

BOVVING

TOWARDS THE

ALTAR,

Upon

Religious Reasons,

Impleaded as

Grossely SUPERSTITIOUS.

Being an

ANSWER

To Dr. *Duncons* DETERMINATION,
Lately Reprinted.

By *D. Cawdrey*, Minister of the Word at *Billing-Magn.* in
Northamptonshire.

1 John 5.21. *Babes, keep your selves from Idols.*

1 Thel. 5.21. *Abstain from all appearance of evil.*

LONDON,

Printed for *J. Rothwel* at the Fountain in
Goldsmiths-Row in *Cheapside*, 1661.



To the Judicious and Conscientious Reader.

Reader,



Although the Doctors Determination, as to the Substance of it, was answered above Twenty years since, in a Traët, purposely published to give a stop to, at that time-creeping Superstition, in Holiness of Churches, and particularly, that of Bowing to, or towards the Altar (as they began to call the Communion-Table) wherein the strength of that Determination was considered, and consuted, none ever since, having appeared to give it a Reply (though many have snarled at it, but durst not fasten) and though now this last Year, that Determination hath been Reprinted, in Latine, by R. W. and turned into English, and published by I. D. yet because nothing was replied to that Traët, and upon Review of the Determin finding it so weak and loose in way of Argumentation, I thought it not worth any further Consideration, having contested with two very Learned men, (to make no Comparison with the Doctor) and men pretending stronger Reasons then any given by the Doctor, in this Controversie. But on the other side, when I heard, that an Acute and Learned Divine had written a little Traët, in opposition to the Do-
Mr. z. c.
ctors Thesis, called Altar-Worship, &c. directed chiefly against him (though taking others also into Consideration) I expected, that he would have, *κατὰ πρόθεσιν*, answered the Doctors Determination; which, upon sight thereof, I perceived

ved be had not done, nor any for him: Thereupon, fearing lest the Eloquence and fair Glosses of the Doctors Discourse, might find too much Applause and Approbation from ignorant people, and unstudied young Schollars, who like greedy fish, are ready, for Preferments sake, to swallow Bait and Hook together, I thought it not amiss (yearequisite) to allow a few dayes, to give it an Answer, to Antidote the hurt that such gilded, Poisonous Pills might cause in ungrounded Souls. Other Learned men (whom it as much concerned as me) perhaps contemned to give it an Answer, as having little hope of Honour from a Victory over so impotent an Adversary, who takes much pains to prove, what no rational man denies, and neglects to speak to that part of the question, wherein the controversie lies.

His four Arguments, with his double so many Postulata premised, to bottom them upon, prove no more but this;

"That it is, in it self considered, as Lawful and Pious, to bow towards the Altar, when that Sacrament is administered, as towards the Font at Baptism, or the Pulpit, at the Sermon.

Which, who denies let him be hissed out of the School-gates: But he was to prove, (according to his own second stating of the Question.)

1. "That Bowing towards the Altar, is not only lawfully, but best determined that way. 2. That at every Ingrefs or Egress, or Passing by the Altar, worship is best of all (and so necessarily) to be tendered that way. 3. That it is not Superstitious to do so, upon Reasons of meerly humane Institution, viz. 1. More Holiness in that place. 2. More Divine Presence there at all times, then in other places of the Church. And, 3. By consequence, more and better Acceptance of his Worship from thence.

But I stay thee too long from the Tract it self, where these things are more fully handled, and leave it to thy Judgement, to resolve both of the Truth and strength of all, Farewel.

Bow



Bowing towards the Altar, upon Religious Reasons, impleaded, as grossely Superstitious, if not also Idolatrous.

After a Romish Pralusion of a Cross, and a Cursory Preface or Introduction to his Determination, he propounds the Question to be discussed in this manner.

Whether Bowing towards the Altar, to worship God thereby, in our Ingresse into, and Egresse out of his House, and as often as we present our selves before it, to worship him with Supplications, be Lawful and Pious, Laudable and Conformable to the Practise of the Ancient Church, and not at all liable to the present Calumnies of Novellists?



What reason he had then to start this Question, or any now to publish this his Determination, so full of weaknesses and impertinencies, I cannot (nor can any sober man) conjecture, unless it was, and still is their Design, to reconcile us unto Rome, or Rome to us, I hear, some of them do now profess, their Design to be, to go as near to them, as without sin they may, both in Doctrine and Worship, as in Discipline they are the same: But how

how this can be done in one or other, without *Corrupting* our *Doctrine*, or *adulterating* the *Worship*, is not to me imaginable: That *Rome* is *Heretical* in much of her *Doctrine*, and *Idolatrous* in much more of her *Worship*, is confessed by themselves, and palpable to all Reformed Churches. That *Protestants* in the least, should comply with her, hath no less *appearance* of evil, then for a man that would be reputed chaste, to be seen often to frequent the Stews, in pretence forsooth, to convert some of those *Prostitutes*. To bring *Romanists* to us, is equally as impossible, as to fetch and remove the old City of *Rome* into *England*, they go upon *Principles* irreconcilable with us, or with the Truth. We may go to them (as many have of late) but they cannot come to us, without ruine to themselves, and their Church, that is, by admitting their Church to have erred in any one thing; which may conclude them capable of *erring* in more, and so in all, wherein they differ from us. All their labour, that have attempted this *Reconciliation*, hath been in vain; if yet that may be said to be in vain, which hath reduced so many of ours to *Rome*: But this is largely manifested by others, and I forbear, and shall speak to the present Question, of *Bowing towards the Altar*. If they had a *Design* to bring the *Romish* Mass into our Churches, what better *Engine* could they use, then this in hand? viz. to prepare the People for it, by calling the Table an *Altar* (which is a *Relate* to a Priest and a Sacrifice, as this Doctor confesses hereafter) then placing more *Holiness* on it, and after that, more *Veneration* to, or towards it, then towards any other parts of the Church, to make it the *Object* or *Motive* of our worship, and that at any time; will not *Consciences* be scrupulous to know the reason of this *Adoration* that way more then another? What can be pretended, 't the *Sacramentals* of Bread and Wine, or the *Body* and *Blood* of Christ, as some begin to call them without a *Figure*? But it will be said, these are not always upon the *Table* or *Altar*, and therefore when there is no *Sacrament* administered, there is yet an *Appearance* of *Idolatry*, in worshipping a *Table* made of Wood, or an *Altar* of Stone, What remains to remove this Scruple, but only the *fixation* of the *Transubstantiated Elements* upon the *Table*? which, if they were

were absent, *Papists* themselves confess, they should be gross *Idolaters*, in worshipping either the *Table* or the *Elements*: But of this, more in the *Procefs*.

I come now to examine the *state* of the Question, ss here by him propounded: which is indeed a *double Question*: In one,

1. Whether our *Adoration* must be directed towards the *Altar*, rather then towards any other part of the Church, either as a special *Object*, though not the *Ultimate*; or from any thing in it, as a *Relative Motive* of our *Worship*: For the *state* of the Question is not in general, whether it be Pious or Lawful, to worship God towards the Altar or Table, as a Place, simply considered: For it's lawful to worship God towards any part of the Heavens, *East, West, North, &c.* Yet he so layes the question, as if some did deny this, and calls them *Novellists* for so doing, and conceals his designs of placing more *Holiness* and *Divine Presence* there, as the chief *Motives* of his worship that way, till he comes to his second Argument.

2. Whether if in the *Administration* of the Sacrament, it be lawful, &c. to tender our *Worship* that way, towards the Table, it be also lawful and pious, &c. to bow towards it, when there is no publick *Divine Service* in being? For so he states it.

"Whether it be lawful, not only when we present our Service, and perform divine Offices there, but in our Ingresses and Egresses, Entrance, or out-going (or passing through the Church) it be lawful, pious, &c. For it seems very rational, and *prudential*, that the *Table* be so placed, at the *Administration* of the Sacrament, that the eyes and posture of all may be fixed or directed towards the *Service* done at or upon the Table, as our Church advises and commands. The like may be said for the Scituation of the *Pulpit*, and our posture towards it, in time of *Preaching*: That the *Minister* when he officiates at the *Table*, may bow or kneel in *Prayer*, is very lawful and pious: And therefore our Church requires, that he stand at the *North side*, (not end) of the Table, and read or pray, at the *Consecration* of the *Elements*: But then he bows not towards the *East* (as is by them intended) but towards the *South*: And if he should stand on the *West-side* of the Table (as they require) he turns his back

back upon the People, that many (especially in the Body of the Church) shall neither see what he does, nor hear what he says ; which is a very great *Indecency* and *Disorder*, and destructive to *Edification*. But that men should be compelled or perswaded to bow towards the *Table*, rather then towards any other part of the Church, or at all, when occasionally they come in, pass through, or go out of the Church, savours too much of *Romish* Superstition, and without strong Reasons of some special *Privilege* belonging to the Table, not found in other places, cannot, I suppose, be justified. And this is the true state of the Question, as will appear, in his second stating of it, before he gives his Arguments for it.

“ Whether Adoration may be tendered towards the Altar, lawfully, piously, (*optimè*) and best of all ?

For certainly, our worship to the *Divine Majesty*, is to be tendered in the most decent, most orderly, and best *Mode* we can, if any be better then another. But see now, how many Questions are secretly involved in this one. 1. Whether it be lawful to worship God towards the Altar, and that either in the time of the Sacrament, or at any other time. 2. Whether it be pious ? And 3. Laudable. 4. Whether it be the *best way* of Adoration ? 5. We may add, whether it be *conformable* to the Practice of the *Apostles* and *primo-primitive* Church ? All which are supposed in stating the Question, and we shall meet with the most of them, in that which follows.

This *Superstructure* is like to be high, and therefore he digs deep, to find some firm ground, to lay his Foundation upon, by premising four particular *Postulata*, as granted by all.

“ 1. [That it is necessary, that some place designed by the Church, as Chappels, Temples, &c. must be destinated to the Publick Worship of God, &c.] Where first, I list not to ask what the Difference is, between a place *Designed*, and a Place *destinated* by the Church ? For I perceive by their Practice, and by that which followes, That he means, a Place must first be *designed*, that is, *Consecrated*, by a Bishop, and afterwards destinated to Publick Worship. Where I observe, he secretly steals into a Church, an *Holiness*, more than in other places, by vertue of that Consecration, to lay a ground-work for his *Romish*

ing towards the Altar, as the most *holy Place* in the Church ; as will appear more and more in the following Discourse : But this should not be begged , but here, or somewhere, have been proved , which he takes for granted. But I adde further, It is not absolutely necessary , that the place for Publick Worship, must be *fixed* (much lesse *consecrated*.) sure not in times of Persecution , when God people are not suffered to have publick Meeting places, as when they meet in *Houses, Caves, Fields, &c.* as they could , now in one place, then in another. Certainly then, they did not stand upon those *Punctilio's* of Worship (now stood upon so wantonly) to have their meeting places framed *East and West*, and their *Tables* set up at the *East-end*, or to direct their *Adoration* Eastward , with Relation to the Table : It's probable, their Table might stand in the *midst* of the Room , that on every side, people might look towards it, in the Administration, or towards the Minister, where he stood to *preach* or *pray*. But enough of that.

2. "[That all obedient Christians are bound to go to those Places, destinated to God and holy things, there to offer their prayers and praises to God, and to exhibit their due worship and Veneration.] I observe here,

1. That here is no particular mention of *Preaching* or *Hearing* the Word, as if that were no part of *Divine worship*, nor indeed do they account it so to be , as I have elsewhere shewed.

2. It now further appears, that by *designed by the Church*, in the former premise, he meant some *Holiness* in those places so designed : For so he sayes; " Those places are for that end separated from Common things, and therefore have Dedication and Consecration, with some solemn Rite, that people may worship God together in his House.] Of which I have spoken elsewhere , and more is said to it by another Learned man, in a Tract lately reprinted, called *Gurnay Redivivum*, p. 31. To which I refer.

*Superst.
Superstices.*

3. "[That this publick religious worship, is to be performed, with the Body, as well as the Soul, sincerely, visibly, exemplarily, submissely, humbly, &c.

I have nothing to say against this, but only thus ; That this is nothing at all, to his *Adoration*, at any time , as a single per-

son, when there is no worship publickly in the Church, which yet is in his Question.

4. "This perfect worship of Body and Soul, when people meet in the holy House, performed to God, is without doubt lawfull, pious and laudable, as favouring of the practise of the Primitive Church, and so cuts off all occasion from Novellists of gainsaying and calumniating.

1. Mark here, how he now more oppenly begs the place to be holy; which if it were granted, (as it is denied) makes nothing more for Adoration towards the altar, then towards any other parts of the Church, being equally holy; unless he first proves (which he still begs, and proves not) that there are not only degrees of holiness in the Church, but also that the Altar is the most holy place: Which how weakly he performs, shall be seen anon.

2. It is also a Presumption to take it as granted, that this was the practice of the purest Primitive Church, as will appear hereafter. They did indeed worship God, with souls and bodies, in their publick meeting-places; but that was only, in the time of Publick worship, and that as well in other parts of worship, as at the Sacraments; but not, that yet appears, by Bowing towards any part of the Church, when there was no Publick Worship: Which he undertakes to make out in his Question.

3. Who is so destitute of Prudence and Religion, as to doubt of the Lawfullness or pioufness of Bowing to God with soul and body, whether in publick or private Worship? It is an unsufferable slander & Calumny, to call his Adversaries, Novellists, as if they deny it lawfull at any time, to worship God with Soul and Body together: But an ill cause thrives best, with ignorant and prophane people, by Calumnation of their Opposites.

Having premised these things, he comes to that, which should have preceded his Premises, which are indeed the Topics of his Proofs, viz. the Explication of some Termes of the Question: As,

1. The word Altar sounds harsh (if properly taken, as some now of late begin to speak) in a true Protestants ear, as either heathenish or Jewish, in its original acception, importing a Sacrifice, either

either a bloody one, or unbloody, as Papists have learned to speak: This he puts off with scorn and indignation.

'Are they so ignorant: as not to know, that all the Antient Fathers in the Eastern and Western Church, from Ignatius to Bernard, have often used that Word? Or so imprudent to affirm that those Antients laid the first foundation of the Popish Mass?

To the first, I say, the Fathers used the word Altar, as also, that of Sacrifice, but not in a proper, but figurative sense; not as Papists, and some others of ours in latter times: The Papists have found out a proper, propitiatory, but unbloody Sacrifice, in the Mass, for which, they have made a proper Altar: Some of ours speake near the same language. Our Doctor below, speaks of,

'An awfull and most venerable Sacrifice, which our Lord did institute, celebrated on the Table, of which more in its place.

Another of his Symists and Contemporaries speaks, what then he durst not.

'It is a propitiatory Sacrifice, to reconcile us unto God, offended with our daily sins.

Widd. Lawl.
Puritan. p. 34.
89.

What could a Papist say more or worse? The Fathers, as by a Sacrifice, they understood nothing, but either a remembrance of a Sacrifice, or a Sacrifice of Praise and Thanksgiving, so call'd, Heb. 13. 15. So by Altar, they intend either Christ himself, so is that to be taken, [Heb. 13. 10. We have an Altar] Or the Table allusively, with respect to that Sacrifice; Of Which more hereafter.

2. As Learned men, and pious as this Doctor, are not afraid to affirm, that by their Rhetorical, exorbitant expressions (not intentionally good men) the Fathers laid the foundation of the Popish Mass, as is evident, by their citing and making use of the Fathers words (against their meaning) of Altar, Sacrifice, unbloody Sacrifice, and the like. But those Fathers may better be excused, then our late Doctors, who take the words literally and properly, which they intended figuratively.

The Doctor he confesses, 'Altar, Priest, Sacrifice, are indeed Relates, and from one to another, the argument is valid.

That is, a proper Sacrifice infers a proper Priest, and a proper Altar.

But say Papists, say these men, the Sacrament of Bread and Wine 'is an awfull and most venerable Sacrifice, a propitiatory Sacrifice; as was newly said: *Ergo*, it must have a *Priest* and *Altar* proportionable thereunto.

True, sayes he, 'but from those three, the *Altar*, *Priest* and 'Sacrifice, there is no shew of consequence to Transubstantiation. Take away Transubstantiation, (sayes the Reverend Father B. of *Winch.*) and there will be no controversie betwixt us of a 'Sacrifice.

The Reverend Bishop, I suppose, meant by a *Sacrifice* as the *Fathers* did, a remembrance of a *Sacrifice*, or a *Sacrifice* of praise, not a proper, propitiatory *Sacrifice*, as some now do: No, nor a *Commemorative* *Sacrifice*, as Bishop *Laud* began to call it: but a *Commemoration* of a *Sacrifice*, which is another thing. And though there be no necessary *Consequence* by way of *Argumentation* from those three, if improperly and figuratively understood; yet if they be taken properly, *Transubstantiation*, is a very probable *Consequent* thereof, it may quickly follow upon those Expressions. Yea, to make the *Bread* and *Wine* in the Sacrament to be a propitiatory *Sacrifice* for sins (as some do) is not so rational, as the Papists *Transubstantiation*: Forasmuch, as with these, the *Bread* and *Wine* are now turn'd into the *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ*, really and corporally there; which makes the *Sacrifice* propitiatory for sins: But with those of ours, the *Elements* are still but *Creatures*, which can never expiate sins; what remains then, but to clothe with *Papists* in their *Masks*, to have an unbloody *Sacrifice* suitable to their *Altar* and *Priest*?

2. *Adoration* before, or towards the *Altar*, is liable easily to mis-construction (as well as bowing toward, or before an *Image*) Some have suspected and censured them:

'That they have tendered their *Adoration* to the very *Altar* 'of *Wood* or *Stone*, a manifest and outrageous slander. So 'the *Heathens* charged the *Christians*, as *Sun-worshippers*, because they worshipped *God* towards the *East*, &c. This suspicion and Censure might very well arise upon several grounds.

1. Because some of them have been so bold, as to assert and defend *Bowing* to the *Altar*, which *Papists* seem to abhor.

2. But *Bowing* towards the *Altar*, or before it, rather than any

any other place or part of the Church, seems parallel to the *Papists* bowing towards or before a *Crucifix*, which is by *Protestants* charged as *Idolatrous*; and some part of such worship falls upon the *Altar* or *Table* equally, as upon an *Image*, so used, as shall appear.

3. Did the *Christians* well, to tender their worship to *God*, towards the *East*? As they had not any solid ground of *Scripture* for it, or example of the *Apostles*, that we read of, so they did not well to give such a scandal to the *heathens*, confirming them in their *Idolatry*, as worshipping the *Sun*, as some of them also did.

This very Custom of *Bowing* towards the *East*, brought into the Church by degrees, more *Superstition*: As, 1. To build their *Churches*, and place the *Table* East-ward. 2. To tie their *Worship* that way. 3. To place more *Holiness* and divine presence upon the *Table*, than upon other places or parts, not only during the time of the Sacrament administered, but at other times; and at last, the *Hof* transubstantiated to be fixed on the *Table*, lest men should otherwise be suspected to be *Idolatrous*, in worshipping the *Table* or *Altar*. Lastly, The charge lies still upon them, that they do impart some *Worship* to their *Altar*, in making it an *Object*, though not ultimate of their worship, and a *Motive* to excite their *Worship* from something in it, though but relative; as *Papists* make their *Images*, and are judged by ours to be *Idolatrous*; Of which more hereafter.

But it is excepted, 'In *Prayer* we lift up our eyes to *Heaven*, 'or towards the *Roof* of the Church, we do therefore worship 'them? At our entrance, we uncover our heads, do we therefore worship the *Sacred* *Stones*? Entering our *Seats*, we fall on 'our knees, do we do it to our *Seats* before us? They praying, 'put their hats before their eyes, do they worship their hats? &c.

To which I say, the Cases are vastly distant: For, 1. We do those things named, without any religious respect to the places or things, merely as places; but they make their *Altar* a religious *Relative* object and motive of their worship, as such an *holy* place, or *presential* place, which are not found to be in it by any *Institution* of *God*, which renders their worship *superstitious*, making it

it an *Image* or means of worship against the second Commandment. 2. We know no reason why people should fall to prayers at entrance into their Seats, which is (to say no more) a *Breach of Order*, to tender *private Prayers*, in a place designed for publick worship, as himself said above, and so much the greater, if the *publick worship* be then in hand, as I have shewed elsewhere.

3. The *uncovering* of our heads at entrance into the Church, is not intended to the *Sacred Stones*, as he calls them, nor to any place or part of the Church, as *holy*, or more *holy*, but with respect to the *people* of God there assembled, and as a *Civil reverence*, not at all religious: If it be more, we judge it to be *superstitious*, as placing more *Holiness*, more *Divine Presence*, more *acceptance* of our private worship, because done in such a *publick place*, which is too commonly done by many of our people. Lastly, as for putting their Hats before their faces in time of publick prayer, it may be justified, if done upon this ground, to avoid *diversions* of our Thoughts by other Objects, and therefore some very pious men find it most helpfull to their Devotion, to shut their eyes in time of prayer: though the Doctor scoffes at such devotion, [as a new device, unknown to the Ancients] and thinks that he hath better arguments for *Bowing* towards the *Altars*, whose strength shall presently be tryed.

3. He distinguishes *Adoration* (for further explication sake) into three particular Acts, whereof it consists.

1. ' Of the understanding, the knowledge of the supream divine Excellency.

2. ' Of the Will, which is a free Submission of it self, and all in its power to that excellency, which is the formal reason of worship.

3. ' Of the external act of the body, which is the effect of the two former, &c. All these together must concur to the integrity of our worship, otherwise it is imperfect.

Thus far well enough; But intending to speak only of the last, which hath specially obtained the name of *Adoration*, he instances in four ways of expression of it.

1. ' Uncovering of the head.

2. ' Bowing of the Body.

3. ' Bend-

3. ' Bending of the knees.

4. ' Prostration on the ground.

He might perhaps have instanced in more postures of external worship. *David* sat before the Lord, and prayed; *Christ* himself *sat* or *leaned*, and gave thanks. *Elijah* put his head or face between his knees: But these distinctions are either needless or uselesse (were they many more) For the Question is not of the *Lawfulness* of any of these bodily gestures, in the worship of God, but of the *Object* of them, which is the *Altar*; not simply neither, as a place or part of the Church, but as such a place or part, having *relation* or respect to it, for some quality considered in it, rather than any other place or part of the Church, of which, we shall have account anon: This should have been the state of the Question at first (otherwise he disputes without an Adversary) And therefore he states it anew; thus,

" Whether Adoration or Bowing of the body, towards the Altar, may lawfully, piously and best of all (*optime*) be done?

The words, *best of all*, are now inserted, which were not in the first stating of it. Leave out but those words, and look on the Table, merely as a *place* and part of the Church, and no man so much as doubts, but adoration of any kind or mod, is as lawful towards the Altar, as any other part of the Church, in the time at least, of publick worship: & all or most of his arguments plead for no more, as will now appear in particular. He might have spared his labour, to prove, what none of his adversaries deny, and not have troubled the Church with *unnecessary* and impertinent Controversies: But we must attend his Motion.

Arg. 1. " That divine worship, which in it self precisely and absolutely considered, is pious and humble, cannot be corrupted, much less made impious and superstitious, for this only reason, that according to custom, it is exhibited towards this " or that part of the Heavens, or Church, as the Altar or Font. " But such is bowing towards the Altar, precisely, &c. considered, *Ergo*.

What a Mighty and Doughty Argument is this of so learned a Doctor? Which

Lat. Epist.

Which is wholly granted, and proves no more but this, that it is lawfull to worship God, any wayes, toward any part of the Church, the Font or Pulpit, as well as towards the Altar. Should not the conclusion have been, according to the last stating of the question, ["Therefore bowing towards the Altar, is not only lawfull and pious, but the very best way of worshipping God."] Better then towards the *Font*, or any other part of the Church: Which how it arises from those *Premises*, let the Learned judge. Is this a Determination ["approved by most grave men, at the Commencement, and heard with so grateful and pleasing murmure or humming, by the Epistoler and others] But was that the question controverted, whether *Adoration* towards the *Altar*, be as lawfull and pious in it selfe considered, as towards any other part of the Church? No, but it is charg'd with other misadventures, that it is made the best way and men obliged to worship that way, rather than any other way for *Religious reasons* to be give anon. And his Proposition is by himself acknowledged to be weak in 4 respects:

[1. 'If we think that God hath confined himself to that place, which is injurious to his Omni-presence.

2. 'Or that God hath tyed his special gifts and graces to this place, which violates his mercy and goodnesse: Or,

3. 'We suppose our worship in any part, is bestowed upon that place, at least transiently or relatively, or some other way. Or,

4. 'There be danger lest any should think justly, we do give worship to that place or thing: There is no other way to vitiate this worship.]

These all, or any of them, will make that worship, which in it self considered, is *lawfull* and pious, to become *impious*, *superstitious* and *unlawfull*: But I assume; all, or most of these are done by our *Altar-worshippers*, Ergo, it's unlawful, &c. These he denies to be done by them in *words*; but it will be proved in *deeds*, in particulars.

1. They do confine *Christ* (God-man) to that place, not only, but more, then to any place of the Church, the *Font* or *Pulpit*; and that when there is no *Sacrament* administred, and give this for the *reason* of their *Adoration* towards their *Altar*, rather

rather than towards any other place, at their *ingress* or *egress*, or passing through the Church. Hence they call the Altar, [*the Seat of the body and blood of Christ*] as our Doctor cites the words from *Optatus* and *Chrysost.* below. Others call it *Solum Christi*, the *Throne* of Christ, and *Seat of Glory*; and speak of his *daily Oblation* and *Presence* there, as to make it more *holy*, so to oblige their worship *that way*. It's true indeed, Gods *Omnipresence* or *essential Presence* cannot be confined to any one place; but he may *exhibit* his *Presence* more in one place than another, as of old he did, in the *Bush*, in the *Cloud*, on the *Arke*, *visibly* and *Symbolically*; and now does *spiritually* in the midst of his people assembled: But what *Presence* of Christ is that which they feign on the Table? His *Corporal Presence* is in Heaven; *visible* or *Symbolicall Presence* he exhibits not, unless when the *Consecrated Elements* are upon the Table; which is not always, (unless they have a *Sacrament* (as Papists their *Masse*) every day, or some of the *Consecrated Elements* be reserved or kept upon the Table, which yet our *Altar-worshippers* have not done.) His *spiritual Presence* is equally at the Pulpit or Font, when those *Ordinances* are in hand: and so the *Adoration* may be as lawfull and pious towards those places, as towards the Altar: But what is this to prove *that best*, which is tendred towards the Altar? or when there is no *Sacrament*, &c.

2. They do, at least by *Consequence*, affix Gods *special gifts* and *Benefits*, upon the Altar, though not only, yet more *specially*, than to the Pulpit or Font, because they place Christ's *Presence* more there, than at other places, and so expect more acceptance of their worship tendred *that way*, than any other way (we shall hear anon of *Miracles*, wrought by prayers made at the Altar.)

The Doctor sayes here, [*We lay our Vowes and Prayers upon the Altar.*] Which is scarce *Orthodox*: For sure Christ is the Altar of our Prayers, and not the Table, and by him, as our *High Priest*, we offer up our *selves* and *Services* to God the Father. It may easily be believed, that *Papists* do expect more acceptance of their Prayers made at or before the Altar, and consequently more *Grace* and *Benefit* to themselves, than if made in any other place: And may not the same be suspected of our

Altar-worshippers ? Why else do they pray when they come into a Church, privately ? and why rather towards the *Altar*, than the Pulpit ? They will tell us anon.

3. Though he sayes, they do only worship God *before* or *towards* the Altar, yet it is much to be feared, that some part of their worship *sticks* to the Altar, *transiently* and *relatively* : Transiently, as making the Altar the Object of their worship, *mediately*, though not ultimately : *Relatively* as a *Motive* to excite their worship, for its *more holinesse*, than in any other part of the Church ; and for other Reasons, by him, and by and by to be given us, here he tels us : Sure we are, *Papists* are more than suspected, even charged to be *Idolatrous* by our Divines, for *bowing before* or *towards Images*, as ours, *before* or *towards* the Table.

4. The *Danger* is very great, of *Scandal* given, both to the ruder sort, and to wiser men, to censure them as Altar-worshippers, as well as *Papists* to be *Image-worshippers*, bowing before, or towards their *Idols* ; though they professe never so much against it. All that he sayes to excuse it, will not prevent it.

1. He would infer, [That then when men enter the Church, with heads uncovered, (as they ought) they may be censured, as *Stone-worshippers* : of which he spake before.]

And he was answered before, that, that *Reverence* was either to the people of God there present, or but a *Civill Reverence*, which we tender, when we enter into a friends House ; at most respecting *decency*, but not any part of worship to God, much lesse to the *Stones* or *Seats* of the Church : His Conceit, that men ought to do so, springs from a superstitious opinion of more *Holinesse* in that place, more *divine Presence*, &c. as hath been declared elsewhere, and may again ere long.

2. It's true, [That any (prescribed) mode of worship, though never so good (best I know none : Gods wayes of worship are all equally good) may be an Object of scorn, to ignorant and prophane Persons.]

The *Heathens* mocked at the Jews *Sabbaths*, & *Michal* at *David's Devotion*, but so dare not knowing and pious men, if the mode of worship be prescribed by God : Yet he knowes, the *Romish*

Mode

Mode of worship, and their *Gesticulations* in the Mass, are justly ridiculous and contemptible to pious men of the *Reformed Churches* (as that of *Baals Priests* was to *Elijah*) and so is all men-devise^d worship ; though he be pleased to *scesse* at such zeal, and wishall, to give a slur to *extemporary* private Prayer, made by the Spirit of God ; as in opposition to the *Liturgy* or publick composed Form of Prayer, a thing usual with all *Liturgical men* : For thus he sayes,

' Renouncing the Sacred Forms appointed by the Church, shall we presently pour out our Prayer, of our own head, from an unsound mind, and a tongue that utters any thing, that comes next to hand ?

I pray, who do so, more then (I say not such as he was) his vulgar people, when they come into a Church, whether in time of Divine Service, or at any time, when no body is there, get into a Seat, and patter out their private Prayers in a publick Place ? But he looks more at the *Mandates* of the Mother-Church, then at the *Commands* of God our Father. What does the command ? [Namely, *That divine Offices, be so much the more carefully and attentively performed, the more unworthily and hardly they are caused to suffer from others.*] This is true of all worship prescribed by God ; otherwise *Papists* may say as much for all those ridiculous *Gesticulations* in the Masse, spoken against by all truly pious men.

3. Says he, *That mode of divine Worship, which we invented not of our selves, but received it from our Ancestors, through all ages past, is not presently to be abandoned, because some Novellists think it stands too near to superstition or Idolatry, &c.* This is the same that was said in the last, and may be pleaded by *Papists*, as well as themselves. They have many *Modes* of worship, received from their *Ancestors*, through many generations (some, the same with ours) but not from the Scripture (the only *Rule* of Worship) nor from the prime *Antiquity*. He and they must now, that *Modes* of worship must neither be *invented* by our elves, nor *received* by *Tradition* from our *Fathers*, but must have the *stamp* of divine Authority, or must not be admitted by the people of God : But it is a great presumption for him to assert, and take for granted, that this *Altar-worship* is received,

C 2

through

He called
them Sacred
Stones, above.

through all generations past, as shall appear, to his 4th. Argument below : Let them tell us a reason, why men are bound to stand up more at *Gloria Patri*, &c. then at other parts of the *Psalms*, being divine Inspired Scripture, and perhaps nothing spoken in them of the *Trinity* ? Or why must not men rise up from their knees at Prayer, When the *Doxology* (which is the same) is pronounced at the end of a Ministers Prayer ? [To whom (*Jesus Christ*) with the *Father* and the *Blessed Spirit*, be all honour and Glory, &c.] And what Scripture taught them to bow more at the Name *Jesus*, then that of *God*, *Emmanuel*, *Christ*, *Lord* ? when as there is more danger of *Idolatry* in that Name, because there were more that were called by that name, *Joshua*, and *Jesus* called *Justus*, and one *Bar-Jesus* ; on purpose, one would think, permitted to obviate and prevent, a latter *Superstition*, if not *Idolatry*, to a Name ; (as now to a Table) I myself have observed one of their devout *Cringers*, to bow at the Name, not onely when meant of *Joshua*, and *Jesus Justus*, but when read and spoken of *Bar-Jesus*, a *Scorcerer* : But enough of that.

4. He desires his Adversaries to exercise their *Charity* in doing two things.

1. To tell the people, that they worship *God*, and not the *Altar*, nor *God*, with, by, through, under, above the *Altar*, but only before, or towards the *Altar*. But this we cannot well do, till we be better satisfied : For though they do not directly or ultimately worship the *Altar*, yet they do worship *God*, not only before or towards the *Altar* of their own devising, but through and by the *Altar*, as much as *Papists* do, by and through an *Image* ; they make it a mediate *Object*, and a *Relative Motive* of their worship, and so a devised *Medium* of Worship ; contrary to the second Commandment. We cannot see, how they can acquit themselves of *Altar-Worship*, but they must also acquit *Papists* from *Image-worship*.

2. The second Request is therefore also vain : That we would caution the people, that when they worship *God* towards the *Altar*, they be very careful, that neither purposely, nor unwarily, the least way, or stricture of their worship, be transferred to the *Altar*, but give it all and wholly to *God* : Which is as vain and idle, as to tell

tell *simple Papists*, they must take heed, that they give not the least *Glimpse* of worship to the *Bread* and *Wine* in the *Masi*, or to the *Image*, when they worship *God* or *Christ* before it : which is impossible for them to separate. Were it not better, therefore, to remove such *stumbling Blocks* out of the way, that may be very probable occasions of *Idolatry* ? and to tell the People, that there is no more *Holiness* in the *Altar*, than in the *Pulpit* or *Font*, or any other place of the Church, and that they may lawfully worship *God* any ways, one as well as another. For to put any *Religious Respects* upon the *Altar*, more than upon other places (as these men do and teach) is the next way to make them superstitious, if not *Idolatrours*, as will appear, in answering his Second Argument, to which I come.

Arg. 2. That worship, which is lawful and pious, if done in the House of *God*, is such if it be done towards the *Altar* : But Adoration in the House of *God*, is lawful and pious. Ergo.

The same general Answer may serve here as to the former : Consider the *Worship* simply in it self, and the *Altar* simply as a place or part of the Church, and it is as lawful and pious to worship *God* towards it, as towards the *Font* or *Pulpit*, and so the whole Argument is granted : But should he not have concluded the question ; Therefore it is best to worship *God* towards the *Altar*. Would that be concluded upon these Premises ? Let both *Universities* judge. Must he needs fly out with scorn and Calumnies upon all occasions, to call his supposed Adversaries, *Novelists*, and *Novarorum novissimos*, meditating nothing but new things, &c. and prove his *Minor*, which no body denies ? No, nor his *Major*, as it lies ; but he fetches a Compass to confirm it, and yet confirms it not at all, as shall appear : Hear how he goes about it, by premising (as granted) some more Propositions, some whereof, are nothing to the purpose, and some are plainly false : As,

1. Adoration being a corporal Act, must necessarily be done towards some part of the Church, East or West, North or South, &c. And what then ? Ergo, its best towards the *Altar* : What a Loose Broom is this ? not fit to sweep the *Altar*-place in the Chancel : Would not this Conclusion better follow ? Ergo, Seeing *God* hath left it free to bow towards any place, its as lawful and pious,

pious, if done towards the Font or Pulpit, as towards the Altar. See the next.

2. *It's a manifest violation of the Apostles Precept, Let all things be done decently and in order, if it be left free for every man to determine his worship, which way he pleases, to the Bell-free, Font, Pulpit, &c. But this is a manifest violation of not only our Christian Liberty, Christ having left it free, and no where determined it, but also of the Apostles meaning: For there is neither indecency nor disorder in using our allowed Liberty; Nay, this were rather Disorder, if men should take upon them to determine people this or that way, when Christ hath left them free; and the greatest causes of our disunion and divisions, have arisen from the determination of Indifferent things in the Service of God: There are several Ordinances of God performed in the House of God in several places; as Baptism at the Font, Preaching in the Pulpit: Now what an Indecency and Disorder would this be in the Church, if our posture of worship were determined all one way, suppose towards the Altar, must not many turn their backs upon the Ordinance in Being? which how decent and orderly it is, let these orderly men judge: It seems, in nature and reason (seeing the Minister in every Ordinance dispensed, is the Steward of Christ) sitting, that the eyes of all the people should be towards him, as well at the Font or Pulpit, as at the Table: which concludes the contrary rather; that it's not decent nor orderly to determine our posture one way, but to vary with the Ordinance. But see the Gangreen like nature of Superstition: not only to make things allowed by God, to be indecent and disorderly, but also to make things necessary, which God hath left indifferent and free: For this is the intention of this Disputant.*

What ever is best, most decent and orderly in the Service of God, is necessary, and ought to be done. But so he makes his Adoration towards the Altar, when he pleads for it as best: as by and by.

3. *The Fathers of the Primitive Church (to whom God gave the Spirit of prudence and wisdom) did well and with good advice, decide this Controversie, before it was risen, determining their worship towards one and the same place, viz. the Altar*

But 1. Who were those Fathers of the Primitive Church? If the

the Apostles, they never determined the place, or let us see where. If the Fathers an Age or two after, they were not primo-primitive, nor yet infallible, but erred in many other things as well as in this, if so they did determine.

2. But the Truth is, there is no such Determination to be found, of the Fathers of the purest Primitive Church, nor in some Ages after: And whenever it was done, it was a wrong to Christian Liberty, and proved a Spring of many Superstitions. Of this, more in his 4th. Argument.

4. And now the Design comes to be discovered, by his giving the Reasons of this Custom of Bowing towards the Altar, so long continued, and that was (as he sayes) [*Because the Altar is the best, chiefest, & most holy part of the whole Ecclesiastical Household-stuffe.*]

And this is first confirmed, by the Titles given to it, by the Ancients, Greek and Latine; the Holy Altar, the holy Table, the Divine, Reverend Altar. And by their comparing of it with, and preferring it above the Jewish Sanctum Sanctorum, their Rayling of it in, from the Laity, &c. And the reason of that Excellency and Holinesse in it, was from the almost daily Oblation and presence of the Lords Body and Blood; that it was the Seat and Throne of Christ, &c.

To which, I have this to say in general, with our best and most Orthodox Protestant Divines, That the Mystery of Iniquity, towards the introducing of that abominable Sacrifice of the Masse, began to work betimes, and those Fathers unawares, laid the Foundation of it: They prepared first the Altar, and talked of a Sacrifice, but both in a Figure. But the Pope hath found out both a Literal Altar and Sacrifice; and so have some of ours with a little difference, as was said above. Both of them have a Sacrifice to their Altar, both an unbloody Sacrifice, both a propitiatory Sacrifice for sins; only Papists have the Bread and Wine transubstantiated into their God; and ours yet acknowledge them to be but Bread and Wine: They have their Sacrifice or God alwayes upon the Table, these only during the Sacrament, but both continually and alike, bow towards the Altar, and which are the worser Idolaters, is not easie to determine. But in Particular,

1. Is it not *Jewish*, to revive *degrees of Holiness, Goodness, Betterness* in the Churches of the Gospel? Who gave the *Church* such power to *consecrate* places, and make *degrees of Holiness* in those places? And thereby to make *Divisions*, not only among *Christians*, but also between the *Parts of the Church*, which shall be *greatest, chiefest, most holy*? As between the *Pulpit, Font, and Altar*? Who dare say and prove it from Scripture-reason, any is *better*, or any *lesse good* or holy than another? If any thing make any more holy, it must be the *holy Ordinance* in being, and so they take their turns: The *Table*, when that Sacrament is administered: the *Pulpit*, at Preaching: The *Font* at Baptisme. Which is *ridiculous* to imagine, much more to affirm; and would not further his *Designe* of bowing towards the Altar, when no Sacrament is there administered. For if the *Table* be the most *Holy place*, it must be only with respect to the *Holy and Consecrated Elements*, whilst they are upon it; and what's that to countenance *Bowing*, when they are gone? Yea, if the *Table* be made *holy* by them, they themselves must needs be *more holy*. Now suppose some *Consecrated Bread* and *Wine* be left after the *Communion*, what shall be done with them? Either *burnt*, as the Relicks of the *Paschal Lamb*, or *reserved* still on the *Table* (as the *Papists* God) to give the better Countenance and Grace to their *continual Adoration*, towards the Altar, and then, why doth their *Mother* the Church of England suffer the *Remainders* to be eaten and drunk by the Minister and others, and not rather *reserve* them, either for the sick, or till next Sacrament? by which time, if it be not daily, they will be *mouldy and sour*, unfit for use. Somewhat would be better advised in this case.

If it were not *odious* to make comparisons in such things (and so to raise differences and divisions as afore) between such sweetly agreeing friends, the *Table* is the least to be respected of all the three. The *Pulpit* is the place where the *Word of Life* is dispensed, to the Conversion of Souls. The *Font* (they say, as the Doctor below) is the place of *Regeneration*, or first giving of spiritual life, at least to all *Infants*. The *Table* is not an *Instrument* ordinarily, of either of these *Benefits*, but only to confirm, as Food, what was formerly wrought by the *Word* and *Baptisme*. Look then, how much *Conversion* and *Regeneration*, are better than

then meer *Preservation* of life, so much is the *Pulpit* and *Font* better than the *Table*: But these Comparisons are, I say, *odious*, and good for nothing but to *distract* the Church and People of God, with *superstitious* Imaginations of men. It's a *sad thing*, and much to be lamented, that the *Sacrament* of the Lords Supper, which is the *Symbole* of our Church-*Communion*, and nearest *Union*, should by the *perverseness* of some Spirits, on both sides, be made a ground of the greatest Divisions and Disunion; as of late years it hath been.

3. But hear his reason for the *betterness* and *most holiness* in that place or part of the Church, the Altar: [It is taken chiefly at least, from the almost daily Oblation of the Lords Body and Blood, and presence on or at the Altar.] How fully first, he speaks the *Language of Rome*, were it not for that word (*ferè, almost*.) They have the *Mass* daily, ours as yet, scarce *weekly* or *monthly*, or quarterly, thrice a year only was exacted of Communicants. A *Sacrament every day*, would come nearer Rome, than yet we are. But herein they pretty well agree: [an Oblation of the Lords Body and Blood] often, if not daily: What means he by his *Oblation*? an Offering or *Sacrifice* of the *Body and Blood* of the Lord? What differs that from the *Sacrifice* of the *Mass*, daily offered by a Priest? Is the *Bread* and *Wine* really the *Body and Blood* of Christ: If so, it's the same with the *Mass*; if not, but *sacramentally* or figuratively, as a *Table* will serve for that, better than an *Altar*; so it is not an *Oblation* or *Sacrifice*, nor as some speak or lipse, a *commemorative Sacrifice*, but a *Commemoration* of a *Sacrifice*, long since offered up by *Jesus Christ* himself, once for all, as the *Apostle* sayes: But with us, this is not done yet daily. And granting Christ to be *spiritually* there, it is but during the time of the *Sacrament*, and with respect to the *Consecrated Elements*, which conduces nothing to make the *Table* more *holy* after the Administration is over: and so nothing for bowing that way at other times, more than towards the *Font* or *Pulpit*, where Christ is as *spiritually* present, at the dispensation of those Ordinances, the *Word* and *Baptism*, as at the *Table*: But of Christ's presence, enough was spoken before.

4. He is yet so bold, as to make comparisons between the *Table* on the one side, and the *Pulpit* and *Font* on the other, thus: [The

The Ancients give no such *Excommunications* or high Titles to the Pulpit or Font; yea by no reason can such be given to them. I remember not any man that hath shewed himself so mad, who, if the Question be of the holiness (of those parts) will dare to compare them together. But I pray Sir, consider, whether this be not *insanire cum ratione*, to commit or set these parts together by the ears, as was said above, when they are all equally made holy, not only by the present Ordinances, but by the Bishops Consecration. I once saw a Church consecrated, but with no solemn Rite more at the Table, then at the other places. But leaving that, if all the Ordinances exhibited on those divers places, intend the same thing, viz. to set forth Jesus Christ and him crucified; What reason can any (but a mad man) give of greater holiness in one then in the other? Is there not an Oblation at least a Commemoration of Christs death and Blood-shed at the Font in Baptism? Is not Christ set forth as crucified, in the Pulpit, or preaching of the Gospel, Gal. 3. 2. as well as at the Supper? Nay, does not the Word and Prayer make and consecrate the Sacrament? *Quod esset tale, magis est tale*. If Comparisons here were fit and decent: Yet hear his distracted Reasons, of this vast difference.

1. The Sermon thence uttered, is not the word of God. Indeed such the Sermon may be, that it is not the word of God, but of a vain man, that preaches himself, &c. But sure, if a Minister preach (as he ought) Jesus Christ, and him crucified, that Sermon is the word of God; and so the Thessalonians took it, when preached by Paul; not as the word of man, but, as it is indeed, the word of God. The Object of Faith is the whole word of God, especially the Gospel; and Faith comes by hearing ordinarily of the word preached, Rom. 10. And is not the Sermon then the word of God? How contemptibly do these kind of men speak of Preaching? All their Religion and Worship consists in Praying, and that in a Set Form of the Liturgy.

2. But suppose it be (not granting it) yet the Spirit of God is not believed, to be so nearly united to the word divine, as the Son of God, with the Sacrament of the Altar. Had he said, the Sacrifice of the Altar, it had been pure Roman; the Union being so near, that the Elements are turn'd into the very Body and Blood of Christ. But if it be but a Sacrament, the Union of the Son,

of

of God with the Bread and Wine, is the very same, with the Union of the Spirit with the Word, viz. spiritual. But if the Pulpit may not compare with the Altar for Holiness, yet, it's hoped the Font may, where as great and more generally greater Benefits are imparted to the Receivers of Baptism. Let himself speak then, All Infants and men of years baptized, that do not put an Impediment, 1. Receive Remission of sins. 2. Are made the Children of God. 3. And also heirs of Heaven. Ample Privileges indeed, and such as confer Honour and Holiness to the Font, &c. Ample Privileges indeed, if all this were true, and made good to all that are baptized, Infants and Adult. But if it be so, how comes it to passe, that so many Apostate and lose those Privileges? May a Child of God become the Child of the Devil? An Heir of Heaven come to be disinherited? A poor Comfort to Parents and Children from their Baptism: And do sins pardoned come to be called to account again? These Doctrines are too like the Romish. But suppose (not granting) it to be so, as he says, these Privileges are both greater, and more generally granted to all baptized Infants, then many receive from the Lords Supper; few are thereby converted, or receive Remission of sinnes, or made Children of God, &c. Yea, many eat and drink their own Damnation. But all Infants baptized, are (with them) certainly regenerated, and enjoy all those Privileges; and if they die in Infancy, are as certainly saved: So the Font seems to have the most ample Privileges, to invest in with more honour and holiness, and to challenge the first place in their Adoration, among all the Church-Vessels. And yet, the poor Font (as he confesses) was made to stand without doors, for many years, and afterwards, got but a little within doors; whereas the Altar was advanced into the supreme part of the Church, close to the upper East-wall of the Chancel, the *Sanctum Sanctorum* (as they call it) lest any body should (as some ridiculously speak) sit above God Almighty. But what singular Privilege, and more Divine, hath the Altar, above the other parts? O much, and more divine without compare! (For, in it, is celebrated that tremendous Sacrifice, which our Lord instituted to the Commemoration, to the representation, to the application, to the exhibition of that most perfect Sacrifice, once offered and

finished on the Altar of the Cross. Stay there a little ; this is super-eminent.

1. Did Christ, I pray, institute a *sacrifice* on the Table, or but a *Sacrament*, or the *commemoration* of that Sacrifice on the Cross? Ask St. Chrysost.

2. Was that *sacrifice* but once to be offered and finished on the Cross, and did Christ institute another *sacrifice* to be offered upon the Table daily, say the Papists, frequently, say ours?

3. Does *superstition* (as one said of much *Learning*) make men mad, or to speak nonsense? what sense is there in those words; *Our Lord instituted a sacrifice, to be a Commemoration, &c. of a sacrifice?*

4. That *sacrifice* indeed upon the Cross, was a tremendous sacrifice of the Son of God, but the *sacrifice*, or rather the *sacrament* which he instituted, for his people, is most comfortable ; being (as he saies more truly) a *sacrament*, or rather an heavenly Banquet or Feast, above all the Dainties of the world ; where we eat the bread of life, and drink the cup of eternal salvation and blessedness, yea the very body of our Lord, and his most precious blood. How all this ? not corporally, but spiritually in a mystery : And who do so ? Not all that eat and drink the outward Elements ; but all Infants baptized at least, are regenerated at the Font, and therefore, if these comparisons were not odious, the Font might contend with the Altar, for Honour and Holiness : But enough is said, to shew the vanity of these Novellists, for so they are, not only compared with *Scripture* and *pure primitive practice*, but also with *Englands Reformation* ; when Altars suffered not the last, nor least reformation, but were at first pull'd down by Authority, and Tables set up in their stead, not in their place but in the midst of the Chancel : But this is now judged a deformation, and they laboured to be removed to their old place. This is his Second Argument.

Arg. 3. Adoration towards the East, is a lawful and pious Worship. Ergo, so is Adoration towards the Altar :

The Antecedent is proved from the perpetual practice and custom of the Catholick Church. The Consequence, by Analogy, &c.

I might dismiss this Argument as the former, as wholly granted, and not concluding the Question, That Adoration is best made towards the Altar. Let me argue in like manner ; Adoration

Adoration towards the West or South, &c. is a pious and lawful worship. Ergo, so is Adoration towards the Altar. What's the Conclusion of this, but Adoration is lawfully made to God, towards any part of the Heavens or of the Church? But if Adoration towards the East, be intended to be better and more pious, then towards any other part of the Heavens, for any Religious Reasons devised by men, I would venture to deny both the Antecedent and the Consequence. First, the Antecedent and the proof thereof ; because Adoration towards the East is not better, nor more pious then towards the West ; yea not so good ; when God directed his people to bow Westward, which Direction being out of date, and no other determined by God in the Christian Church, both are equally pious and lawful : Besides, it is not nor can be proved, that this was the perpetual practice of the Catholick Church, taking in the Apostles, and the first Christians : Whenever it began, it's probable it was done in opposition to the Jews, to be as contrary to them, as might be, and in compliance with the Gentiles (as he speaks below) to draw them to Christian Religion, as they did in some Festivals, and other things : For though Nature might teach them to bow or prostrate themselves before their Idol gods, yet I would ask, what light of nature could teach Gentiles, to build their Temples Eastward, and to fix their Altars that way, rather then toward the West ? unless, because its likely, the first Idolaters did worship the Rising-sun ; and for this Reason, it may be, God directed his Temple, Altar, and his Sanctum Sanctorum, to be placed Westward, in opposition to the Gentiles herein, as in many other things he did. Add to this, that the Eldest Sons of the Church, the Apostles, and their immediate Successors, having no Churches, and living in Persecution, were not scrupulous which way they adored God : They were their Grand or great Grand-Children, that troubled themselves, (in the peace of the Church) with such Punctillios of Worship, in their situation of Churches, Altars, Bowings this or that way. But the Consequence likewise is not good, granting the Antecedent. Adoration towards the East, was lawful and pious, Ergo, so is Adoration towards the Altar. I mean, considered not simply in it self, but with those Religious Reasons, given in his second Argument, which they that bowed towards the East, knew not of.

of. The proofs of his Consequence are insufficient. *The greater Altars were anciently erected and placed in the Eastern part of the Church, so that he that bowed towards the East, at the same time bowed towards the Altar.* I might take him off thus; that it was some Centuries of years, before the Christians had any Churches or Altars; the Gentiles objected this to them at least, that they had no Altars, though they had Meeting-places. But I answer, 1. The reason it seems, of their bowing towards the Table at first, was not any Religious Respect to it, but from the custom taken up, of bowing towards the East, as the Jews were said to bow before the Altar, because it was so placed, that when they bowed towards the Mercy-seat, they could not, but also bow towards the Altar: or as the Gentiles bowed towards their Altar, not perhaps with any respect to it, but because they worshipped their Gods, that were placed beyond them, or above them. 2. I said before, and say again, the Christians did not well, to worship towards the East, or to build their Churches as the Gentiles did, to call their Tables Altars, and the Sacrament a Sacrifice; by the one scandalizing the Gentiles, and nourishing them in their Idolatry, by the other, teaching Antichrist the way, to bring in their abominable Mass: Nay they did ill, to take a pattern of the Mode of their Worship, either from the Gentiles or the Jews; which must have its direction only from the New Testament; the Worship now being more spiritual, and less carnal or external. 3. As for the Jews, if they did bow with Religious Respects towards the Altar, or towards the Temple, these were both media Cultus, means of Worship, of Gods Institution, and had a promise of acceptance, which if he can prove to be found in our Churches or Table, he may the sooner persuade us to direct our posture of Worship that way, but not till then: Nay, not then; without better reason: For we know, that the Bread and Wine in the Sacrament, are both instituted and consecrated by Christ himself, and yet after their use, if any be left, no man yet was so mad, as to bow towards them, nor will I think, till they be placed on the Table transubstantiated into the Body and Blood of Christ; yet they certainly had more Holiness in them, and more divine Presence with them, than the Table. What he produces out of some forged Rubricks, for bowing towards the Altar, is posthumous

posthumous, 2 or 3 hundred years, to Primitive Practice, and of no Antiquity or Authority with Learned, Orthodox men: Of which, more in his Last Argument: Enough hath been said to the Third.

Arg. 4. This, though the last in Order and Number, yet he accounts the first and chiefest in weight and vertue; taken from the practice of the Fathers, &c. For thus he argues; *That which was the Custom of the holy Fathers, in the Primitive Church, that which they faithfully delivered to their posterity, that which through all generations hath continued to our times, that without doubt, in divine Services, is lawful and pious: But such is Adoration towards the Altar, Ergo.*

Behold, as the old Saying is, the Mountain was with child, and brought forth a Mouse; we have now four Arguments labouring to bring forth this Conclusion, *That it is not only lawful, but the best way to worship God towards the Altar, not only in time of Divine Service, but as oft as we go in and out the Church:* And the result is no more but this, that it is lawful and pious, to adore towards the Altar, in time of Divine Service, when the Sacrament is administered, or as lawful to bow that way, as towards any other part of the Church. Is this worth the Acclamation of the University, as a peice of rare Learning? Is this worth the admiration of Romish Priests and Jesuits? If so, I shall only say, as was said of old Rome.

Hec quam perfatua, sunt tibi, Roma, toge!

One Argument from God our Father, I mean, from the Spirit-inspired Scriptures of the New Testament; though but by a remoter consequence, had been of more worth and strength, than all his four Arguments, taken from the Customs of some Fathers, and they but Children compared with the Apostles, the first Fathers of the Christian Church. It cannot but seem strange to all wise and truly pious men, that a matter of so much Religion, so much Piety and Devotion, as our Altar-Cringers place in building and consecrating Churches, placing and adorning of Altars, and bowings towards them, should not be thought on, or a word

word spoken of it, in all the New Testament, by Christ or his Apostles: But we must be sent to the *Practice* of some Fathers, and the *Customs* especially of the *Romish Church*, for many generations, in her *Antichristianism*. But not to slight the Doctors Learning too much, something also shall be said in particular to this Argument.

And first, to the *Major*, (which he accounted a piece of *insolent madness* to deny) it may be questioned in all the parts, with respect to the true state of the Question.

For, 1. It is known well enough, that the Fathers erred in other things as well as in this; as in the Custom of giving the *Supper* to Infants, for 600 years successively, says Dr. Morion, is that therefore *Lawful* and *Pious*?

2. Does not the Church of *Rome* plead for many of her Superstitious Practices, *Tradition* from the Fathers?

3. *Even to this day*, as for their *Altars*, *Sacrifice* of the Mals, and the rest, are they either more *Lawful* or more *Pious* for that?

But his *Minor* is more reasonably to be denied, still I say, with respect to the state of the Question. For,

1. Those holy Fathers that assert this practice of bowing towards the *Altar*, either are not of the *primo-primitive Church*, or only testify to the practice, but say nothing of the *Lawfulness* of it, or at least, say nothing of the *Betterness* (and so of the necessity of it) which was the Question.

2. Or if they did, they speak only of the time of *divine Offices* performed; not a word of bowing towards the *Altar*, at other times, which now is so pleaded for.

3. Nor hath this practice been *legally* perpetuated to our days; but as *Altars* were cast out of their places, at the *Reformation* of Religion, so the *Bowing* that way was forbidden, or at least antiquated in most purest Churches, only kept up, in compliance with *Rome*; by some *Bishops*, to reduce us in time (as the design now appears) to the *Romish Religion*. The former is manifest by our own *Liturgy*, wherein, there is no mention of *Altars*, or *Bowing* towards them. His *Evasion* is *frigid* and *vain*; They esteemed it *superstitious*, to command that *Rite* in those days most usual, and known

known to all. A *Likely Tale*! that they that commanded *Altars* themselves to be pulled down and cast out of the Church, would allow or practise *Bowing* toward them that were not: It was indeed kept up (as *Altars* were) in some *Chappels* of the *Universities*; and most *Cathedrals*, but by such as were noted to be *superstitious* men, and too much inclined toward *Rome*. His Instance of *Gorgonia*, *Greg. Nazianz.* Sister, carries the Letters of its own confutation: For as she was a *private Person*, and went to pray at the *Altar*, (which is nothing to their bowing, when they pray not) So its said, she laid her *Head* to the *Altar*, which was not lawful for a *Lay Person*, a *Woman* to do, who was not allowed to come within the *Railles* or *Chancel*: Or if she was permitted so to do, it was a piece of *Superstition*, to imagine, God to be more present there, and their Prayers to be better accepted there, than in another place of the Church; even to the working of a *miraculous Cure*; which yet the Doctor commends *appious* and *imitable* to all pious men: The like may be said of *Alexander, B. of Constantin.* in most of the Particulars afore. But of both, it may be said, these Instances are too young. by some hundreds of yeares, to plead the *Primitive Antiquity*. *Greg. Nissen*, *Damasen*, and *Chrysostom*, and *Basil* were much about the same age; and so was *Ambrose* and *Hierome*: *Justin Martyr* is the most ancient of those alledged, but speaks nothing to the point in hand: Of bowing towards the *Altar*, when no *divine Service* was in Act. But how they used *standing* at Prayer, on all *Lords days*, betwixt *Easter* and *Whitsontide*; though he say also, *Sometimes we fall down and prostrate our selves on the earth*; not with any respect to the *Altar*, as more holy, or as the place of more special *divine Presence*, as now is pleaded, but for other Reasons, viz.

That we may acknowledge our *sins*, with Father Abraham to be *dust and ashes*, men as it were dead, and fallen to the earth, where on we stand; unworthy, in the House of God to appear standing, to deserve to be cast presently into Hell, for our sins, if God were not above measure mercifull. *Tertullian* among the *Latines*, will do him as little Service, but prejudice rather: He says, The penitents were wont to fall down to the *Presbyters*, and to kneel to, or at the *Altars*

tars of God. He knows the words are otherwise read by very *Learned Critics*; not *Aris*, but *Charis D i*: which may be meant of the People (*belov'd of God*) whom they supplicated for pardon. His Evaluation is, *That the penitents at first were excluded from the Church and Soci ty of the Faithful, but when they had performed their penance, they might be admitted also to kneel at the Altar.* And yet elsewhere, he makes it unlawful for any but the *Priest*, to come within the *Railles*: How do these things agree? *Tertullians* other places speake of *Modesty and humility in adoration in time of Prayer, and of volutation and Fasting in the Church of God.* But nothing at all of the *Altar*; or if that was usual, yet not for his *Reason*: of more *Holiness*, &c. The same may be said of *Salvianns* his Speech: *We run to the House of God, cast our bodies on the ground, and Tears mingled with joy, make Supplications*; not a word of bowing towards the *Altar*; much less, as oft as they went in, and out of the Church, when no *Divine Service* was in being.

To draw now to a Conclusion: This *Consequence* is very inconsequent: *The Fathers of the second Primitive Church, did lawfully in the Service of God, bow towards the Altar*: Ergo, it is *lawful and pious to do so now*; yea, best, even at any time when we go in and out the Church.

For,

1. They did it in time of *Publick Worship* only.
2. If they privately and singly prayed there, it was in *worship* still: Ours bow, when they pray not.
3. They did it not with *Religious Respects* to the *Altar*, as ours do, or if they did, they were *superstitious*, as ours are.
4. There was not the same *Offence and Scandal* given and taken, as now there is, seeing it is the *Practice of Papists*, and hath brought in the *Sacrifice of the Mass, & Idolatrous bowings* thereunto; and if not checked, will bring it again into the Church of *England*; which the Lord prevent,

If any desire further satisfaction in this Controversie, he may please to consult that Tract above-mentioned, called *Superstitio Superstiter*, Published 20 yeares since, or Mr. *Zech. Croftons Altar-Worship*, Lately come forth,

FINIS.