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Reader,

Although the Doctor's Determination, as to the Substance of it, was answered above Twenty years since, in a Tract, 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 confuted, none ever since, having appeared to give it a Reply (though many have Stumbled at it, but durst not fasten) and though now this last Year, that Determination hath been Reprinted, in Latin, by R. W. and turned into English, and published by I. D. ye Because nothing was replied to that Tract, and upon Review of the Determination, finding it so weak and loose in way of Argumentation, I thought it not worth any further Consideration, having contended 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 Controversy.) But on the other side, when I heard, that an Acute and Learned Divine had written a little Tract, in opposition to the Doctor, &c. clartie's, called Altar-Worship, &c. directed chiefly against him (though taking others also into Consideration) I expected, that he would have, with Mirth, answered the Doctor's Determination; which, upon sight thereof, I percei...
Bowing towards the Altar, upon Religious
Reasons, impleaded, as grossly Supernatural, if not also Idolatrous.

After a Roman Preface of a Cross, and a Caricature 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 Ingress into, and Egress out of his House, and as often as we present our selves before it, to worship him with supplications, be lawfull and pious, laudable and conformable to the Precepts of the Ancient Church, and not at all liable to the present Calumnies of Novellists?

Hat reason he had then to start this Question, or any now to publish this his Determination, to full of weaknesses and imperfections, 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 Doctrines, or adulterating the Worship, is not to me imaginable: That Rome is Heretical in much of her Doctrines, and Idolatrous in much more of her Worship, is confessed by themselves, and palpable to all Reformed Churches. That Protestants in the leaf, should comply with her, hath no least appearance of evil, then for a man that would be reputed chaste, to be seen often to frequent the Stews, in pretense forsooth, to convert some of those Protestants. 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 ruining 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 Roman Mass into our Churches, what better Engine could they use, than this in hand; viz., to prepare the People for it, by calling the Table an Altar (which is a Relation to a Priest and a Sacrifice, as this Doctor confesses hereafter); then placing more Holiness on it, and after that, more Generation 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 Confessors be irrefragable to know the reason of this Adoration that way more then another? What can be pretended, at 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, there are not always upon the Table or Altar, and therefore when there is no Sacrament administered, there is yet an Appearance of Idolatry, in a representing a Table made of Wood, or an Altar of Stone: What remains to remove this Scruple, but only the Exaltion 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 Process.

I come now to examine the State of the Question, as 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 init, 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, firmly considered: For it's lawful to worship God towards any part of the Heavens, East, West, North, &c. Yet he lays the Question, as if some did deny this, and calls them Novelists, so doing, and conceals his designs of placing more Holiness and Divine Presence there, as the chief Motive 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 perform our Service, and perform divine Offices there, but in our Ingrefs and Egress, Entrance, or our going (or passing through the Church) it be lawful, pious, &c. For it seems very rational, and prudent, that the Table be so placed, as 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 advices and commands. The like may be said for the Scitation of the Papists, and our posture towards it, in time of Praying: 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 nor 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 persuaded to bow towards the Table, rather than towards any other part of the Church, or at all, when occasionally they come in, pass through, or go out of the Church, favours too much of Roman Superstition, and without strong Reasons of some special Privileges 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, (optime) 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 than 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 Postulates, as granted by all.

"That it is necessary, that some place designed by the Church, as Chappels, Temples, &c. must be designated to the Publick Worship of God, &c."

Where first, I lift not to ask what the Difference is, between a place Designed, and a Place designated by the Church? For I perceive by their Practice, and by that which follows, that he means, a Place must first be designed, that is, Consecrated, by a Bishop, and afterwards designated to Publick Worship. Where I observe, he secretly steals into a Church, an Holiness, more than in other places, by virtue of that Consecration, to lay a ground-work for his Rom.
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 add further, it is not absolutely necessary, that the place for Publick Worship, must be fixed (much less 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 Parnello'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, destined 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 there 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 says; "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 Redivivus, p. 31. To which I refer.

3. ["That this publick religious worship, is to be performed, with the Body, as well as the Soul, sincerely, visibly, exemplarily, submissively, 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 person..."
[7]

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

Are they so ignorant as not to know, that all the Antients, Fathers in the Eastern and Western Church, from Ignatius to Jerome, have often used that Word? Or so imprudent as to firm 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; as Papists, and some others of ours in latter times. The Papists have found out a proper, prophane, but unbloody Sacrifice, in the Mass, for which they have made a proper Altar. Some of ours speak near the same language. Our Doctor below, speaks of, 'An awfully and most venerable Sacrifice, which our Lord did instituted, celebrated on the Table, of which more in its place.

Another of his Symbils and Contemporaries speaks, what then he durft not.

[7]

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

What could a Papist say more or worse? The Fathers, as by a Sacrifice, they understand 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 it is that to be taken, [Heb. 13. 12. We have an Altar] or the Table allsufficive, with respect to that Sacrifice; of which more hereafter.

As Lord 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, than our late Doctors, who take the words literally and properly, which they intended figuratively.

The Doctor he concedes, *Altar*, *Priest*, *Sacrifice*, are indeed Related, and from one to another, the argument is valid; That is, a proper Sacrifice infers a proper Priest, and a proper Altar.
[8]

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

True, says he; but from those three, the Altar, Priest and Sacrifice, there is no flow of consecration to Transubstantiation. Take away Transubstantiation, (says the Reverend Father, 2of Wikes) and there will be no controversy betwixt us of a Sacrifice.

The Reverend Bishop, I suppose, meant by a Sacrifice as the Fathers did, remembrance of a Sacrifice, of a Sacrifice of praise, not a proper, propitiatory Sacrifice, as some now do: No, nor a Commemorative Sacrifice, as Bishop Land 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, it improperly and figuratively understand; yet if they be taken properly, Transubstantiation, is a very probable Consequence thereof; it may quickly follow upon those Expectations. Yes, 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: For a much, as with them, the Bread and Wine are now turned 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 expire; so remains then, but to clothe with Papists in their Mas, to have an ache by Sacrifice suitable to their Altar and Priest. 2. Adoration before, or towards the Altar, is liable easily to mis-constitution (as well as bowing toward, or before an Image). Some have suspected and cenured them: That they have tendered their Adoration to the very Altar of Wood or Stone, a manifest and outrageous slender. So the Heathens charged the Christians, as Sun-worshippers, because they worshipped God towards the East, &c. This supposition and Censure might very well arise upon several grounds.

1: Because some of them have been so bold, as to affront and detest Bowing to the Altar, which Papists seem to abhor.

2. But Bowing towards the Altar, or before it, rather then 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 util, 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 Holy 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 Host transubstantiated to be fixed on the Table, left men should otherwise be suspected to be Idolatrous, in worshipping the Table or Altar. Lastly, The charge lies still upon them, that do in truth 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, 1. 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 Caesars 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 Object and motive of their worship, as such an holy place, or preferential place, which are not found to be in it by any Institution of God, which renders their worship superfluous, 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 (as lay more) a 

Breath of Order to render 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 scenes, 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 superstition, 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 helpful to their Devotion, to shut their eyes in time of prayer; though the Doctor scoffs at such devotion, [as a new device, unknown to the Antients] and thinks that he hath better arguments for Bowing towards the Altar, which strength shall presently be tried.

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

1. Of the understanding, the knowledge of the greatest divine Excellency.

2. Of the Will, which is a free Submission of itself, 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. Bending of the knees.
4. Prostration on the ground.

He might perhaps have instance in more postures of external worship. David fell before the Lord, and prayed; Christ himself fell or leant, and gave thanks. Eliphaz put his head or face between his knees: But these actions are either needlesse or useless (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 either, 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 first 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, of all, are now inferred, which were not in the first stating of it. Leave out but those words, and look on the Table, nearly as a place and part of the Church, and no man so much as doubts, but adoration of any kind or modis 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 Motions.

Arg. 1. That divine worship, which in itself 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., confirmed, Ergo.

What a Mighty and Daughtly Argument is this of so learned a Doctor?
Which is wholly granted, and proves no more but this, that it is lawful to worship God, in any way, 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 lawful 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 murther or humming, by the Epitoler and others? But was that the question controverted, whether Adoration towards the Altar, be as lawful and pious in itselfe 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 given 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 goodness.
3. We suppose our worship in any part, is bestowed upon that place, at least transiently or relatively, or some other way.
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 itself considered, is lawful and pious, to become impious, superstitious and unlawful: 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 administered, 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 Osiatus and Chrysost. below. Others call it Solium Christi, the Throne of Christ, and Seat of Glory; and speak of his daily Omission and Presence there, as to make it more holy, so to oblige their worship that way. It is true indeed, God's 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 Symbolically. 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, where 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 tendered towards the Altar? or when there is no Sacrament, &c.

2. They do, at least by Consequence, affix God's 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 tendered 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 easilly 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
After-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 they say, they do only worship God before or towards the Altar, yet is much to be feared, that some part of their worship flocks to the Altar, transtinctly and relatively: Transtinctly, as making the Altar the Object of their worship, mediately, though not immediately, as a Motive to excite their worship, for its more holiness, than in any other part of the Church, and for other Resons, by him, and by and by to be given us, here he tells us: Sure we are, Papists are more than suspected, even charged to be Idolaters 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 fort, and to wiser men, to confence them as Altar-worshippers, as well as Papists to be Image-worshippers, bowing before, or towards their Idols, though they profess never so much against it. All that he fayes to excite 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 confounded, as Stoneworshippers, of which he spake before.

And he was answerd before, that, that Reverence was either to the people of God there present, or to a Civil Reverence, which we tender, when we enter into a friends House; at most respecting deceney, but not any part of worship to God, much less to the Stones or Seats of the Church; His Conceit, that men ought to do so, springing from a superstitious opinion of more Holiness 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 (belit I know none: Gods ways of worship are equally good) may be an Object of scorn, to ignorant and prophan Prefons.

The Heathens mocked at the Jews Sabbath, & Michael at Davids Devotions, but so dare not knowing and pious men, if the mode of worship be prefixed by God: Yet he knowes, the Romans.

Mode of worship, and their Gificalations in the Mass, are justly ridiculous and contemptible to pious men of the Reformed Churches, (as that of Beals Priests was to Eliza) and so is all men-devise’d worship, though be pleased to feaste at such zeal, and withal, to give a flur to extemporary private Prayers, 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 fayes:

1. Renouncing the Sacred Forms appointed by the Church, shall we presently pour out our Prayer, of our own head, from an unfound mind, and a tongue that uttereth any things, that comes next to hand?

I pray, who do so, more then (I fy 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 Mandate of the Mother-Church, than 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 unworshipfully and hardly they are caus’d to suffer from others.) This is true of all worship prescribed by God; otherwise Papists may say as much for all those ridiculous Gificalations in the Mass, 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 standeth too near to Superstition or Idolatry, &c. This is the same that was said in the last, and may be pleased 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 selves, 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,
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 (Jesus Christus) with the Father and the Blasphemy Spirit, be all-honour and Glory, &c.) And what Scripture taught them to bow more at the Name Jesus, then that of God, Amen, Amen, Christ, Lord? when as there is more danger of Idolatry in that Name, because there were more that were called by that name, Jehovah, and Jesus called Jesus, 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 may myself have observed one of their devout Cringers, to bow at the Name, not only when meant of Jehovah, and Jesus Jesus, but when read and spoken of Bar-Jesus, a Sorcerer: 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, but God; yea, 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 do worship God, not only before or towards the Altar of their own deviling, but through and by the Altar, as much as Papists do, by and through an Image; they make it a Mediating Object and a Relative Motive of their worship, and so a deviled Medium of Worship, contrary to the Second Commandment. We cannot see, how they can acquit themselves of Altar-Worship, but they must also accuse 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 trifling 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 simple Papists, they must take heed, that they give not the least glimpse of worship to the Bread and Wine in the Mass, 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 Psalms or Text, 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 idolatrous, as will appear, in answering his Second Argument, to which I come.

Arg. 2. That worship, which is lawful and pious, is such as is be done towards the Altar: But Adoration in the House of God, is such, as is 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 itself, 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 to the whole Argument is granted: But should he not have concluded the question; Therefore it is left to worship God towards the Altar. Would that be concluded upon these Premises? Let both University judge. Muti he needs fly out with frowns and Calumnies upon all occasions, to call his supposed Adversaries, Novelties, and Novatorum novissimae, 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 Compars 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, End or Wilt, North or South, &c. And what then? Ergo, it is best towards the Altar: What a Loose Dream is this? not fit to sweep the Altar-place in the Chancel: Would not this Condition better follow? Ergo, Seeing God has left it free to bow towards any part, its as lawful and
2. It is a manifest violation of the Apostles Precepts. Let all things be done decently and in order. If it be left free for every man to determine his worship, which he please, to the Bible, 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 division and disorder, have arisen from the determination of Indifferent things in the Service of God: There are several Ordinances of God performed in the Houses 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 pollution of worship were determined all one way, supposing towards the altar, and not many turn their backs upon the Ordinance in Being; which how decent and orderly it is, let therejude men judge: it seems, in nature and reason (seeing the Minister in every Ordinance dispenses, is the steward of Christ) fitting, 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 not orderly to determine our pollution one way, but to vary with the Ordinance. But see the Gentiles the 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 Divinity.

What ever is left, 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 well: 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 Controversy, before it was risen, determining their worship towards one and the same place, viz. the altar.

Who were those Fathers of the Primitive Church? If the

And this is first confirmed, by the Title given to it, by the Ancients, Greek and Latin, the Holy Altar, the holy Table, the Divine, Revered Altar. And by their comparing of it with, and preferring it above the Jewish Sacrament Sanctorum, their Raying of it in, from the Loaves and Fish, &c. And the reason of that Excellency and Honor from it, was from the almost daily Oblation and Presence of the Lord’s Body and Blood, that it was the Seat and Throne of Christ, &c.

To which I have this to say in general, with our chief and most Orthodox Protestant Divines, That the Mystery of Iniquity, towards the introductions of that abominable SACRIFICE of the Maffe, began to work before, and those Fathers now aware, 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 to have some of ours with a little difference, as was said above. Both of them have a Sacrifice to the Altar, both an Ambulatory Sacrifice, both a proprietary Sacrifice for sins, only Papists have the Bread and Wine transfigured and in their God, and ours yet acknowledge them to be but Bread and Wine: They have their Sacrifice or God always upon the Table, the only during the Sacrament, but both continually and alike, bow towards the Altar, and which are the worser Idolaters, is not easier to determine. But in Particular,
1. Is it not

then meet 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 disturb 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 Lord’s Supper, which is the Symbol of our Church Communion, and near to Unction, should by the perseverence of some Spirits, on both sides, be made a ground of the greatest Divisions and Diisions; as of late years it hath been.

2. But hear his reason for the Pulpit and most holy in that place or part of the Church, the Altar: [It is taken chiefly at least, from the almost daily Oblation of the Lord’s Body and Blood, and presence on or at the Altar.] How fully first, he speaks the Language of Rome, were it not for the word ‘serm., 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 Lord’s 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; lo, it is not an Oblation or Sacrifice, nor some speak of it, a commemorative Sacrifice, but a Sacrifice of a Sacrifice, long since offered up by Jesus Christ himself, once for all, as the Apostle saith: 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 for 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 Ancients give no such Epitaphium or hasty Titles to the Pulpit or Font, yea by no reason can such be given to them. I remember not any man that hath formed himself so mad, who, if the Question be of the holiness (of these parts) will dare to compare them together.] But I pray Sir, consider, whether this be not in voce communione, 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 Bishop's Consecration. I once saw a Church consecrated, but with no solemn Rite more at the Table, then at 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 Christ's 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? And effectually, nay, even all take. If comparisons here were fit and decent: Yet hear his dilated Reasons, of this vast difference.

1. The Sermon then 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, 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 confids 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 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 farther, that the Elements are turned into the very Body and Blood of Christ. But if it be but a Sacrament, the Union of the Son, 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 Blessings 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 Adults. But if it be so, how comes it to pause, that so many Apostats 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 Remission. 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 Lord's Supper, few are thereby converted, or receive Remission of Sins, or become Children of God, &c. Yes, 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 it with more honour and holiness, and to challenge the first place in their Adoration, among all the Church-Ordinances. And yet, the poor Font (as he conceives) 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-well of the Chancel, the S. Dun Basilicon (as they call it) left any body should (as some ridiculedly speak) sit above God Almighty. But what singular Privileges, 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.
Adoration towards the Easf 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 Easf, be intended to be better and more pious, then towards any other part of the Heavens; for any Religious Reasone devide by men, I would ventures to deny both the Antecedent and the Consequent. First, the Antecedent and the proof thereof; because Adoration towards the Easf is not better, nor more pious then towards the West; yea nor for good; what God directed his people to bow Westward, which Durcation 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 Catholic 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? unleas, because it is, the fifty idolaters did worship the Rising Sun, and for this Reason, it may be, God directed his Temples, Altars, and his Sanctorum Sanctorum, to be placed Westward, in opposition to the Gentiles herein, as in many other things he did. Add to this, that the Elders of the Church, the Apostles, and their immediate Successors, having no Churches, and living in Persecution, were not capious which way they adored God: They were their Grand or great Grand-Children, that troubled themselves, (in the peace of the Church) with such Futility of Worship, in their situation of Churches, Altars, Bowings this or that way. But the Consequent 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 Church's acts of worship. The greater number of the Church's acts of worship, in fact, are performed in the Church's buildings, and these buildings are dedicated to the worship of God. The Church's buildings are also used for other purposes, such as education, social welfare, and community activities. The Church's acts of worship are performed in a variety of ways, including singing, praying, and reading. The Church's acts of worship are also performed in different languages, and the Church's buildings are often used to accommodate worshipers from different parts of the world. The Church's acts of worship are also performed in a variety of styles, from traditional to modern. The Church's acts of worship are also performed in a variety of times, from morning to evening. The Church's acts of worship are also performed in a variety of places, from churches to homes. The Church's acts of worship are also performed in a variety of languages, from English to Spanish. The Church's acts of worship are also performed in a variety of times, from morning to evening. The Church's acts of worship are also performed in a variety of places, from churches to homes. The Church's acts of worship are also performed in a variety of languages, from English to Spanish.
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word spoken of it, in all the New Testament, by Christ or his Apostle: But we must be lent to the Practice of some Fathers, and the Customs especially of the Romish Church, for many generations, in her Antichristianism. But not to light the Doctors learning too much, something also shall be laid 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 Council of giving the Supper to Infants, for 600 years successively, sayes Dr. Morton, is that therefore lawful and just?

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 Just for that?

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

1. These holy Fathers that affect this practice of bowing towards the Altar, either are not of the primitive Church, or only cellifie to the practice, but say nothing of the Lawfulness of it, or at least, lay nothing of the Bishops' authority 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 to be 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 pure 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 Literature, wherein there is no mention of Altars, or Bowing towards them. His Eusebius is frigid and vain; They esteemed it superfluous; to command that Rite in those days is most usual, and known to all.

A Likely Tale is, that they that commanded Altars themselves to be pulled down and cut out of the Church, would allow or prescribe Bowing towards them that were not: It was indeed kept up (as Altars were) in some Chapels of the Universities; and most Cathedrals, but by such as were noted to be Superstitious men, and too much inclined towards Rome. His Instance of Gorgias, Greg. Nazian. Siffer, carrieth the Letters of its own profession: For as the was a private Person, and went to pray at the Altar, (which is nothing to their bowing, when they stay not) So is said, the 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 Rails or Chapel: Or if she was permitted 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 commands unspeakable and imitable to all pious men: The like may be said of Alexander, B. of Constantin, in most of the Particulars afores. But of both, it may be said, these Instances are too young, by some hundreds of years; to plead the Primitive Antiquity. Greg. Nisius, Damasus, and Crys., and Bajul were much about the same age, and to was Ambrose and Hierons; Justin Martyr is the most ancient of those alleged, but speaks nothing to the point in hand: Of bowing towards the Altar, when no divine Services was in All. But how they used standing at Prayer, on all Lords days, Easter, and Whitsunday, though he say alio, 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 Reason, viz.

That we may acknowledge our Selves, with Father Abraham to be such, and after men as we were dead, and fallen to the earth, where we stand; unworthy, to the house of God to appear standing, to be forced to be cast precipitously into Hell, for our sins, if God were not above measure merciful. True Tertullian among the Latins, will do him as little Service, but prejudice rather: He says, the Penitents were wont to fall down to the Presbytery, and to kneel in, or at the Altars.
ters of God. He knows the words are otherwise read by very Learned Critics, not Acts, but Charis D i; which may be meant of the People (beloved of God) whom they supplicated for pardon. His Exposition is, that the prayers at first were excluded from the Church and Society 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 Rails: How do these things agree? Test in these other places speak of Majesty and humility in adoration in time of Prayer, and of volition and fasting in the Church of God. But nothing at all of the Altar, or of that was usual, yet not for his Reason, of more hinderance, &c. The same may be said of Sallustius his Speech: We ran 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 in-constant. The Fathers of the second Primitive Church, did lawfully in the Service of God, bow towards the Altar; Ergo, it is lawful and prudent to do so now; ye, lest, 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 full: Ours bow, when they pray not.
3. They did it not with Religious Respect 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, & Inhuman 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 Treatise above-mentioned, called Suppositio Sapiens. Published 20 years since, or Mr. Zech, De Istam Altar-Worship. Lately come forth,