need not be doubted, but that Vestments meetly Ecclesiastical and Mystical, are Jewish, though not in number, (or perhaps in some other petty differences), yet in kind: and are they not then the same? *Luke* 14:18. *Eph.* 6:9. Dr *Raynolds* Confer. with *Hart.* cap. 8. divis. 4. pag. 494, 495.

3. Either Vestments merely Ecclesiastical and Mystical, instituted by Man, are unlawful; or else it had been lawful for the Jewish Church to have devised to themselves, and used, those Priestly Robes that were in use among them, though God had not appointed them; of they might have invented others of the same kind afterwards, and have added to those God appointed: but this they might not do. It's true, that this would increase the multitude of Ceremonies, and multitude of Ceremonies of one sort, would make them (*f*) inconvenient, because this carryeth with it change of circumstances, whereon conveniency or inconveniency doth depend. But if one Ceremony be lawful, hundreds of the same kind be lawful also; for the definition of one is predicated of all of that sort. It cannot be truly said, That the Jewish Church had less liberty to devise Ecclesiastical Rites (whatsoever some say), (*g*) than the Christian Church hath; except the Christian Church could under the Lord's Charter shew this Privilege to be granted unto her. Add further, that the special Ground that the maintainers of Ceremonies do or can bring in, for the now urged Ceremonies, is the fact of the *Reubenites* building the Altar. If this Argument be of any force, must they not grant liberty to the Church of the Jews, as well as the Church of the new Testament? Therefore, if men deny the Jews that liberty which the Christian Church may rightfully claim, they will prove themselves to stand upon no Ground.

4. Such Vestments cannot be used in Faith, without which the use thereof is sinful. Faith, in this place, is a first assurance of mind and conscience, resting on assured Ground, that the thing which a man doth, is allowed of God to be done by him: So that two things are here implied.

1. That the Act to be done, be allowed of God; otherwise the conscience that doth it, how confident soever it be, is erroneous and faulty, (*h*) No man can do evil with a good conscience.

1. That the mind of the Doer certainly apprehend a lawfulness for the doing of it, the the conscience sinneth through doubtfulness.

Exod. 25:9. &
39, 40, 42, 43,
& 27, 19.
1 Chro. 28:12.
2 Chro. 29:5.

(*f*) Dr *Morton*
protest. appeal.
Lib. 1. Cap. 3.
Sect. 3.

(*g*) Dr *Sparks*
Persuasions to
uniformity.
cap. 3. 8, 5.
pag. 11.
Josh. 22:10.

Rom. 14:23.

Calvin. in loc.
& others. Vid.
Marle. in loc.
(*h*) *Covel's* ans.
to Mr *Burges*
apol. pag. 9.
citing *Hooker.*

With this assurance of mind and conscience, who can use such Vestiments as are merely Ecclesiastical, Mystical Rites, when he cannot find any firm Ground out of the Scripture, that God alloweth such under the New Testament?

5. Whosoever doth not admit the Proportion, he openeth a gap unto Oil, Cream, Spittle, Candles; holy Water, and other Popish Ceremonies to enter into the Church, which our learned Divines reject; for this, that they are mystical significant Rites, devised by Man; as is to be seen, not by the Judgement of Foreign Divines only; as of the Church of *Wittenburg*. *Harm. Confess.* part. 2. artic. 32. *de Cærens Ecclesiasticis*; The Churches of *France*; and the low Countries in their Observations upon the Harmony of Confessions. *Ibid.* Sect. 17. *ad Saxon. Confess. Observ.* 1. *Calvin* in *Esay* 20:2. & *Mat.* 21:25. *Beza Epist.* 8. But also our own Divines, Dr *Whitgift*, *Defence of Answer to the Admon. Tract.* 7. cap. 7. divis. 8. pag. 291. Mr *Perkins* in his *Commentary on Gal.* 3:23, 24, 25. who disallow such signification of Apparel in Ecclesiastical use, as *Peter Martyr* in his *Epistle to Hooper* would put upon it. *Loc. commun.* pag. 1088. *Edit.* 1613.

And further, If the Proposition be not true, Might not a man reason thus for the bringing in of Popish Rites of the same nature and kind? Vestiments instituted by man, and appropriated to God's Worship, and of mystical signification, are lawful: Therefore, Oil, Cream, Spittle, Candles; and other Rich like Popish Rites are lawful also.

6. To conclude, worthy Divines have condemned all Ceremonies when they have been parts of, and appropriated to, Worship; As *Calvin. Institut.* Lib. 4. Cap. 10. Sect. 8. *Perkins Reform. Cathol.* p. 136. And doth not Dr *Abbot* call all Priestly Garments, whereby they are distinguished from the rest of the Church, a spiritual Character of the Beast. *Antichri. Demon.* Cap. 11. Sect. 26.

And whereas for eight hundred years after Christ, there were but eight Vestures used in the whole mysteries of Religion, and now among the Papists there be fifteen; six Priestly, and nine of the Bishops; What reason is there to prove them, or such of them unlawful, which our Law hath rejected, if this Proposition be not true. The Assumption proved.

In the proof whereof it is requisite, that I insist upon these three Heads.

Perkin's Demonstration of
 Probl. in Title
 Apurten. to
 Masse. Sect. 6.
 Dr *Morton's*
 protest. appeal.
 Lib. 1. Cap. 3.
 Sect. 5. Pag. 58.

1. That the Surplice in our Church is appropriated to God's solemn Worship, as to mere Ecclesiastical use.

2. That it is appointed for signification of spiritual Duties.

3. That this is done by Man, without Warrant from the Word of God.

The first of these 3 Heads is apparent by the Reasons following.

1. Albeit young Students in the Universities, who by their matriculation, did receive their *primam consuram* into the Clergy: Querristers in the Cathedral Churches being anciently reputed of the Clergy; and some Clerks in some Parochial and Collegiate Churches, have heretofore, and full do retain the Surplice: Yet we see that the life is still restrained to Worship, (*viz.*) Prayers, reading Scripture, administration of Sacraments, &c. And out of that use it is not to be found, neither is there any civil use made of the Surplice. As for burial of the dead, it is used by none but by a Minister, or one initiate into the Clergy, and that with solemn prayers accompanying: Who then can say, that the use of the Surplice in Burials, is a withdrawing of it from Ecclesiastical use.

2. I might urge what I observe out of Dr *Whitgift*, who denying Pope *Hadrian* to be the Inventer of the Surplice, (*Def. Tract. 7. cap. 6. Divis. 1.*) would draw the Original thereof from *Stephanus*, Bishop of *Rom.* whose, testimony (if it be ought worth) proveth that holy Vestments are not to be touched of any save the Priests, (*Ibid. cap. 5. divis. 2.*) and consequently that they are not of civil use. *Socrates hominibus, Luc. Isiand. Epitom. Histor. Ecclesiast. Cent. 3. Lib. 3. Cap. 14.*

3. In Popery the Surplice was appropriated to God's solemn Worship, without which no Priest might say Service. *Missal. Rom. part. 1. Missain Gallicantu, & die Nativitatis Domini.* Neither could Water or Bells, or any thing else be hallowed. *Dr Humphry his Antidiploma missal. Rom. part. 3. pag. 96.* And if it were not of the essence of the Mass, that every Priest that sayeth it have a Surplice on, yet some Priest cannot say Mass without it. *Durand. rational. Lib. 3. Cap. 1. Numb. 9.* Neither can any Priest make his broaden-god, except he have it on. *Rhem. annotat. in 1 Cor. 11:29.*

This I omit to urge, though I must confess, that though our Church hath varied and changed somewhat from our immediate fore-fathers the Papists, from whom it cometh to us; yet they did

The Surplice to be appropriated to Ecclesiastical use.

Spark's persuasion to Uniformity. cap. 5. pag. 19.

not remove it from Ecclesiastial Places and Services, or instituted a civil or ordinary use of the foresaid Vestment. Doth not the Statute in the first year of Queen *Elizabeth* appoint such Ornaments in the Church to be retained (as were in the Church of *England* by Authority of Parliament in the second year of *Edward* the sixth, until other Order be taken by the Authority of the Queen, &c.) at the time of the Communion, and other administration, &c. Was Order taken? No. We must judge then, for what kind of use the Surplice by the Statute of King *Edward the sixth* was instituted and allowed.

Cap. 2.

The words of the Book of Common-Prayer in the second year of his Reign, are these; *Upon the Day, and at the time appointed for the Ministration of holy Communion, the Priest that shalt execute that holy Ministry, shalt put on him the Vestures appointed for that Administration, &c.* If the use of the Surplice stand by Statute, it is, for any thing that I know, by this, which declares it to be retained for mere Ecclesiastical use: If it be so, as Dr Spark's faith in his Persuasion to uniformity, *Cap. 5. pag. 20, 21.* That Queen Elizabeth by Virtue of the said Statute, by the consent of the Arch-Bishop, and High Commissioners, in the seventh year of her Reign, appointed the Surplice to be worn instead of the Albe; yet it hindreth not, but proves what I say in this Section. But because this I think is confessed, I pass to the second Head in the Assumption.

Can. Eccles.
14. & 17.

That the Surplice is significant of spiritual Duces, is clear.

1. All our Ecclesiastical Ceremonies are such; They are neither dumb nor dark (faith the Book of Common-Prayer) but apt to stir up the dull mind of man to a remembrance of his Duty by some noble and special signification.

In the Treatise
of Ceremonies
prefixed to that
Book.

Mr *Hooker* saith, Ceremonies destitute of signification, must be vain; also he calleth them visible Signs, which are undoubtedly most effectual to open such matter, as when men know and remember carefully, they must needs be a great deal the better informed: Thus much also Dr *Covell* doth avouch (against the Plea of the In-2. To omit that the Papists say, All their Priestly Garments have mystical signification. *Bell. de miss. lib. 6. cap. 14.* And that the Priest must be clothed in White to signify innocency and purity, *& obreverentiam Salvatoris, & totius, Cælestis curia, quam Sacramento alario conficendo, & confecto, non est dubium interesse.*

Ecc. Pol. Lib.
5. Sect. 55.
Ibid. Lib. 4.
Sect. 1.

Lindan de Ce-
lebr. miss.

Those learned men who were set a work in the days of King *Edward* the Sixth, and since (and who therefore were most likely to know the meaning of our Church in imposing) have avouched, That it is, and ought to be continued, for signification, *Bucer. opera Anglican. pag. 632. Pet. Mart. Loc. Commun. pag. 1088.*

Now concerning the third Head. The Surplice, in that foresaid use and signification, is without warrant of the Word of God. It may thus be proved.

1. The Surplice being a garment of a special nature, and use, in that it is a mere Ecclesiastical and Mystical Rite, ought to have a special Divine Institution, as such garments have had in the Church of the Jews: for Reason requires that the ground be suitable to the nature of the thing. But such a ground it hath not, neither can any shew any special Initiation,

2. There is not so much as any general warrant for it in the Book of God. First, there is none in the Old Testament: The Priestly garments were tied only to the place of Ceremonies, not used in any of the Synagogues of the Land, nor in any of those 460 which are reported to be in *Jerusalem*: Were typical, (wherein it stands not with the nature of the times of the New Testament to mitigate them, *Spark persuas. to uniformity, cap. 5. pag. 22.*) Neither were they used in the People's sight, except once extraordinary by occasion of the presence of the Ark before the People. So that if there had been any further use of them (*viz.*) for glory and comeliness, as one faith, not considering, that in the use also they were typical, yet they cannot possibly warrantize Vestiments in the sight of the People.

If the Prophets did use ordinarily any, apparel whereby they might be known from other men, (which doth seem doubtful to some that read *1 Sam. 1:8. 1 King. 20:41.*) yet that which they did wear, was of common and daily use, worn in Town and Field, &c. *1 King. 1:8. Esay 20:2. Zach. 13:14.* So that it matters not in this case, though the Prophets were discerned by a peculiar form of Cloak, seeing it was not of Ecclesiastical and Mystical signification, and withal was extraordinary, as their Function was. Our Divines condemn the Popish Massing Garments, because they are Jewish. To seek ground for the Surplice but of the Levitical Law, Is it not then to overthrow our own grounds?

Further, in the New Testament, there is no ground for the Surp-

Hook. Eccl. Pol. lib. 5. Sect. 29.

Exod. 28:43. Ezek. 42:14. Momæus de Eucharist.

Ezek. 42:13, 14. & 44:15, 17, 19. 1 Chron. 15.

Spark. Ibid.

Whitg. def. tract. 7. cap. 2. pag. 262.

Matth. 3:4.

plice: The habit of *John Baptist* was daily and common, not Ecclesiastical and Mystical. That Christ or his Apostles did use, or institute any Mystical or Ecclesiastical attire, none can shew by the holy Scriptures: and the relation of other Histories is but human and fallible; not the ground of faith. The Apostle *Paul*, *1 Cor.* 14:40. requiring all things to *be done decently and in order in the Assemblies of the Saints*, did give commandment for the right and seemly performance of such Ordinances as were before established; but laid no ground for the institution of mystical Rites in religious services. This speech of the Apostle is a Precept, and hath a Divine binding power; which not to obey, is death. How can this concern the institution of the Surplice, which is no such matter, but reputed indifferent by the Urgers. What the Apostle commands, is necessary and indispensable by Man: But the Surplice and other Rites are arbitrary, and may be dispensed with, and utterly abolished. *D. Morton in Protest. Appeal lib. 1. cap. 3. Sect. 2. numb. 3. pag. 54.*

The Surplice, is confessed to be but inhuman tradition: Who can prove hence, that there is any better ground for the Surplice, than for the 15 Priestly Robes used in the Church of *Rome*?

Thus doth it appear, that the Scripture affordeth not any warrant for the Surplice in our use. I know many Testimonies are cited forth of the ancient Writers: but their testimony being but human, proveth not that God doth allow and warrantize the Surplice. Yea, some of them do not at all concern Ecclesiastical Vestiments. Such is that testimony, that *Eustathim* was deprived of his Bishopric, for not wearing decent apparel befitting his place. Such also was that white raiment that *Semioss the Novat*, did wear; and that under garment of white Linen, in which *Cyprian the Martyr* stood apparelled after he had given his Cap or *Byrrhus*, to the Executioner; and his upper garment called *Dalmatica*, to the Deacon. Such is the garment spoken of by the Council of *Gangris*, as he that considers it, may see.

So that these places are mis-alleged by *D. Whitgift, Def. tract. 7. cap. 4. divis. 1. pag. 208. &c.* And that likewise of *Chrysost. Homil. 6. ad. popul. Antioch.* who sheweth, That the dignity of the Ministry standeth not in going up and down the Church in a white garment, that is, as a gallant white attire being a garment of honour, both in

Spark. Persuas. to Uniform. cap. 5. pag. 21.

Socrat. lib. 2. cap. 33.

Socrat. lib. 6. cap. 20.

Vide Concil. à Binnio Collect. Conc. Gang. cap. 12. part. 385.

the East parts, and in the West among the ancient *Romans*. *Sigon. de Jud. lib. 3. cap. 14.*

As for that which the Apostle *John* is said to went, called a *Miter*, but rather a thin plate, as τὸ πέταλον doth signify, either *Eusebius* doth thereby (alluding to *Moses's* Law, *Exod. 28:36.*) mean, that *John* entered into the Sanctuary, as it were, with Prerogative, and had the very Mysteries of God revealed to him *Rev. 1:1.* as Dr *Rainolds* doth understand; or else, if this relation deserve credit seeing *Eusebius Pamphilus* lived *Anno Domini* 340, about 200 years after the death of him of whom he writeth, and saith, *John* was a Bishop, which agrees not with the Apostle's Office and Commission, that was universal; yet this habit was a common and daily habit, as the words of the Author rather import.

Moreover, some Testimonies urged do concern the Jewish Vestments, as that of *Jerome* in *Ezek. 44.* The Religion of God hath one habit, (as Mr *Hooker* confesseth. *Eccles. Pot, lib. 5. Sect. 29.*)

Lastly, though some testimonies quoted may shew, that anciently there were some Linen garments in Ecclesiastical use, as *Theodoret, lib. 2. cap. 27.* speaks of a baptizing robe given by *Constantine* to *Maccarius*, Bishop of *Jerusalem*. And *Jerome* makes mention of Linen garments used in administration by Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. And the Council of *Carthage*, Can. 41. (where there were 214. Bishops, of whom *Austine* was one) decreed, *Diaconus tempore oblationis tantum, vel lectionis, Alba induatur.* Yet none of these prove, that these were instituted for mystical signification; or, if they were, that there was warrant from the Word of God for so doing.

Thus the Assumption being confirmed, the Conclusion necessarily followeth; That the Surplice may not lawfully be used.

Of the sign of the Cross in Baptism.

THAT the use of the sign of the Cross in Baptism is unlawful I prove by this Argument:

No Rite merely Ecclesiastical, and of mystical significatton, ha-

Perk. Probl.
tit. The Ap-
u. ten. of the
Mosaic.
Histor. Eccles.
lib. 3. cap. 25.
Secundu aliam
div. sionem 31.
Conference
with *Hart*,
cap. 8. divis. 4.
pag. 516.

Lib. 1. advers.
Pelagium.

ving no Warrant from the Word of God, can be used without sin.

But the sign of the Cross in Baptism is a Rite merely Ecclesiastical, and of mystical signification, having no warrant from God's Word:

Ergo, It cannot be used without sin.

The Proposition of this Argument, being in effect the same with the Proposition of the Precedent Argument, (the Cross and Surplice being *Homogenea*,) is confirmed by the Reasons of the foregoing Proposition. I will therefore with great brevity confirm this *Major*.

First, Such Rites as are merely Ecclesiastical and mystical, having no warrant from God's Word, are false worship: Otherwise we shall never be able to convince the Papists of Will-worship in their Superstitious Rites. Also, all actions, whereby religious duties are taught in God's public service, are Worship: otherwise how can the preaching of the Word be worship. But Rites, merely Ecclesiastical and mystical, &c. do teach us spiritual and religious duties. Are they not Worship then? Yet not true, for they are not divinely warranted. Of necessity therefore they must be false Worship.

Secondly, Such mystical Rites are Sacraments not approved of God. Sacraments they be, for they are visible signs of an invisible grace, and have both the parts of a Sacrament, which are set down in the common Catechism authorised by Law. But these are not true Sacraments, when God the Author of the Covenant doth not institute them.

Thirdly, Such Rites as are merely Ecclesiastical, and Mystical, are not discernable to be good by the light of Nature; and therefore are to have approbation from God's Word the rule of Faith: otherwise with safety of conscience they cannot be received.

Fourthly, Our learned Divines say, That to bring insignificant Ceremonies into the Church, is plain Judaism. Dr *Reynolds* Conference with *Hart*, cap. 8. divis. 4. pag. 521. *Willet Symops.* 2. *gen. Cont.* 24. 2. part of the Qu. pag. 110. Edit. 1614.

The Assumption now remains to be proved; and in it three things. 1. That the sign of the Cross is merely Ecclesiastical. 2. Of Mystical signification. 3. Without warrant out of God's Word.

First, There is not the least shew, to deny the sign of the Cross to be meetly Ecclesiastical: For other use of the sign of the Cross, than in Baptism, we deny. Indeed, anciently it was ordinary in common use, as well as in Ecclesiastical. So likewise it is with the Papists: but ordinary Crossing, morning and evening, is condemned by our Divines: and the Law requireth, urgeth, and alloweth only the use of the Cross in Baptism: wherein if it be not of mere Ecclesiastical use, what can Ecclesiastical use be defined to be?

Secondly, Can there be produced, any likelihood, or shew, of truth, to deny the sign of the Cross to be of mystical signification, seeing all our Ceremonies are such, as was before shewed: and the words of the *Common-Prayer-Book* do teach as much, saying, *We receive this Child into the Congregation, &c. and do sign him with the sign of the Cross, in token that hereafter, &c.* And the Canon saith, *That the Child, baptized, is dedicated to God by the sign of the Cross.* These things, I suppose, do prove the sign of the Cross to be of mystical signification.

Now it remains, that I shew, That this mystical Rite is without warrant out of the Word of God. This may be proved by these Arguments following.

Though the Cross, being a Rite of a peculiar nature, ought to shew for it self a peculiar and special Institution; yet it is so void of that, that there is not so much as a general warrant for it in the Book of God. At the examination of the places cited by the Papists, or Protestants, will manifest.

I omit to mention in this short abridgment, some Instances for the Cross, though used by the Ancients, which have not so much as a colour of the truth, and will produce these few Instances.

(1.) The mark which was set in the forehead of the mourners, *Ezek. 4:9.* is urged to prove the sign of the Cross lawful.

Answ. 1. *Tau*, translated a mark, doth signify in common any sign, as *Arius Montanius*, and *Pagnin*, in their Dictionaries, shew. The Vulgar Greek, called the 70, translate it $\sigma\eta\mu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma\iota\nu$.

2. The form of *Tau* being this η , makes nothing for the Cross.

3. This was an invisible mark, and peculiar to the Elect; such as that was, *Apop. 7:3. & 9:4.*

(2.) Protestants Object the Altar built on *Jordan's* bank; the Altar built by *Solomon*; the Music used in the Temple; the Love-

Can. 30.

Just. Martyr in Tryphone.

Feasts which were in use in the Primitive Church; and the Kiss of love, as grounds to warrant our use of the sign of the Cross. To all which Instances, I answer in order.

First, The Altar that stood on *Jordan's Bank*, was not of Ecclesiastical, but of Civil use. The Tribes confess that they had indeed grievously sinned, if they had determined an Altar to the same use, for which the Lord had set up one before. It was a memorial, that they were one people with their brethren, entitled to, and estated in the Priviledges of the Lord with them: but it was no mystical sign of Christ and his grace.

Secondly, If *Solomon* built not his new Altar by extraordinary Inspiration as a Prophet (as one saith): Yet he did it out of the equity of *Moses's* Law itself, and was no addition at all of a diverse kind. And it is most certain, That God who by his visible descending, did approve of the whole work of the Temple when, it was done, did authorize him for the doing of it; which *David's* words may also confirm, 1 *Chro.* 28:19.

The Music used in the Temple, was specially appointed of God, 1 *Chron.* 16:4. & 1 *Chron.* 29:5. and both the Altar and it were Typical, tied to the place of Ceremonies, and continuing but with them.

As concerning the Love-Feasts, if they were of Apostolic Institution, (ordained by the Apostles, as they were immediately guided by that Spirit which infallibly did assist them in their Ministerial Function) they were Divine, (for it is not Apostolic in that sense, and divide the same? Dr *Abb. answer to W. Bish. cap. 7. of Tradit. Sect. 4. Fran. Junias animadv. in Bellar. lib. 4. cap. 2. not. 6.*) and had a special appointment from God; which the Cross hath not. But if none knoweth by whom they were brought in, yet they are abrogated there by the Apostle; where we find first mention of them: neither were they of mystical sanctification, and are not yet moved to be of mere Ecclesiastical life.

To conclude, *Osculum pacis*, which went before the Solemnity of the Supper, to prepare men to the worthy receiving in Charity, was in tract of time disliked, and degenerated in to the kissing of the *Pax*. This I say was a natural indicant Sign of Peace and Reconciliation, as embracing, shaking hands, &c. and other the like actions be.

Bishop *Babington* on the second Commandment.

Ma. Sutclif.
contra *Bellar.*
de Sum. Pont.
lib. 1. cap. 6.
Franc. Jun.
Cont. 3. lib. 4.
cap. 17. nota.
4.

Just. Marti
Apoc. 2. ad
finem.
durant. de rit.
lib. 2. cap. 54.
Sect. 7.

If the Sign of the Cross be in some ancient Writers called Apostolic, they are to be understood in no other sense than as they called Lent-Fasts, the Creed, Saturdays, and Wednesdays, Fasts-Apostolic, *Et præcepta Majorum* (saith *Jerom*) *unaqueque provincia leges Apostolicas arbitratur*.

Moreover, whereas it may seem that *Constantine's* Vision was a divine ratification of the life of the Cross; I answer,

1. The Narration is human and fallible.

2. The words of the Historian be Ἐν τούτῳ νικᾶ, which do rather import, In this Christ, than in this Sign.

3. The sight which appeared was, σταυροῦ σκήματι πεποιμιμον *made after the fashion of a Cross, τοῦ σωτηρ. &c. τὸ σύμζολον, A mark of Christ's Name.*

The mark contained the two first Letters of Christ's Name, XP, So that P was made, and X by crossing (as it were) a Spear a-slope, after this manner XP. Nothing hitherto hath proved the Sign of the Cross to be warranted by the Word of God; and that which follows will prove that it is merely human, if not worse.

Was not the Heretic *Valentius* the begetter of this Sign, who gave it the same effective Power that the Papists do, as our learned Writer saith? Was not *Montanus* the first that gave it credit? Was not *Tertullian* the chief Instrument under him, that so much commendeth it, (a man well known to be infamous after his Fall)? *Deering* on the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, Lect. 2. And did not the Superstition of the People further the breeding of it up: *D. Reyn*, Confer, with *Hart*. cap. 8 divis. 4. pag. 504. So did it, appear, when it was said, *Signatos Cruce in morte secunda Diabolus tentre non audet: Care signatur, ut Anima muniatur*. *Tertul. de Resurrect. carnis*.

If this be the original of the Sign of the Cross, the creeping of it into Baptism cannot be by divine appointment.

But to conclude, if this Sign be indifferent (as it is acknowledged by the maintainers of it,) then the instituting of the use of it cannot be more than human. Out of these premises it is easy to conclude the unlawfulness of the Cross in Baptism.

Jerom. Epist. ad luc.

Euseb. de vitâ Constan. l. i. c. 22. Sec. lib. i. c. 1.

Dr Fulk Arg. in Rhem. Test. Luc. 22. 5. ex Iren. l. i. c. 1. Magdeburg. Cen. 3. cap. 10.

Ambr. in Epist. ad Rom. cap. 8.

*Of Kneeling in the Act of receiving
the Sacramental Bread and
Wine,*

I Acknowledge that the Supper of the Lord, ought to be received with all due Reverence, yet so that the rule and measure of that everence be the Word of God, not the Will and Wit of Man: To which rule, because I know not how this kneeling doth agree, therefore I dare not submit to the practice of it.

Argument. My Argument against it I thus dispose.

Argumen.

No bodily religious Adoration of God, before any Creature, with respect unto it, having no allowance from God, can be lawfully used.

But kneeling in the Act of receiving the Sacramental Bread and Wine, is a bodily religious Adoration of God before a Creature, with respect unto it, having no special allowance from God.

Ergo, It cannot be lawfully used.

Proposition. The Proposition may be justified by four reasons.

Proposition.

1. The Scriptures are so perfect in matters of Worship, that they shut out all human Inventions: Therein God blaming what is not according to his Commandment, *Lev.* 10:1. *Jer.* 7:31. and 19:5. his revealed Will being the All-sufficient Rule of Worship, *Deut.* 12:31, 32. which both ancient Writers (*Chrysost. in Epist. 2. ad Corinth. Homil. 13. Basil Epist. 80.*) and modern also do avouch, while they maintain the Scriptures to be the total Rule of Faith and Manners: *Protestant's Appeal.* 1. 2. c. 25. Sect. 11. *Thes. Joh. Reynolds.* Thes. 1. Sect. 3. *White's Way,* Sect. 5. Digres. 3. And many others.

2. Such Worship the Proposition disalloweth, as Will-worship or Superstition; which is a Religion forged by Man, the root whereof is Ignorance of mind, mis-guided zeal, and false fear. This is and hath been condemned and punished by the Lord, *Deut.* 12:8. *Isa.* 1:12. & 29:13. *Mat.* 15:9. *Lev.* 10:1, 2, 3. *Numb.* 3:4. and judged flat Idolatry both by ancient and modern Writers, both Or-

Hook. Eccles. Pol. 1. 5. Sect. 3.

Aug. de Consen. Evan. 1. 1. c. 18.

thodox and Popish. Dr *Bilson, Apol.* part. 4. pag. 344. *Vasq. de Adorat.* lib. 2, Disput. 1. cap. 3.

3. The second Commandment doth condemn relative Adoration of God without special Warrant: For it requireth that we worship the true God purely, according to his Will. For, the better understanding of it, observe two things to be forbidden in this Commandment.

1. The making of an Image for religious use, and under this by a Trope (wherein apart is put for the whole) all Forms of Worship devised by Man, are forbidden.

2. The adoring of an Image, or Form of Worship of his own head: So that if a man make an Image for sacred use, though he do not actually adore it, yet is he a Transgressor of this law. If of his own head he bow down to any form of Worship, though he did not devise it, yet is he an Offender.

If any should say, That the Lord hath forbidden making of an Image or Form of Worship, and the worshipping and serving of that only which he devised, but not the adoring of God's own Ordinance; he doth so straighten the sense of the Law, that Popish Adoration of the Sacrament would escape the censure of this Law, and so should be unjustly blamed on the Papists: Also he openeth a gap to the Jews to have worshipped Manna, and all the Sacrifices of the Law; and to Christians, with religious Worship bodily to adore the Bible, Baptism, yea, the Minister himself, without Impeachment of this Commandment: It cannot then be denied, but that relative Adoration of God before his Ordinances, with respect to them without special licence, is here forbidden, learned Divines have laid this down as an Axiom in Divinity, That a Negative precept standeth in all the parts of it in force, except the Lord of the Law lay down so plain a dispensation of the Law, or any branch of it, that a Man's Conscience upon good grounds may rest persuaded, that God doth exempt him from the Power of his Law, in this or that particular case; as the Jews were dispensed with by special Appointment, requiring they should worship the Lord before the Ark and Temple, in such a sense as they did not before their Sacraments; and other legal Rites. *Fulk* against *Rhem.* in *Heb.* 11:2. *De lib.* Concord. Admon. Christ, *cap.* 11. *Perkins* Treatise of Divine and relig. Worship.

Protes. Appeal.
l. 4. c. 29. S. 3.
White's Way
pag. 519.

Dr *Reynolds*
of Stage-Plays.

Psal. 99:5.
Calv. Piscat.
Votabl. Muscul.
in loc.

4. The Brazen Serpent, set up by the appointment of God was a lively Type of Christ was reserved as a memorial of special divine Mercy, and in process of time the Jews did worship God respectively before it, not determining their Worship in it; as may be gathered from Examples in Scripture compared, and from the Judgment of the learned: yet because they offered Incense before it to God, without special Warrant, their Fact was condemned, and the brazen Serpent demolished.

Numb. 21:8.
John 3:15.
Exod. 32:4.
Judg. 3:13.
2 King. 10:26,
27.
Dr Reynolds
lib. 2. de Idol;
cap. 2. S. 5.

Assumpt. The Proposition being confirmed, the Assumption is to be proved. In the proof whereof four things are to be insisted upon.

Assumpt.

1. That kneeling in the Act of Receiving, &c. is a Worship.

2. No civil but a religious Worship.

3. That it is a relative Adoration of God, before a Creature with respect unto it.

4. There is no special Warrant, nor Appointment from God for it.

Concerning the first branch, That kneeling is a Worship.

1. It is a gesture of the body, used to testify, signify, and shadow out the inward and hidden Act of the mind to some person or thing. This the learned acknowledge to be Worship.

Perkins Case of
Consc. 1. 2. cap.
11. Sect. 2.

2. If a man should bow in such sort, as he doth in the Sacrament unto God, *Psal.* 95:6. to his Prince, *1 King.* 1:23, 31. to his Parents, *Exod.* 20:12. to the Chair of State; to an Angel, *Gen.* 18:2. & 19:1. *Rev.* 19:10. to his Superior, *Gen.* 33:3, 6. & 42:6, 9. compared with 37:7, 9. yea, to an Idol, is he not said to give Worship to that whereto he kneeleth?

3. Reverend kneeling and bowing of the body is expressed by such words in the Scripture, that signify outward worship-
προσκύνησις. *Gen.* 18:2. & 23:7. *Mat.* 2:8, 11.

Scultetus *de*
Precatione par. 2. &
Concor. Græc. *de*
voce **προσκύνησις.**

4. The Evangelist *Mark* recording the Story of the Leper that came to Christ, faith, that he kneeled down, *Chap.* 1:40. *Luke* saith *he fell on his faith*, *Chap.* 5:12. and *Matthew*, that he Worship, as ped, *Chap.* 8:2.

Lastly, Kneeling in the act of receiving is not intended by urgers or obeyers, for ease, or civil furtherance. It's no gesture of necessity, as it is in them, who being lame, kneel, because they can do no otherwise. Neither is it a gesture of order to kneel at a Feast, whether Spiritual, or Corporal; and what order can there be when most do sit or stand to attend the Word read, to sing Psalms, medi-

1 Sam. 9. 21.

rate, &c. that the person communicating should kneel. But if that be true which some have said, that the Greek words used by the Evangelist speaking of the gesture used by the Lord Jesus in his Passover, and consequential also in his Supper, do rather signify kneeling than sitting; a man might have some colour to avouch, that nature, reason, and custom, taught rather to kneel at some Feasts, than to sit or stand. But the truth is, that the Evangelist's use two words to express the gesture of our Saviour. The one is ordinarily rendered sitting, as maybe seen in these places, *Matth.* 9:10. and 26:7, 20. *Mark* 14:18. and 16:14. *Luke* 11:37. and 22:27. *Joh.* 6:11. or guests, *Matth.* 22:10, 11. or such as are at a Table, *Joh.* 13:28. and scarce more than once it's translated lying down, *Mark* 5:40. and once leaning, *Joh.* 13.28. The former of these not concerning any gesture, and the latter shewing their national manner and fashion of fitting.

The other word is translated, sitting, *Matth.* 15:35. *Mark* 6:40. and 8:6. *Luke* 11:37. and 14:10. and 17:7. and 22:14. *Joh.* 6:10. and 13.12. and, it may be, not above once otherwise, *Joh.* 21:20. These words are translated sitting by our *English* Translators, as in the late Translation in the *Geneva*, and in that of the great Bibles to which we were tied by Law to subscribe. *Beza*, *Piscator*, *Arias Montanus* the vulgar Interpreter, the Doctors of *Rheims*, do thus translate them: and do not Grecians know, that these words do properly note the gesture of sitting? Indeed the fashion of sitting in the Oriental parts, was different from that that is used in the Northern Climates; but National circumstances carry not the nature of gesture. I conclude then, that seeing this kneeling is not a gesture of necessity, ease, order, or civil furtherance; it is a gesture of reverence and worship.

Secondly, kneeling in the act, &c. is a Religious worship; for all bodily worship is Civil, or Religious. Civil is such as is performed to the Inhabitants of the same society, as of man to man in respect of superiority in office, age, or gifts. This is performed by man, but to such with whom he doth converse; and then only to Angels when they had visible communion with man. Such civil adoration, kneeling in the act of receiving, is not for what finite social object is there present at the Communion, to which kneeling should be performed? To worship man at that time with such solemn worship, is to worship God by the halves, if not to give that

Ἄνέκειτο
Ἄνέπεσε

Ἀνάκειται

Ἀναπίπτω

Joh. Royn.
plect. 79. pag.
941, 942. An-
nor. Bez. in
Joh. 13:23.

Perk. Case of
Consc. l. 2. c. 11.
S. 1. And Com.
in Matth. 4:9.

Perk. Case, l. 2.
e. 11. Sect. 1.

to man which God doth appropriate to himself. Human Authority commanding this gesture, doth not make it civil, no more then it makes Prayers, &c, civil actions, by enjoining them to be made. Seeing this is not a civil gesture, it must needs be Religious.

4. Religious adoration, as it is an opposite members to civil, is Spiritual and unlimited in all places, at all times, and in all things causing him that worshippeth to adore before that which is worshipped, and this is performed to God, or something that is reputed and worshipped as God. Of this kind is the kneeling in question, as the chief Patron; of conformity do aver, saying, that it is the meetest and fittest in respect of Prayer and Thanksgiving.

Whitg. def. p.
598. tract 15.
c. 1. Div. 2.

It is a gesture of Piety, and more necessary in this act than many other. *Hook Eccles. Pol. lib. 5. S. 68. Cov. against Burg. p. 143.* Of this kneeling, the Book of Common Prayer Authorized by King *Edward* the 6th, saith, it is commanded *for signification of the humble and grateful acknowledgment of the benefits of Christ given to the worthy receiver.* Add further, that such kneeling as this, done to Idols, would be an Idolatrous worship; which could not be, except it were a Religious worship.

To conclude, bowing the knee doth sometimes in the Scripture note the whole worship of God. *Psal. 95:6. 1 King. 19:18. Esay 45:23. Rom. 14:10. Phil. 2:11. Ephes. 3:14. Hos. 13:2.* From all this, the conclusion may be inferred, that kneeling in the act of receiving is a Religious worship.

This Kneeling is a relative adoration of God before a Creature, with respect unto it. The Sacrament is a consecrated Creature, and before the Sacramental Bread and Wine, we are required to bow. In the intention of the Law, and in the opinion of the most people, there is a relation had in the very act of bowing unto the Sacrament, though it be not the object in which they purpose their adoration should determine. Is there not the like respect as the Papists have, when they kneel, or knock their breasts before a Cross, or Crucify &c?

The act of kneeling, and the Circumstances thereof, do convince, that there is such a relation: for we are allowed to sit, or stand meditating, or singing Psalms, &c, until we be about to receive the Sacramental Bread and Wine, and when it is given by the Minister to be received by us; Law requires that we should reverently fall down on our knees, and the practice of most is suitable

thereto, Scarce is there (if any) more visible sign and token to the eye of the spectator, to convince the Papists of adoration of the Sacrament, than this our bowing at this time is to declare that there is an actual reverence had to the Sacrament when we kneel to God before it. If a man were not only to bow before it, but to it, what could he do more? If, in this sense, and after this manner, a man should bow to an Image; would not wise men judge this act an adoring of the Image, or of God before it? The Book of Common Prayer of *Edward* the 6th, enjoineth this posture to avoid the profanation of the Sacrament.

The urgers and maintainers of kneeling, tell us in plain terms, That kneeling is done to the Bread and Wine, not simply, but as resembling Christ; that none is so sottish to adore the sign, but the thing represented by that sign; that our bowing is an outward reverence meet to be performed, because of the holy action in hand; that it's done to keep the Sacrament in reverence, &c. and that we kneel to put difference between ordinary Bread and Wine, and these Sacramental, to which we give more reverence, because, its more then ordinary Bread and Wine; and partly to stir up by our selves and others a more Religious estimation of these Divine Seals, partly to remove all profane thoughts of contemners and despisers of the Sacrament of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus; partly to put a difference hereby from our common bread and Wine which we take in our houses, and at our Tables; and partly to teach us to lift up our hearts to God to bless his own Ordinance. In a word, Articles have been put into, and allowed in Ecclesiastical Courts, which have charged the Ministers to have delivered the Sacrament unreverently to the people, not kneeling. To omit the opinion of the vulgar, who come, as they say themselves, to receive their Marker; or who place holiness in the outward bowing, and have relation to the Sacramental Signs, which yet addeth some strength to the matter in hand. I conclude with Mr *Hooker*, who saith well, In actions of this kind, we are more to respect what the greatest part of men is prone to conceive, then what some few men's wits may devise in construction of their own particular meaning.

Now it remains that I assay to prove, that kneeling in the act of receiving, hath no special warrant from the Word. This gesture being proved to be a relative adoration of God before a consecrated Creature, it is of a special and peculiar nature and use, and there-

The Hutton
part. 2. p. 54,
56.
Eccl regim.
p. 140.
Spar. persuas.
to unifor. c. 4.
Th. Hutt. part
2. pag. 62.

Eccl. Pol. l. 5.
Sect. 5.

fore ought to have a peculiar warrant from God to authorize it, otherwise gestures of this kind cannot be used in Faith; for these are not discernable by the light of Nature; neither can the general rules of the Scripture yield ground for such. When the act done is of special nature, it must have a peculiar direction. The *Jews* did not worship towards the High Priest, or his Attire, towards the Paschal Lamb, the Manna, the water of the Rock, or their Sacrifices, in that sense as they did before the Ark of the Covenant, or the Mercy-seat in the Tabernacle, or in the Temple, although these holy things were Types of Christ. Nature could not teach, neither yet any general rules in the Scripture why, before one rather than before another, they should bow; therefore for this peculiar adoration, there was a special appointment. When the *Israelites* also were stung with fiery Serpents, they looked up at the Brazen Serpent which was a Type of Christ, that they might be healed, but this was by special direction.

Exod. 12:11.
Exod. 15:16.
Exod. 12:11.
1 Cor. 5:7.
and 10:3, 4.

Numb. 21:8.

Now as for kneeling in the act of receiving, who can shew any peculiar institution. Moreover, Canonical kneeling is not authorised by God's Word, nor by any general rule.

1. Both maintainers and urgers of this gesture, say, it is indifferent; and that it was so reputed by the State, appears by this, that in the beginning of Queen *Elizabeth's* Reign, standing was ordained at *Coventry* and *Northampton*, by virtue of her Highness Commission, and kneeling abolished.

2. Christ and his Apostles at the first institution of the Communion, did not kneel; which they would have done, if this gesture had been divinely ratified.

Matth. 26:20,
26.
Mar. 14:18,
22.
Luk. 22:14, 17.
Joh. 13:12.

3. The Apostles after Christ's Resurrection delivered nothing concerning the Lord's Supper, but what they received of the Lord. *1 Cor.* 11:23. and yet delivered the whole counsel of God, *Act.* 20:20, 27. but yet say nothing of kneeling; which doubtless they would have done if it had been a divine Ordinance. Kneeling is not of that antiquity to have ground or institution by the Apostles. That mention which may seem to be of it in *Origin*, is nothing, the book being counterfeit. *Rob. Cocus in Censuram quorundam veterum Script. pag.* 13.

Homil. 5. in
divers. Evang.
loca.

Gorgonia, her bowing before the Communion Table, or Altar, was to the night intended for Prayer, not to receive the Sacrament.

Sozem. lib. 8.
cap. 5.

About the year of our Lord 157, it may appear that Standing was used at the Communion.

About the year 160, *Justin Martyr* giveth not the least inkling of this Gesture, but mentioneth the Peoples coming to the Table.

Tertullian (who was about 180 or 200 years after Christ) reports, That in his time they used not to kneel at prayer upon any Lord's Day, or upon any other Day between *Easter* and *Whitsuntide*.

In the Council of *Nice* 327, a solemn Decree was made, That none might pray kneeling, but standing, upon the Lord's Day; This continued in *Basil's* time, (if that Book was his) *Anno Dominus*, 380, and was afterward confirmed by the sixth Council holden at *Constantinople*. So that either the ancient Churches never received the Sacrament on the Lord's Day (which is without controversy most false), or they used a Gesture of greater reverence in receiving the Sacramental Bread and Wine than they did at prayer, (whereof there is no likelihood); or else it must be granted, That they were accustomed to receive the Communion with some other Gesture than kneeling.

Anno 380, in *Gregory Nazianzen's* time, the People stood at the Communion about the Table. I will for brevity omit other pertinent Testimonies for this purpose which he that will may read in the Acts and Monuments in the difference between the Church of *Rome*, that new is and the ancient. The sum of *Paul's* Doctrine delivered to the Gentiles, &c. Also in the Dialogue between Custom and Truth, pag. 1264. *Edit.* 1610.

To draw to an end, very many of our learned Worthies do affirm, That odoration, or bowing before the Sacrament came into use, in the days of *Honorius* the third. But whatsoever the Original of it was, That which I have spoken sheweth that it is but a human Tradition. Seeing therefore that kneeling in the Act of receiving the Sacramental Bread and Wine, is a religious adoration of God, before a consecrated Creature with respect unto it, having no special Warrant out of the Word of God, it cannot be used without sin,

Hitherto of the Arguments directly concluding the unlawfulness of the controverted Rites. Now follow, the considerations for which our request not to be urged unto conformity, may seem reasonable.

1. It was not the intent of the Statute by which the Ceremonies stand in force to perpetuate the use of them, but only to tolerate them out of hope of a fitter time of reformation. This Law was not in-

Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 7. cap. 8, or 9. *Bez.* Tractat. the large Vol. 3. Part. 183. *De Coron.* milit. cap. 3. *Can.* 20. *De Spir.* Sanct. cap. 27. *Gentilletus* exam. concil. *Triden.* lib. 2. Sect. 4. pag. 44. *Dr Fulke.* answ. to *Rhem.* 1 *Cor.* 11:29. Sect. 2. 4. *Jewel's* resp. artic. 8. divis. 1. *Zach. Urs.* common. Chitr. consid. error. 3. consid. Bale in the Life of *Honorius* 3. Tho. *Mort. Pret.* Appeal. lib. 4. cap. 29. Sect. 3. *Hispin.* Hist. Sacra. part. 1. lib. 4. *Francis White's* answ. to the Treatise called, *White dyed black* part. 2. p. 347. *Perk.* Idol. of last times, last particular, &c. *Willet* Synops. contr. 13. q. 4. pag. 649. edit. 1614. *John White's* way to the true Church. Sect. 50. Num. 9. Stat. 1. *Eliz.* cap. 2.

tend to be revealed, or the benefit thereof, to denied, though the Proclamation of his Highness did ratify the authority of the Bishops to make Ecclesiastical Canons, as the words of that Proclamation do import;—most humbly desiring us to give our royal assent unto the said Canons.

In the Procla. prefixed, and set before the Book of Canons.

2. Nonconformity proceeding from fear of sinning against God, is neither contempt, nor scandal; and therefore, may be allowed, favour in the eye of the Law. If a bare omission of a Rite were contempt, then all that use Bowling which the Law disalloweth, and do not wear Caps and men Habits as the Statute enjoineth, shall be Contemners. Where we dare not do, we are ready without resisting to suffer; and suffering is as sure a Sign of subjection, as obeying. In some cases, the Law is satisfied by submitting a man's self to the Mulct. Neither is forbearance a scandal, because it affords no hurtful conclusion, which may be naturally and, necessarily thence deduced; except as much and more, may be deduced from some Conformities, that do not use the Ceremonies so oft as the Law requireth. The railing Inferences of some maliculous Papists, are but mere inconsequences; and do not proceed from our forbearance, but from their malice.

Treatise of Ceremonies prefixed before the Book of Common-prayer. And Stat. 1. Eliz. cap. 2. B. *Bislon.* ag a. Apol. part. 2. pag. 349. *Mort.* asnw. to the Popish demands. Demand, 30.

The use of Ceremonies ought to be free. This the Law seemeth probably to import, which enjoineth subscription with this exception to the Articles of Religion, which only concern the confession of the true Christian Faith, and the Doctrine of the Sacraments. This practice (only) limits subscription to the things expressed, leaving as it may seem other things at liberty. Neither was there any hurt that came to the Church of God by the free use of the Ceremonies in the beginning of Queen *Elizabeth's* Reign. For the space of 10 years Papists came generally to the Church, but since the urging of these Rites, they have not been so forward. This God hath not blessed the imposing of them, as the leaving of them free.

Jewel of the private Mass tract. 2. div. 9. in the end of his answ. Stat. 13. Eliz. cap. 12.

4. Worthy men, the maintainers of these Rites in the Days of King *Edward*, (*viz.*) *Peter Martyr*, and *Bullinger*, upon better consideration, did retract their Judgements.

Sir *Edward Cook* his speech at *Garnet's* Arraignment. P. *Mart.* Epist. *cuidam* in *Angl. Scripta an.* 1559. *Vide* loc. com. pag. 1225. *Bucer. censura.* Mr *Casaubon* Mr *Hooker*, Eccles. Polit. Lib. 5. Sect. 67.

Foreign Divines disallow these Rites, and may not we be suffered to doubt of them?

5. Since the urging of these Ceremonies, these Points have sprung up for the defence of them; (*viz.*) The Church's Authority binds

the Conscience, That it's not to be enquired into, whether Christ be present in the Sacrament by Consubstantiation or Transubstantiation, and that it doth no way hinder or further us, however it standeth. That relative adoration of God before a Creature with respect unto it, without special Warrant, may be lawful, &c. May not this breed some doubt of the equality of the cause, that is by great Scholars thus maintained?

6. As yet we have nothing to settle our doubting-consciences upon, but these two Points, which yet are not without some doubt.

1. That the Rites imposed are indifferent.

2. That in such things, the Church's or Magistrate's Authority binds the Conscience.

Yet are we taught that no individual Action is indifferent, (*Thom. Mort. Apolog. Lib. 1. Cap. 47.*) indifferency resting in the general Nature, (*Aquin. 1, 2, 18. Artic. 97. That, particulares Magistratum leges nullum habent in conscientias diminatuus.* Whitak, *contra Duræum. Lib. 8. Sect. ultim.* That no man incurreth the guilt of Damnation, but by breaking the Laws of God. Dr *Field* of the Church, *Lib. 4. Cap. 33.* to which purpose some other Worthies do write: *Perkin's Treatise of Conscience, Cap. 2. Sect. 70* in the end. If it should be said that the use of the Veil, *1 Cor. 11.* may afford Warrant unto us, for such Rites as are in Question. We are to consider, That the use of the Veil was in ordinary life, not in mere Ecclesiastical use, *Gen. 14:65.* Also it was not not a Symbolical Sign, but a Natural indicant Sign of modesty. This considered, doth not our humble suit seem reasonable, that till these Propositions be better cleared, we may be foreborn?

7. Resolution in matter of Ceremonies is not easy, because the holy Scriptures which in weightier matters is clear, is more dark in things of lesser moment. So that the *Media* be used in Argument either for, or against, the Ceremonies are difficult to be found out: Hence it is, That from the beginning there have been great Controversies, and that among the greatest, in matter of Ceremonies; as *Bellarm*, saith, *De effect. Sacram, Lib. 2. Cap. 3.*

8. Are learned Protestants deceived or not, when they say, Poppish Ceremonies are to be condemned, because there is an opinion of holiness, necessity, and worship annexed, wherewith they are urged? Or can ours be freed from this holiness or necessity, seeing

Calvin. Instit.
 Lib. 4. Cap. 10.
 Sect. 8 *Beza*
 Epist. 14.
 Zanch. de ope
 rib. Redemp.
 cap. 4. *de cultu*
extera. qu. 4.
 Dr *White's* de-
 fence. p. 287.

they are reputed religious Rites, and urged under I great penalty, both upon Minister and People, as the Canons shew.

9. Lastly, If this Proposition be true that is given and agreed of by the Learned; Rites of meet human invention, of no necessary use, antiently abused to Idolatry, now superstitiously used among many ignorant persons, are to be abolished: It is a worthy labour to resolve us that our Ceremonies be not such. We are taught, that Ceremonies to be in the Church, must not be in nature impious, in use superstitious; for their weight not over heavy, and grievous to be born; that for their worthiness in the eyes of the Ordainers, they be neither of an equal prize, nor of more account then the Ordinances of God, so as, for the performance of them, the Law of God must be left undone; that they be not against the liberty of Christians, or any way contrary to the Commandment of God: but tend both to the nourishing and increase of love, friendship and quietness among Christians, and retaining of God's People, in God's holy fear, &c.

Dr Willet
Synops. 2. Gen.
Contr. qu. 3.
part. 2. p. 110.
Edit. 1614.
Tho: Rogers his
expos. of the
39. artic. Act.
20. pag. 101.
102.

FINIS.
