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SUPERSTITIO
SUPERSTITES.

OR
The Reliques of Superstitition
newly Revived.

CHAP. I.
Concerning the Holiness of Churches.

Here hath bene of late, amongst our selves, a Controversie revived, concerning the Holiness of Places, now in the times of the Gospel: [Whether any Place be properly Holy, or more holy than another.] In particular, Whether the Church be more holy than other Places, or one part of the Church more holy than another. This Question wee therefore choose to begin with, because it is the foundation of the succeeding Controversies, and they stand or fall together with it: For the clearer decision, and Resolution whereof, wee must crave leave to premise some few Considerations.

First, That under the Law, there was a difference of Places, in regard of Holiness, one more holy than another: as the whole land of Canaan was called the Holy Land, after the Law.

Zach. xxi. 12, and was accounted more holy than other Lands. The land of the peculiar holy people, a Type of the Church on earth, and of the
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the Kingdom of heaven. And thereupon, the Saints of God did desire to be buried there. [Jacob G 47 39. Joseph Gen. 50 25.]

2. The City of Jerusalem was also called the holy City, Math. 4 5. and 27 53. because God had chosen that place, above all others to dwell in, and to put his name there. [ 41 Salem is his Tabernacle, and his dwelling in Zion, Ps. 76 2.]

3. The Temple was yet more holy than the City, in any other part thereof; because that was, as it were, the Palace of the great King; and therefore called the holy Temple, Ps. 58. and 91 12. where the, as the very Throne of his Holiness. And this Temple had its degrees of Holiness, according to the parts thereof.

1. The Court (so called) the place where the people assembled, Luke 1 10. So holy a place, that our Saviour would not suffer any to carry a vessel through it, Mark 11 16. 2. The Holy place, so called, Lev. 6 20. the place where the priests officiated; so holy, that the people might not come into it; spoken of also, Heb. 9 2.

3. The Holy of Holies, or the most Holy place, Heb. 9 3. into which, none, but the High priest, might go, and that once a year. We shall set up this first Consideration, with a double Observation; First, that one Reason of the Holiness, affected to these places, common to them all, was, they were Typically set forth, to signify something in the Gospel, and as they did more nearly, and as I may so say, more lively Typish Christs to the difference and degree of Holiness did appear; as the Temple was more Holy, because it typified the body of Christ, in whom the Godhead dwelt bodily. Col. 2 9. as God did dwell Symbolically in the Temple, though other reasons of their Holiness are adduced. Secondly, we observe, that besides these places, mentioned, we read not of any ordinary standing place, that was called Holy, in the old, or new Testament: For the Synagogues, which were ancient, and appointed or reading the Law, &c. are never (that I remember) called Holy. And now we see the reason of another Consideration, to be premixed.

Holy is, Secondly, holiness (with reference to the creature) is distinguished

Superstition revived.

Divided into two sorts: 1. Inherent, and Relative.

1. Inherent holiness, is that, which is infinite to the creature, not by the holy spirit of God. And of this kind of holiness, numerous rational creatures, Angels, and Men, are capable. No other thing, Time, Place, can be said to be inherently holy.

2. Relative holiness, is, that alone whereof we now speak, with respect to something, without them, which doth not necessarily make them holy. And it may be thus described, [An inherent holiness, is that, which being communicated to God, is by him, thenceforward, owned, as his peculiar.] Thus well hath the adverb patrie describe it hereafter. [Relative holiness, is nothing else, but a state of relation of peculiarity to God.] From which description of holiness, in things or Places, now, as proper Effects, or natural Consequences, thence particular. 1. The unlawfulness of alienating them by Men, or employing them to other uses than sacred. 2. The power or virtue, of sanctifying the services of those that use them, making them more effectual and acceptable. Some particular positive respect or Reverence, in the use of them, and as such like. These all (if I mistake them not) are affirmed by some or other of the adverbial part, in this prefixed Controverse, as such in due time be manifested. And there are but Distinguishing two things, as I suppose, that are made the grounds of this description. 1. Relative holiness, applicable unto Places, in the eftimage of one or other side, viz. The holy God, and the holy things of God, meaning in those Places.

1. The holy God: in relation unto whom, Places are called Holy. His Presence, His Precepts, Command.

And his Presence there exhibited, which presence of God, is also distinguished, according to the manner of the exhibition, It is either sensible, symbolical, or spiritual. Sensible and visible, when God did please to manifest his Sensible, symbolical to be present, to the very eyes of men, by some shew of glory. And this was extraordinary, as in the bush to Moses, and the manna. 2. The place where thou handest, is holy ground.

A 3. And
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And so was that to 7obsnale, Cap. 5. 1. 5. And in this respect, the Mount, where our Saviour was transfigured, is called the holy Mount. 2. Pet. 1. 8.

2. Symbolical. 2. Symbolical, or Ordinary, as in the Temple, upon the Ark, where God was constantly Resistant, by a Symbolical presence. The difference of this holiness, from this different presence, was this. That the extraordinary or sensible presence made the places holy only for the present Time of apposition; the ordinary or Symbolical presence made the place perpetually holy, during the good pleasure of God there to dwell.

3. Spiritual. 3. Spiritual and invisible presence is that which God especially affords unto his own servants, and hath particularly promis’d to them, in the use of his holy Ordinances; [Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them, Math. 18. 20.] That is, when Gods people meet together in any place, he is spiritually present with them; not with respect to the Place, but to the Person. And therefore note, that he doth not say, I am in the midst of that place, as in the Temple of old; but in the midst of them: present in the Place, for their sake, not present with them, for the Places sake: For had they met in another place, his presence had attended them there, as well as here, where now they are assembled. Now this spiritual presence of God (we say) makes no place properly holy; because then, God being present spiritually, with all his Saints; when, and wherefore assembled, it would follow, that any Place, House, Chamber, Closet, Field, &c. should become holy; which, no man, I think, will affirm.

2. The Precept. 2. The Precept, or Institution of God, is another ground of Religious holiness, in places: I mean, his Sanctification, or Consecration of them to holy use: As the Tabernacle, and Temple, were made holy places of old; so powerfully sanctified by God, that they were made parts of his worship, effectually means of grace, bringing acceptance of the persons, and services there performed; holy, not only during the time of the publick service, but also, at all other times, in so much, that it was utterly unlawful, to change them, for other Places, or to employ them to any other uses, than sacred, without his express leave.

2. Place, are said to be holy, with respect to Holy things, as the Holy duties and exercises of Religion there performed, or Holy persons there assembled: And thus men use to speak that a deal in this Controversy; saying, [That places dedicated and set apart by the Church, for Gods worship, are holy, in relation to the duties there performed.] But, by their leave, this, of all the rest, is a most improper holiness; and places in this respect are very improperly called holy: For all holy duties (or persons) make any place holy, then every Place may be made and accounted holy, where Holy persons meet, to performance of Holy Duties. The Apollites and Disciples met together in private Houses, and by the River side, Acts 1. 6. to preach, pray, celebrate the Sacrament: Here were holy Persons, and holy Duties, yet no man will say, as I suppose, those places were holy, in their use much less, after the use, when the duties ceased, and the persons were departed. In this sense, every private House, where Prayer is made, and the Word read, were a holy as the Church; which, how it will please some men, I do not well conceive, but leave them to consider, and decide to another consideration.

Thirdly, then, It is a point of prerogative, belonging unto God alone, to Sanctifie any thing, to make it properly holy, that is, to sanctifie, that the Thing is made a part of his Holy Worship, an effectually means of Grace, giving acceptance to the Worship, and to the worshipers; and so, that it is unlawful to alienate it for another thing, or to employ it to any other use, than Sacred. This is generally granted, by all Orthodox Divines, and therefore I forbear the further confirmation of it, unless it be required.

Fourthly, Whereas we often hear now adays, that men do Consecrate, or Sanctifie Things or Places; it must be understood, if not superstitiously, of an improper kind of holiness, consisting only in a Separation of them from Secular Employments, for order, decency, & convenience; with a great deal
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desire of difference from the Consecration of God; in the special and such particulars.

1. Places (to instance still in them) Consecrated by God intimation are thereby made parts or proper means of worship, as the Temple of old was, but Places, Consecrated by Men, are only circumstances of Worship for order, &c.

2. Places Consecrated by God sanctified both the Worship, and the Worshippers; as the Altar is said to sanctify the Gift, and the Temple the Gold, Matt 23:18. But Places sanctified by men, they say, the duties sanctify the Places, if at all they be sanctified.

3. Places Consecrated by God were principal, the duties left principal, the Worship being appointed for the Places. But in the Covenanted by Men, the Duties are principal, the Places left principal, being appointed for the Duties fake. For example, the Temple, and Altar, being Typical of Christ, were made more regardfull, than the very fervices professed in, or by them, to signify that Christ is more worth, than our Prayers professed by him; and the Excellency of them, flows from his Mediation, than the nature of them, in themselves, though commanded by God, and to Hec and his Types were indeed the Principal. But in the Synagogue, (and some Churches) the Duties were the principal, and indeed, all in all, the Places little or nothing.

4. Places sanctified by God, were properly holy, with respect to the Institution; but Places sanctified or Consecrated by Men, are improperly holy, only with respect to the holy duties for which they are separated and for appr.

5. Places sanctified by God, were holy, even extra solum publicum; they might not be employed to any USe, but foral. But Places Consecrated by Men, if holy at all, are holy only in the Publick use, with respect to the people of God, there, and then Assembled, and the holy Exercises there performed: As shall more fully appear hereafter.

Thee thing being thus premised or Explication, we now come to the Consideration of the Negative, That there is no more Holiness in Churches, than in other Places, nor more So.
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other place, because more holy &c. But now that difference is taken away: As the Apostle hath said, There was a time when prayer was more effectual and better accepted, in one place than another; but now men may pray in every place, with like ease &c., if they lift up pure hands, &c.

3. The assumption is also confirmed by the Tertullian, who expressly lays: The differences of places, is not more taken away now under the Gospel, than of times. That is, the differences of times and places are equally taken away, in the time of the Gospel. But of this more anon.

Reason 2.

Secondly, this was reason, If things of God's own Consecration, or made holy by his Institution, be not now more holy than other things, ney, be not holy at all, after their use, then is nothing or place of mans Consecration (as it is called) is more holy than another, after the use, whatsoever it be, in the use. But some things made holy by God's Institution, are not holy at all, after their use; e.g. The Feast is Strong, a major ad minus: If God's Consecration does not make them holy, after their use, men cannot. The assumption is manifest; the water in Baptism, the bread and wine consecrated for the Lords Supper, even by divine Institution, and so more holy in the use, than others of the same kind; yet after the Sacrament ended, are no more holy, but return to be common as they were; in the judgement of all Orthodox Divines, and the practice of our Churches. Therefore no place, and particularly, not the Church, separated by Men, to holy use, is holy after the publick use; whatsoever it be, in the use, with respect to the holy oracles. Of which again we are long.

Reason 3.

Thirdly, If any place, (for example the Church) be more holy than another, even in the publick use, it would add virtue, and efficacit, and acception, to the worship therein performed. But no place now adds virtue &c. to the worship: e.g. The feast is evident, from the places Consecrated by God. The Temple, and Altar, did add Virtue, Efficacit, &c. to the Worship, there, and thereupon performed. The Altar, which is the Gift, &c. The assumption is also manifest, because no Consecration of Men, can give efficacit to the Worship, but only by the institution of God. In the old Law, not only the publick Worship, but also the private, was better, and more effectual, &c. not only in, but done towards the Temple, than in any other place: But to think, that any Worship, especially private, performeth, or towards our Churches, is better accepted, &c., is a great Superstiticius Pothick conceit: For this is the Resolution of Gesenius, and divers others of that Schole, The Church or Consecrated Place, is, by reason of its use, in its venerable condition, A Place provoking to Repentance; And thence he infers many conclusions; 

1. First, that ordinarily is a work, more holy on its legs, more pleasing to God, more profitable to us, to Pray in Consecrated places, than elsewhere.

Which, what is it else, but to equal the Tradition of Men, with the Institutions of God? And yet some of our own have, B. 77, approved this Conclusion of his, and made use of it, to other good of such ends, and by approving it have made it their own: Let them consider how they will avoid the just Censure of being Superstitious, But we may, perhaps, call him to a particular account hereof, in another place.

Fourthly, If any Church, or any place or part of the Reason. 4. Church, as Chancel, or Table, &c. be more holy, than another, then it must be made holy, by some, or more of these Means. 1. By God. 2. By Men; 3. By the holy services, or duties done there, or thereupon, 4. By the particular benefit, obtained by Christians, in those places. These are the only ways, as I suppose, that can be pretended, for the holiness of those places: But no place is now made holy, by any of these Means, as shall appear in the particular.

1. For first; No place is now made holy, or more holy, by God himselfe, for, then, either by his institution, or by his special Preseit, there, more than in other places: But neither of these ways hath God made any place more holy than another. 2. Not by any Office of Institution; or, in all the New Testament, God hath not himself, or by any Command, sanctified any one place, more than another, or if he have, let us see the Pres. 2. Not by his special preseit there, more than in other places; for then either by his sensible or Symbolical
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shall Presence, or by his spiritual Presence; But first, the
sensible and Symbolical Presence is altogether ceaseless; And secondly the spiritual Presence of God doth not make any place holy as we proved above, or one Place more Holy than another: Therefore, on God's part, nothing can be pleased to make a Place holy, Yet this is the Resolution of some who derive the
line upon Churches, from the Presence of God there; Thus one
speaks: [The preeminence we give to the Church or Table, is
ever relative, in relation to the Presence of God, in Places
consecrate. And though the whole structure be God's house, and 2
be more present there, than in other Places; yet his Presence
there hath degrees.] Now, though we may grant, that God
is Spiritually Present in the Church, during the Assembly
there, by his special Presence, and blessing, according to his
promise; yet we can deny, that God is more Present in one
place in the Church, than another, during the Assembly, or in
the Church, or any part thereof, where there is no Assembly there.

Not one in one place of the Church, than another, during the
Assembly: We have the Promise of Christ, that when
or where, two or three are gathered together in his Name, he
will be in the midst of them, that is, equally Present with
all his people: and when they assembled. And no doubt, he is
(spiritually) present at the Font, when Baptism is administered,
and at the Table, when the Words are preached as at the Table,
and the Lord's Supper is celebrated. So that, if this special Presence
make a Place more holy, the Holy places take their turns, one
now, then another more holy, which is absurd to say.

2. Not in the Church, more than in other Places, when
there is no Assembly there, which we thus declare. 1. We
have no word for it, no such promise, and for men to say, or
affirm God to a place, is high presumption, and Superfition.
2. We have no reason for it; For as for Christ's bodily presence, it is confined to the heavens, by the Scripture. As for
his Godhead, it is incomprehensible, and cannot be affected to
a place, without his own good pleasure, as of old. Lastly, as
for his spiritual presence, it doth not make any place holy, in
the life, much less after the life is over. 3. We have, we
think,
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than one: which this wee manifiest.

1. It is an untruth to say, That any place dedicated and set apart by the Church, for God's worship, inhereth that Holiness which was once peculiar to the Temple. For, I. The Temple was Holy, by more rights than one, by divine institution, by Symbolical presence, by typical use; and so was a part and means of worship, made the services effectual, acceptable, might not be employed to any other use than it was; and, if any man shall inferne of our Churches, I shall more admire his confidence than his judgement. 2. The Synagogues (the paterns of our Churches) were set apart by the Jewish Church, to the moral worship of God; yet they were very bold, that should affirm, that they were as holy as the Temple. And thirdly, In his own confesstion, they are holy, only with relation to the duties there performed to God; but the Temple was holy, without relation to the duties there performed; and the place sanctified the duties, not the duties the places: therefore the difference is palpable and apparent.

2. It is also an untruth, and an erroneous assumption, to say, That in regard of the abundance of grace, now vouchsafed, God may be said, to be more present in our Churches, than heretofore. In those places of his own assigning. For, that the power of dispensing grace, is in the Church's Consecration, is manifetly false: as if it were in their power, to consecrate places to be effectual means of grace to them that use them. 2. To give the preeminence to places of men's consecration, that God might be more present there, than in places of his own assigning, is most high presumption; to make God wait upon the Traditions of men, who doth not use himself, no not to his own institutions, to dispence grace always, much less, to men.

3. The abundance of grace now vouchsafed, is not with respect to any place whatsoever, but with respect to his own ordinance, then, or there performed, to his own people there assembled, and indeed principally, to his own promise made unto them both: So that for all this, it dooth not appeare, that there is any virtue in the
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the consecration of men, to put any relative holiness, properly seale, upon the Church, but it is done, if it be done, by relation to the holy Services; which now comes next to be considered.

3. Neither doth the particular Services, done, in part, or upon the parts or places specified, in keepe more holy than other parts or places. Yet some there are that do imagine, who say, [In what place we have the most lively demonstration of God's presence, by some thing either done, or said there, as in a place, and at an instrument, appropriate to that Service, there is the highest Court, of, or for his Holiness, called the place of Majesty, &c.] But that this is most absurd, shall at present appear. For,

1. If the particular Services done at or upon any place doth make it more holy, and God more present; then, any place where those Services are done, (and they may be done in any place) should be more holy, which is absurd. Yet, the Font, the Reading Pew, the Pulpit, were more holy than the Table, when there is no Sacrament theret adinistred.

2. This is contrary to the old rule, The Altar sanctified the gift, and not the gift the Altar: But here the Service is made to sanctify the place, and not the place the service.

3. If the Place or Part be Sanctified by the particular Service, then, the Chalice, and Patrine (as some call it) containing the bread and wine consecrated, were more holy than the Table, by virtue of a more immediate touch of holy things: Yet, the hands of the Minister (or Clerk) carrying the consecrated elements, the hands and mouths of every Receiver, were all made holy, by touching of holy things, and might not be used to common uses: and so no end of superstition.

4. Certainly the bread and wine, in the Lords Supper, (and so the water used in Baptisme) were in all reason to be accounted more holy, even after the use, than the Table: The reason is, [Quod est talis, est magnum talis:] Which the practice of all times, accounting and using them as common, after the
the Sacred use, doth closely contrariet: If therefore the consecrated Elements lose their Holiness, and return to their common nature, and use, much more doth the Table lose its Holiness, if it hath any, after the use is over. And again, if God be not present with the Elements, after their use, more than with other things, much less is he present at the Table, or in the Church, when the publick use is ceased.

6. Lastly, if the consecration of the Elements on the Table, do make it holy, even when there is no Sacrament, as their men say, then when the Minister visits the sick, and consecrates the Sacrament, upon a common Table, or a Chaff, when there is no Table, That Table or Chaff is also made holy, and may no more be employed to any common use: or else some other way must be devised, to prevent this inconvenience, which yet I do not name.

4. If none of these ways make the Church or Table holy, there remains but only one way more to be imagined, and that is, The particular benefits, obtained by Christians, in or at those parts and places. And thus likewise some derive an Holiness, upon some places. [As the Font (says one) children obtain remission of their sins, are made the children of God &c., ample privileges, and such as do procure honour and Holiness to the sacred Font, from whence they flow.] Not to take all exceptions that offer themselves in this Affection, this I only say: That by this way, the river Jordan, wherein John baptized, and the Bason used in baptismne, in a private house, and the sick mans Table, we make of before should all be made holy, and never more to be used in common affairs. Such, and many more, are the absurdities, which they must needs run into, who once for all take the truth.

To draw to an end of this argument. If any man shall say (as some doe) that, [Though the particular services be not always in all, yet the Demonstration of not, because the same place, and things are reserved still, for the same purpose, and Gods relative propriety not abolished, the great figure of his presence still abiding.] To this we say; That hee begs the question more than once: As 1. when he faith, The Demonstration of God's presence consisteth not, though the Services be not always in all: and then againe, in saying, that the great figure of his presence still abideth. For I demand, what is it, that demonstrates, or significis Gods presence? Is it not the Sacrament, upon the Table? But doth that always remaine, when there is no Sacrament? It doth indeed, with Papists, who have the Hoit (as they call it) alw. yet resident upon their Altar, but not yet with us, who make no reservation of the consacrated Elements, but command them to be presently sanct. And if he mean, that the Table is the Demonstration and signe of Gods presence, he may say the same, as much of the Font, or Pulpit. 2. He begs againe, supposing that the presence of God, once exhibited in a place, makes it perpetually holy; for if so, then the Bath wherein God appeared to Moses, and other places, where God manifested himselfe to men, should have beene perpetually holy, as much, as the signe of that presence diat afterwards remaine. 3. He supposes also, that the spiritual presence of God doth make a place properly, and perpetually holy, which is untrue. 4. He takes for granted, which is denied, that humane consecration, doth not only give to God a propriety in the places, but also puts holiness upon them, even extra seum publicum, to fare, that they may not be otherwise employed; which is contrary to experience, and the common practice of the Church, or State, wherein Churches themselves have been made common ground, turned into Gardens or Parks.

And now we proceed to another argument. To bring in Superstition into the Church is utterly unlawful. But to make one place or part of the Church more holy than another, is to bring in Superstition: ergo. The minor, which ord. needs confirmation, is thus made good. 1. To make any thing a part, or medium of worship, which God hath not made so, is to bring in Superstition. But to make one place or part of the Church more holy than another, God not having made it so, to make it a part or medium of worship, ergo. 2. To make any place or part to holy, that it may not be alienated, or employed to any common use, is to bring in Superstition:
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Supposition; but to make one place or part of the Church properly holy, is to make it to holy that it may not be alienated, or employed to any common use: *ergo.* The *major* is proved by this, that it belongs only to God to make any thing holy; and in the manner so ordained, holy: therefore for men to doe it, is to bring in Superstition, against the second commandment.

Section 6.

Further thus we argue. That opinion, which is the proper and direct ground of many more Superstitions, is false and erroneous. But this opinion, That one place is holier than another, hath beene, and is the proper and direct ground of many Superstitions, *ergo.* The *minor* is proved by many instances, amongst the Papists; who build many Superstitious practices upon this opinion. As 1. Their Pilgrimagesto the Holy Land, (as they will calle it) to Leper, and other places, esteemed of greater holiness. 2. Build in Consecrated ground, as better; and more profitable to the dead. 3. Private prayer in publick places, which they holier, be more effectual, because the place is conceived to be more holy: and divers other such like; whereof more hereafter.

We add another argument, *ad hominem:* If all Days or Times be equally, in regard of Holiness, under the Gospell, then all places are also equall in regard of Holiness. The reason of the fearefull, because (as they say) Time and Place are equal circumstances of worship. But all days and times (as they also) are equal in regard of Holiness, in themselves considered, for they are holy (as they) and so called, only with respect to the Holy duties done on such a day: But Holy duties do very improperly denominate a Day to be Holy: Therefore, if places be equally with Times, and holy only with respect to the Holy duties, they are also very improperly called holy. And I cannot but wonder, that they that dispute against all Holiness in Days, should yet put Holiness in places, making one more holy than another.

If it be said by them, That they as well wonder at us, who taking away all Holiness from Places, are yet so rigorous for Holiness in some Days, making one more holy than another, to wit, the Lords Day, which wee call, and keep holy, as our Sabbath.

To this I answer, That the advantage is on our side: For there is no reason for distinction of Days, in regard of Holiness, than for places: As 1. Because it is granted by themselves, that, to have some effective, sufficient Time, to be dedicated to God, it is not absolutely necessary, but not so, to have any sacred place. 2. Wee have the fourth Commandment expressly for one Day in 7 to be kept holy, or (as they speak) some sufficient Time, not less than one Day in seven: But wee have no commandement to make any distinction of places, but rather a liberty to hold all indifferent, Jes. 4. 1 Tim. 3. 8. And 3. We have the Apostolical practice, for observation of the Lords day, which considering the two former reasons, amounts to a Divine institution. But there is no Apostolical practice, making difference of places, but rather a contrary command, *ergo.*

And now, I might fetch my last argument from Authorities of all, or most Orthodox Divines, who herein concurr: that there is now no Holiness in any place, but with respect to the holy Assemblies, and holy duties there exercis'd: and in Act. I shall name but one for all: Our Church in her Homilies, approved, as part at least, of pulling Church Dietes, this expresseth it: [The Church or Temple is called Holy, and so accounted, yet not in itself, but because God people resorting thither, are holy, and exercisse themselves in holy, and heavenly things.] And with this I end.

Concerning reverence in the Church.

We have been somewhat larger in the former Discourse, concerning the Holiness of Churches, or Places, because indeed as we have said, that is the foundation
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people, to divine services, praying, reading, expounding, and hearing of the word: And yet it seems, that there was no such respect or reverence given to them, but they were sometimes employed to secular uses. For the manifestation whereof, they may be pleased to remember and consider, what is the sense and meaning of that text, Matth. 23. 34. [And some of them ye shall scourge in your synagogues.] For the interpretation whereof, by Synagogues, in Scripture, is never meant any place of only secular meetings, but of sacred assemblies. And then concerning the phrase of scourging, in the Synagogues, two things only can be pretended, either first, that they did in their Synagogues inflict the punishment of scourging, or whipping upon the parties so enjoined, which the letter seems to import; or secondly, that they did there sit in judgment upon delinquents, and confine them to be scourged, though the execution of it were done in some other places. If either of these were done there; then, behold, a place as holy as our Churches employed to a secular use; and if so then, what hinderers, but it might be so now? And indeed, what is that lese, which is now commonly done in some of our Churches, where there are Confessors erected, and Courts kept, and that in the holy place thereof, the Chancellors, where confinements are imposed upon some delinquents, unholy enough, for sodomitical, adulterous, &c. If any way there be ecclesiastical estates, subjected to the confines of the Church: I grant it of some, but not of all, as Wills, Tithes, Deaths, &c., but yet they are not scourged enough, some of them, for such holy places, as those are pretended to be.

Secondly, if this Author mean it absolutely, that it is unlawful to do any secular thing in the Church, he must needs reconcile the Synagogues, taking upon him, to put that holiness upon a more superstitious foot, to make it so holy, that it may not be otherwise employed.

Thirdly, suppose we grant him, that the Church ought not to be so converted to secular uses, during the separation of the people, from the Church, to divine employments. Yet this we do not yield upon his grounds, because it is more holy, or God's more
more present there, at all times, than in other places, but so, cause of that order, and decency, &c. which is required in the service of God. For it is not convenient or decent, that the Church, which is required to holy use, should be employed to any secular, or much less to any profane use. And though we doe deny any positive reverence to be due there, yet negative reverence we are ready to yield, that is, that the things, or places, separated and subsistent to religious duties, be not abused, or made despicable, by any contemptuous usage. As, that the bread left after the sacrifice should be cast to dogs, or the wine spent to drunkenness, the Table used for profane drinkings, the Church it selfe made receptable for Hogges or Horses, &c. This we doe abhorre, but think it fit, that they be decently and cleanly kept for the service of God, to which they are devoted. But this indeed is no more than a civil reverence, due to any place of publick meeting, a Senate-house, or the like. And this we add, that the Church, upon just occasion, shall think it fit to substitute other things or places, for divine imployments, than those former things, or places, doe returne to their common nature, and use, which could not be done, in things or places sanctified by God, without most horrid sacrilege. For example: If the Common Tables, Font, or Pulpit, shall waxe old, and unfit for the service, the Church may, and must substitute others in their places, by the rule of order and decency. But what shall be done with the old ones? Why, by some, they must be revered, and not employed to any common use, that were to profane holy things. But is this not to run into superstition, while they would avoid profaneness? Is not this to equall the confection of men, with the sanctification of God? And is not that opinion of holiness, in things or places, the ground of this, and more superstition? I say, if once heard a learned Doctor discourse, concerning an old Surplice. The question was made, what should be done with it, when it grew old and unfit for wearing any longer? Might not the Minister or Churchwardens take it home, and employ it to some domestical use? The
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CHAP. III.
Concerning Bowing to, or towards the Altar.

I propose this Question, with a double expression, of Bowing to, or towards the Altar; because the profilers and maintainers of it, do thus differently express it. Some there are, who say directly and in terminis, they do, or may bow, not only towards, but to the Altar; so the Author of the tract, called, 'Sunday no Sabbath,' is bold to affirm. ['If we do not only bend or bow our body (to) but blessed board, or holy Altar, but fall flat on our faces, so come as ever mee approach in sight thereof, &c. who would commend us for it.'] Why, Sir, not only many Protestants, but even Papists do commend you, if you do, for the greater Idolaters in the world, and worse than Papists themselves, who have their God always in a Box upon the Table, lest they should worship a piece of wood. Others are more modest, and they call it, Adoration towards, or before the Altar; more nicely perhaps, than wisely, upon their own Principles. For, 1. Though they do not bow to the Altar, as to the ultimate object of their Adoration: yet they do bow to it, as to the next and most immediate object of it; which is strongly proved from the former grounds, by themselves laid, as the reasons of this adoration towards the Altar, rather than any other place; which are more holy, and more special presence of God there. This relation had to the Altar in their Adoration, calls the worship to be in part rendered to the Altar, as a medium of worship, which is ultimately terminated in God. Just as Papists adore and worship Images: For they do not use the Image objectively, as terminating their worship ultimately therein: but say, they worship God, or Christ, in, by, through, or towards the Image, which is direct Idolatry. 2. In Scripture usage, to bow, kneel, worship, before God, is all one, as to bow to, kneel to; and to worship God, as is evident in many places thereof. [Deut. 26.10.]

Psal. 23. 27. 57. 86. 91. 95. and infinite more; So likewise bowing, kneeling, worshipping, and falling down, before or towards Images or Altars, is the same with bowing, kneeling, to Images or Altars, as these places manifest; 2 Chron. 31.14. 33. 17. 19. Dan. 3. 3. 5. 6. So when St. John would worship the Angel, he says, I fell downe before the feet of the Angel, Rev. 19. 10. and 22.3. 'Yes, the Devil himselfe, when he tempted our Saviour to worship himselfe, He says that, if thou wilt fall downe, or worship before me, all that shall be thine, Luke 4. 7. which Math. 4. 9. is thus expressed; if thou wilt fall downe and worship me. From whence it is apparent, that our Altar-worshippers, who would acquit themselves from Superstition and Idolatry, by this distinction, of Bowing before and towards the Altar, and not to the Altar, cannot evade it, but that either they excuse and free Papists, who say also, they bow not to the Image or Crucifix, but before it, or to Christ, towards it; or else they do intangle themselves to farre in Superstition, that there is little or no difference between themselves and Papists: For while they do require, that the face be towards the Altar, and if the back were so, it were (as they say) with them, unrepentence and prophesying, and withall, do it with those respects of more Holiness, and more special presence of Christ there; There, towards, and before, must needs be to the altar, at least in part, which is enough to hile their Superstitions and idolatries. But take them as they please: They bow they say, not to the Altar, but to God. towards the Altar; Now we demand a reason why they bow towards the Table, rather than towards the Font or Pulpit, or any other place, or part of the Church: and they answer. They do it, because fall in, it is the most holy place, or part of the Church. Because it is the most preferable place both, which, if they be denied, and not proved, the bowing towards the Table, with those respects, must needs be Superstitious, to say no more. And thus we reason against it from our former grounds.

1. If there be no more Holiness, no more special presence of God there, than in other places; then, the bowing towards the Table, with those respects, is Superstitious. But the first is proved true above, ergo.

2. To make anything part or medium omnis, which God hath not made for whatsoever, against the second Commandement. But to bow towards the Table with opinion of more Holiness, and more

Special
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SPEciall presence of God there, is so to doe, as hath above beene proved. Ergo.

3. To bow to, or towards the Bread and Wine, after the Sacrament is ended, as more holy, or as the place of Christes more specciall presence, is superstitious: Therefore much more is it superstitious, to bow soo towards the Table, with the same opinion and respect. The confesquence is evident, d major ad minus; Those elements are farre more likely, to be more holy, and to be the place of more specciall presence, than the Table, because they were properly holy in their use, by divine Institution; Therefore, if it be (as it is) superstitious to bow to or towards them, with the same respect, much more to bow towards the Table, with the same respect. The Antecedent is the judgement of all orthodoxe Divines; and besides, it hath beene proved by the practice of the Church, that there is no more holy, no more specciall presence of Christ in them, after the use, ergo, to bow to then, or towards them, with that opinion, is superstitious, and very neere if it be altogether Idolatrous. And indeed, what hath been the ground of Popish veneration of the Elements, and adoration of the Host, but this conceit, at least in part. That they are more holy, and Christ more specially (even corporally) present there then in other places: And here this opinion I fear will end, if it be not timely stayed.

4. I adde yet a fourth reason, directed especially against those that say and teach that we may bow, not only towards, but also to the Table; Thus I dispute against this opinion and practice. If it be not lawfull to adore or bow to the consecrated elements during the time of the Sacrament, then much less to the Table, when there is no Sacrament; The seuell is strong, d major ad minus; The Antecedent is thus confirmed; because all adoration of a creature, is Idolatry against the second Commandement; Thou shalt not bow down to it, nor worship it, nor. And therefore Popishs themselves, to justify their adoration of the Host, as they call it, are forced to flye to their Transubstantiation, and imagine the bread to bee turned into their God; For they confesse, if it were not so, but remained still bread, they were most groffe Idolaters. Now we, for our parts doe confesse it to be bread still, and so a creature and not God; therefore we cannot with Idolatry terminate our adoration upon it; The adoration which is tendered in receiving of the Sacrament, is tendered only unto God, in the use of his owne ordinance: For the clearer expression of this, what honour or reverence

D 2
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is due to the Sacramentall elements, I shall make bold to transferbe and translate, what I find in two learned and judicious Divines, professors of Divinitie in several Universities.

First, one thus declast himself. Although divine honour is not to be applied unto Sacred things in their use: No those things to bee told that are consecrated for the adoration of that worship, by which the worship is join'd to God, nor lastly any worship of inferior kind is to be bestowed upon them, all which are the errors of Papists, whilst they worship the Host as God. 2. Images as the next, though not the ultimate objects of religious worship; 3. holy shrines, with a certaine religious reverence; Yet that honour which is due to God, cannot bee yielded only unto him, unless the inferences thereof be bounded with singular reverence, because of that strict or necer connexion and relation, which is betwixt the all, and inference of that all.

The other is more large and full in his expression. This I say, Dr. Fisher Prof. there is no positive veneration of the Sacrament, (to bee indeed that which is called) unless it be the adoration of that thing whereof it is known: it is a Sacrament, in the use of the Sacrament. For there is one veneration of the Signes, which is negative, if I may so say, by which we take heed lest we use them unworthily or profanely; So use due reverence the temples dedicated to God, when we abstain from defiling or profanation of them, and carry not our selves unseemly in them, But of things that are mean, there can be no positive veneration lawfully, which may carry the name of Adoration, unless it be the adoration of God, in the use of the thing. As we reverence the reading of the Sacred Scripture, hearing it, with heads uncovered; that is honouring God, speaking to us, with an adoring gesture, Neither is that our veneration or adoration any wayes terminated in the words written or spoken.

But that our adoring gesture is partly thanksgiving, whereby we praise God for his revealed Mysteries, and graces speaking to us, partly it is a kind of Prayer, that God would make our hearing sauing; Otherwise, if we grant any religious adoration to a mere Creature, however we call it with the name of Veneration, we are not sure from Idolatry. So in receiving of the Eucharist, that positive veneration, or adoration, whereby we reverence, and by an adoring way, receive the Symbols or Signes presented to us, in the worship of adoration of God; For to use the divine Mysteries reverently, is to use them with the reverence of God. Neither ought the least adoring devotion of our mind, or be lookt upon as any wrong, or upon any thing, but upon God and in God. Therefore to adore or revere the mystical Symbols, is
to use them with adoration and veneration of God. Thus much I thought good to transcribe, that men may rightly understand how to direct their adoration in the use of holy things. It any man learned, desire to see how he answers the speech of Theodore. The moral Symbols are worshipped, he may consult the Author in the place before mentioned, and receive (I think) full satisfaction.

But some objections may be made, the solution whereof will yet further clear the point in hand; as first it may be said; if it be lawful to adore God, towards, or before the sacred Elements, (not making them objects of our worship,) why then may it not also be lawful to adore or worship God, towards, or before the Table, and not make it an object of our worship? To this I answer.

The difference is much between the things propounded: for first, the Elements in their use are means of worship, and that by God's appointment, so it is not the Table, but a mere instrument of human institution. 2. Because the Elements in their use are properly holy by divine institution, and Christ there (spiritually present): But neither of these (as we have proved) are applicable to the Table. 3. If any say, when we do adore before the Elements, we do so at the same time adore before the Table, and cannot choose but do so; therefore if it be unlawful to bow before the Table, it may also seem unlawful to bow before the Elements. To this I answer, by distinction as before. To bow before the Table, merely as a place, instrument, or part of the Church, is not unlawful: But if we should bow towards or before it, with those religious respects of more belonging, more special presence of Christ in it, than in other places of the Church, we should be superstitious, if I do not say, idolatrous. Lastly, we speak of bowing before the Table, at other times, chiefly when there is no Sacrament; and therefore this objection doth not hurt our cause.

Yet some perhaps will be ready to lay hold upon our former grant, that it is lawful to bow before the Table, considered merely as a place or part of the Church, as well as it is lawful to bow towards any other part of the Church; For our Polity of Adoration must be directed some way, and no way is limited by God, East, West, North or South but all left indifferent. Whereupon they will infer, that then, being in it false indifferent and lawful, the Church hath power to determine which way men shall direct their posture of Adoration, and having determined, that must be obeyed. And this is as much as they desire.

To this I answer; 1. We grant that it is as lawful to bow or Sol, before the Table, as any other part or place of the Church, considering them merely as parts or places without any religious respect but then we say, it is as lawful to di new our posture any other way, or to any other part of the Church, as towards the Table; but this will have pleado them who plead for our adoration to be directed this way, and towards this part, rather than any other, and give us religious reasons for it: For if they left it indifferent, we should not much contend, 2. If then they will relinquish that hold, I mean those reasons, as weak and erroneous, we shall follow them to the present scruple now objected; And that I say first: Our Church hath not determined yet, our posture to be this way directed, but left it free for men to use, either to use. But secondly, we crave leave to consider whether the Church hath any such power, I mean, whether they may lawfully determine all men to direct their posture towards the Table, rather than to any other part of the Church. And, with due respect unto our Mother, we may and do suppose she cannot: For though the Churches power extends to indifferent things, and them only; yet the Church cannot command the use of every thing indifferent in the service of God, but must have due respect to other rules as well as this, whereby the must direct her determinations. And they are these, 1. Of Order and decorum, 2. All appearances of evil must be avoided, and things of evil report. 3. All occasions of superstition must be prevented as much as may be. Now if the Church should determine our posture to be this way only directed, almost all these rules would thereby be infringed. For, not to speak of the violation of Christian liberty (if so it were determined) the three rules are all hereby violated, we shall take them backward, the last.

1. This were a ready way to breed and bring in Superstition into the Church of God: For hereby some would, after a while, finde religious reasons, why their posture should bee this way directed, rather than any other way, and men (being naturally superstitious) would be apt to believe and entertain them, i.e. to think and esteem the Table as the most Holy, and most presents place; and this we need not doubt, seeing we see it done already. From which errors, once entertained, many more superstitious conceits will follow, as we have shewed above,

2. It is a thing of ill report, and hath in it a plaine appearance of evil;
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evil; whereby it proveth scandalous and offensive, both to weak 
Protestants, who think the men that doe it, to be idolatrous, and 
to strong or weak Papists, who are confirmed in their Adoration 
of the Table, because they doe believe it to be farre more holy 
than the Table, and Christ more present there. And therefore 
whereas it is desir'd by the 7. Canon of the late Synod, That the 
rule of charity may be observed, that they which use this rite, defile 
not them, who refuse it not, and that they who use it not, condemne not 
those that use it. We suppose they doe forget another rule of the 
Apostile, concerning the use of indifferent things; They that 
are strong ought to bear with the infirmities of the weak, and not 
to plague themselves with disputing others, but to forbear and re- 
strain themselves in their lawfull liberty, rather than to offend 
their brethren. And therefore we think, they ought to bee so farre 
from defiling them, that use it not, that they themselves ought not 
to use it, it being confessed an indifferent thing, and yet of evil 
report, and carrying with it a false and appearance of superstition, 
and falsly, (which is least considerable) not yet determined 
by the Church. For though it be not in my power to negleget the use 
of a thing indifferent, if once commanded by the superior power; 
still to use it, if it be forbidden, yet when it is left every way 
different in itself, and by the Church, in case of offence and fandall, I am bound to forbear the use thereof; St. Paul was of this 
mind; I will never eat flesh whilst the world standeth, rather than of-
fer my brethren to be offended. Let others be allowed minded.

3. It is a breach of order, and of decence, in the service of God, 
which is too much pretended for it. For if the Church would ord 
men in their posture of Adoration; it were better to order it with re-
spect to the place of the particular service then in hand, as 
towards the Font, in time of Baptisme; towards the Pulpit, in 
time of Prayer and Preaching; and towards the Table, in time 
of administration of the Lords Supper: And for this were have 
a president or example for one particular; When our Saviour 
paiched, it is said, The eyes of all that were in the Synagogue 
were fastened on him. It's very probable he stood in the midst 
of the Synagogue, or more unto it, not at any end thereof; Where-
upon it followeth that they could not all direct their posture one 
way, some looked East, some West, some North, some South: And 
this may be said for this, That if it be not necessary for all the people 
to fix their eyes, and their posture upon the Minister, yet is 
very}

very usefull to do, helping much to further attention, and to 
the words the more upon their hearts, and in their memories, 
And this is by experience found to be a good helpe to this purpose, 
Now let it further be considered, whether it be not a breach of or-
der, for all the Congregation to direct their posture one way, 
in time of preaching the Word, when God spakest to us men, by the 
mouth of the Minister; and a breach of Decency also, in as much as 
many must turne their backs upon the Minister, and consequently 
upon God; And this cannot be avoided, if the Church should de-
tern all the Congregation to direct their posture Eastward, or 
towards the Table, unlese the Pulpit also be removed into that part 
of the Church, which cannot be conveniently done in many, in most 
places. The like may be said of the other particulars. In the time 
of administration of the Sacrament, we suppose it necessary or very 
convenient, and must for edification, that all the receivers should 
have their eyes directed towards the Table, to behold the Confer-
and Sacramental actions of breaking the Bread, &c. For which 
reason our Church hath ordered, that the Table should at the time 
of administration of the Sacrament, lie in the body, that is, in the 
middle of the Church or Chancell, that the people might come 
round about it, to behold the particulars before mentioned. Now, if 
the Church should determine all men to worship Eastward (as 
some desire) whilst the seeses to establish Order, the would ma-
nifiitely break it; for some must necessarily turne their backs upon 
the Table, (which would bee thought piarsial and prophane) 
which I think cannot be done without breach of order and decen-
tee too. There is no way to helpe this, but to set the Table close 
by the end of the Chancell, let any man should (as some absurdly have 
said) set it above God Almighty. But then they fall into another inco-
herence and greater mischief, that they break the Rule of Edifica-
t ion, because many, in many, or most Churches of this Kingdome, 
shall neither see nor hear the Conferation, which it is necessary. 
To draw to a conclusion of this businesse. If any man shall yet 
further say, It being lawfull for to worship God in any way, when 
the Church hath not determined it, it may no see more lawfull if a 
man shall choose to direct his posture of Adoration that way, For 
election of the place or part, towards which a man will direct his 
worship, cannot alter the nature of the worship, to make it wil-

tworth or superstitious.

My answer is partly made to this already, and further thus en-
larged.
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...to use them with adoration and veneration of God. Thus much I thought good to transcribe, that men may rightly understand how to direct their adoration in the use of holy things. If any man learned, desire to see how he answers the speech of Theodore, "The mystical Symbols are not changed, but may consult the Author in the place above mentioned, and receive (I think) full satisfaction."

But some objections may be made, the solution whereof will yet further clear the point in hand: As first it may be said: if it be lawful to adore God, towards, or before the sacred Elements, (not making them objects of our worship) why then may it not be lawful to adore or worship God, towards or before the Table, and not make it an object of our worship? To this I answer:

...The difference is much betweene the things propounded: For first, the Elements in their use are means of worship, and that by God's appointment; so is not the Table, but a mere instrument of humane institution. 2. Because the Elements in their use are properly holy by divine institution, and Christ there spiritually present; But neither of these (as we have proved) are applicable to the Table. 3. If any way, when we adore before the Elements, we do as at the same time adore before the Table, and cannot choose but do so; therefore if it be unlawful to bow before the Elements, To this I answer by diffinition as afore, To bow before the Table, merely as a place, instrument, or part of the Church, is unlawful; But if we should bow towards or before it, with those religious respects of more holiness, or more special presence of Christ in it, then in other places of the Church, we should be superstitious, if not idolatrous. Lastly, we speake of bowing before the Table, at other times, chiefly when there is no Sacrament; and therefore this objection doth not hurt our cause.

Yet some perhaps will be ready to lay hold upon our former grant, That it is lawful to bow before the Table, considered merely as a place or part of the Church, as well as it is lawful to bow towards any other part of the Church, For our posture of Adoration must be directed some way, and no way is limited by God, East, West, North or South, but all left indifferent. Whereupon they will infer, that then, it being in itself indifferent and lawful, the Church hath power to determine which way men shall direct their posture of Adoration, and having determined, they must be obeyed. And this is as much as they desire.

D.D.
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...To this I answer: 1. We grant that it is as lawful to bow or Salute before the Table, as any other part or place of the Church, considering them merely as parts or places without any religious respects; but then we say, it is as unlawful to direct our posture any other way, or to any other part of the Church, so considered, as towards the Table; but this will little please them who plead for our adoration to be directed this way, and towards this part, rather than any other, and give us religious reasons for it. For if they left it indifferent, we should not much contend, 2. If then they will relinquish that hold, I mean those reasons, as weak and erroneous, we shall follow them to the present scatter now objected; And this I say first, Our Church hath not determined yet, our posture to be this way directed, but left it free for men to use, or not to use. But secondly, we crave leave to consider whether the Church hath any such power, I mean, whether free may lawfully determine all men to direct their posture towards the Table, rather than to any other part of the Church. And, with due respect unto our Mother, we may and do suppose she cannot: For though the Churches power extends to indifferent things, and them only; yet the Church cannot command the use of every thing indifferent in the service of God, but must have due respect to other rules as well as this, whereby she must direct her determinations. And they are these, 1. Of Order and decency. 2. All appearance of evil must be avoided, and things of evil report. 3. All occasions of superstition must be prevented as much as may be. Now if the Church should determine our posture to be this way only directed, almost all these rules would thereby be infringed. For, not to speak of the violation of Christian liberty (if it were determined) the three rules are all hereby violated, we shall take them backward, the last first.

1. This were a ready way to breed and bring in Superstition into the Church of God; For hereby some would, after a while, think religious reasons, why their posture should be thus way directed, rather than any other way, and men (being naturally superstitious) would be apt to believe and entertain them, etc. to think and esteem the Table as the most holy, and most present place; And this we need not doubt, seeing we have done already. From which errors, once entertained, many more superstitious concents will follow, as we have shewed above.

2. It is a thing of all report, and hath in it a plain appearance of evil;
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exill; whereby it proveh scandalous and offensive, both to wake Protostans, who thinke the men that doe it, to be iudastrika, and to strong or weake Papists, who are confirmed in their Adoration of the liol, because they doe believe it to be more holy than the Table, and Christ more present there. And therefore whereas it is forbidden by the 7. Canon of the late Synod, That the rule of charity may be observed, that they which use this rite, doe not know who use it not, and that they who use it not, condemn not those that use it, We suppute they doe forget another rule of the Apostle, concerning the use of indifferent things: They that are strong ought to bear with the infirmities of the weaker, and not to please themselves with disputing others: but to forbear and refrain themselves in their lawfull liberty, rather than to offend their brethren. And therefore we thinke they ought not to be so farre from despising them that use it not, that they themselves ought not to use it, it being confessed an indifferent thing, and yet of evil report, and carrying with it a face and appearance of superstition, and high (which is not least considerable) yet not yet determined by the Church. For though it be not in my power to neglect the use of a thing indifferent, if once commanded by the superiour power; (as non est utriusque) yet it is forbidden yet when it is left every way indifferent in itselfe, and by the Church, In case of offence and scandal, I am bound to forbear the use thereof: St. Paul was of this mind; I will never eat fish whilst the world standeth, rather than offend my brethren. Let others be also so minded.

3. It is a breach of order, and so of decorum, in the service of God, which is so much pretended for it. For if the Church would order men in their posture of Adoration, it were better to order it with respect to the place of the particular service then in hand, as towards the Font, in time of Baptisme; towards the Pulpit, in time of Prayer and Preaching; and towards the Table, in time of administration of the Lords Supper: And for this wee have a presidant or example for one particular; When our Saviour preached, it is said, The eyes of all that were in the Synagogue were fastened on him. It's very probable he walked in the midst of the Synagogue, or were unto it, not at any end thereof; Whereupon it followeth, that they could not all direct their posture one way, some looked East, some West, some North, some South: And this may be said for this; That if be not necessary for all the people to fix their eyes, and so their posture upon the Miniliter, yet it is very

very niefull to doe, helping much to further attention, and to fix the words the more upon their hearts, and in their memories, And this is by experience found to be a good helpe to this purpose. Now let it further be considered, whether it be not a breach of order, for all the Congregation to direct their posture one way, in time of preaching the Word, when God speakes to us men, by the mouth of the Miniliter; and a breach of Decentia also, in as much as many doe turne their backs upon the Miniliter, and consequently upon God; And this cannot be avoided, if the Church shoulde determine all the Congregation to direct their posture Eastward, or towards the Table, unlefe the Pulpit be removed into that part of the Church, which cannot be conveniently done in many, in most places. The like may be said of the other particulars. In the time of administration of the Sacrament, we suppose it necessary or very convenient, and melt for edification, that all the receivers should have their eyes directed towards the Table, to behold the Confeption and Sacramentall actions of breaking the Bread &c. For which reason our Church hath ordered, that the Table should at the time of administration of the Sacrament, stand in the body, that is, in the midst of the Church or Chancell, that the people might come round about it, to behold the particulars before mentioned. Now, if the Church should determine all men to worship Eastward (as we desire) whilst the Sacrament is administered, the would naturally break it; for some must necessarily turne their backs upon the Table, (which would bee thought peculiar and prophano) which think not can be done without breach of order and decency too. There is no way to helpe this, but to set the Table close by the end of the Chancell, let any man stand (as some abfurdly have done) above God Almighty. But then they fall into another inconvenience and greater mischief, that they break the Rule of Edification, because many, in many, or most Churches of this Kingdome, will neither see nor hear the Confeption, which is so necessary.

To draw too conclusion of this businesse. If any man shall yet further say, It being lawful for us to worship God any way, when the Church hath not determined it, it may no: so, for us to do the same without a lawfull authority of a man shall chuse to direct his posture of Adoration that way; For election of the place or part, towards which a man will direct his worship, cannot alter the nature of the worship, to make it will worship or superstition.

My answer is partly made to this already, and further thus enlarged.
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larged. Election of a place or part of: the Church to direct our worship towards it, in respect of convenience, decency, edification and the like, as in respect of such circumstances as may further the worship, doth not indeed affect the nature of the worship, or corrupt it: such a part or place being rather of God’s choosing than our own. For the Scripture, & the Law of conscience within, command us to make such choice of place (and time) as may better our worship. But to rule our election of part or place, to adore or worship God, by any such circumstances as hath not any influence into the worship, to better or further it, in him that doth perform it, but only such as is founded upon the device of man, and ends in superstition, is an unwholesome election. For example; Suppose there were in the Church, an Image or Crucifix in the end of the Chancell upon the wall or window; (as in some there is, and some of late set up) it is no doubt as lawful for a man to bow to God that way as any other, if it were done without all respect unto that part or thing. But if any man shall chuse to bow that way, rather than any other, before those Images; I suppose it were simply unlawfull, because he regulates his choice of place or part by such a circumstance as doth now no way further him in that act of worship, but directly tendeth both to further the Idolatrous Papists, in his worship of or by an Image, and also scandalizes the faith that are weak, and himself infects the superstition (or appearance) of Idolatry. The same inconveniences falling upon the choice of the Table, to be the part or place towards which we direct our adoration. Wee may conclude, that such election is unlawful. To clear my self, and shut up all; It is lawful, yes, perhaps necessary, in the time of administration of the Sacrament, to direct our Adoration towards the Table, or rather towards the Sacrament, as much conducting to further our worship (for so it is as lawful, and needfull to direct it towards the Pulpit in the time of preaching; the reason of both was given afore;) But for a man to chuse to direct his worship towards the Table, when there is no Sacrament there, or with some religious respects of more holiness in and more special presence of God at that place than any other, this we thinke to be Superstitious: And to this our discourse is chiefly directed.

I had thought I had now done and answerd all, but meeting with another pretence for this Adoration towards the Alter, to remove (as the Author speakes) the babbling block of the times, of bowing towards the communion Table, out of the way of all well affected people, I could not let it passe without some observation. Thus he lays: The Table being amongst confecrated things, either in the Church, the Church is not only void, but also vain and idle, which no man with (I think) affirms. That which the Confession confess, cannot be any real quality of holiness, for of this it is not capable: it must needs be therefore only a fitneffe or upnness the thing confeccrated, to worke upon the minds and understandings of men, considering it as Confecrated. And is nothing else, but an aptitude to stirre them up to holy thoughts, upon those things represented, and set upon that holy place, multiplying themselves, doe at last become into the all of holy worship, &c. The Table is one, a memorie ensement, unto which the affiance of grace is never wanting, either to lege in our minds such thoughts of the death of Christ, or to excralate our profane such a worship of him, if we be not otherwise wanting to our selves.

To which I have many things to say. First, the Confession it selfe, now challenged and practised by the Churchs justly questionable. By what law of God or man (except the popish Canon law) is Confecration of Churches, or of things thereto belonging, justified? Who gave the B.B. this authoritative, to Confecrate, that is, to transmute such virtue or efficacie into the things confecrated, to worke thus upon mens minds to stirre up in them acceptable devotion which is peculiar unto God. And, I pray, how doth he justify this effectual confecration, but from Cigantus, and the Romish scholors?

Secondly, the Table being amongst confecrated things, and but one of them, why is this efficace more given to it, than to the Font or Pulpit, (or Bell-ropes if they be confecrated) and why are other confecrated things neglected? Surely they may take it ill, to bee so frighted. Why may they not justify their bowing to the Font, &c. as well as to the Table, upon the same reason?

Thirdly, the Confession of the Church or Table, &c. if it be supposed to be any more than a mere separation of them to sacred use, during the decence, convenience, &c. is not only void, and vain and idle, but Superstitious also, derogatory to the prerogative of God, who alone can effectually confeccrate things or places, to that purpose which is here pretended.

Fourthly, but let us consider, what (he says) the confecration doth confere: not any real holinesse, of that, the Table is not capable: what then? any relative holiness? nor that, it licenes: why
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why then is it called a considered thing? yet relative holiness, if properly so called, is proper and peculiar unto God, as we have shewed above. What is it then that the Considerations concern? Nothing else but an aptitude or fitness to allure up men's minds to holy thoughts, considering it as consecrated. But first, is not this grosse popish superstition, as if it were in the power of human consecration to indue into the things consecrated, an aptitude to fit up holy thoughts in the minds of men? The Temple and Altar consecrated by God, did no more. If therefore the ground be true, the devotion cannot be good, nor the worship holy. Secondly, the Table (he says) is a memorative instrument, unto which the affluence of grace is never wanting, either to begot in our minds such thoughts, or to extract from our persons such worship, if we be not otherwise wanting unto our selves: But who made the Table a memorative instrument, with affluence of grace to wait upon it? Not God for certain, he hath no where promised his affluence of grace shall wait upon the Table, or any thing of mere human consecration. Not men, it is too much arrogance and presumption, for men to take upon them the dispensation of grace, to contrive such thoughts, to extract such worship. And therefore such devotion so stirred up, such worship so extracted from the consideration of the things consecrated by men, makes it so far from being acceptable to God, that if we think to have grace attend upon the use of this means, it will make it abominable. Such devotion descents not from above, but is earthly, carnal, and superstitious; And so I leave it.

CHAP. IV.

Concerning private Devotions in a Church.

Superstition, as well as true Religion, is very fruitful of conclusions, with this difference, besides others, that truth hath limits, but error and superstition hath none, but one being granted, a thousand follow after. There is (as I take it) another branch of Superstition springing from the same root. That men, whereas they go into a Church at any time, fall down on their knees (as near the Altar as they dare) and there put forth their private prayers. If they will give no reason of this their practice, as it is not Angish, no reasonable service, as it ought to be,
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place more holy, and God more specially prefers there. Now suppose also, a man is left behind, whether by negligence, or some unjust occasion, a heathen is lawfull for him, when he first comes into the Church, to prostrate himself, and fall to his private devotions, to prepare (as is pretended) for the publick Service. It should seem he lawfully may; for if it be therefore unlawfull to pray privately in a Church, because there is no more Halostræ, no more special presence of God there; then, when there is both there, it may seem to be lawful.

To this I answer many things, yielding the Antecedent, and denying the consequent: For, in publick worship, all the rules of worship must be observed, and a man cannot make amends for one fault, by making another. Now in this practice there are many faults meet; as

1. The not attending on the beginning of publick Service, for then he might have joined with the Congregation in prostration and prayer, 

And this no doubt, this late coming to the publick Service, is one cause of this disorder.

2. The next fault is, the want of preparation before he came, which might for to have beene done, Eccles. 5.1. Take heed to thy soul, when thou enterest that is before thou enterest, not then that art entered, for then thou must be more ready to hear; that is, to joine with the Congregation 1 for bare to adde thereunto.

3. But the worst fault is this, a breach of Order and decency, in regard of the place which is appointed for publick, and not for private worship; the house or chamber is for that, Math. 6. Now it is held, and indeed is, a breach of Order, in peaceable times of the Church, when places are appointed for that end, to have publick meetings and service in private houses; so it must be confined a breach of Order also, to make private prayer in a publick place.

4. Lastly, but there is yet a worse fault than this, The breach of Order and Decency in the publick Service, which should be uniforme and unanimous. People should come together, depart together, pray together, hear, sing, reade together, which is strongly and justly pleaded for. And I cannot but wonder, that they, who stand so much for Vaniformis, Order, and Decency in the service of God, should so much forget and transgress their owne Rule, as both to justify and practice this Decency and disorder, as when they come into the Church, in time of publick Service, to bereave themselves to their private devotions. I leave them to consider it.

To conclude this business. Though we do grant, that prostrating and kneeling, and other gestures of reverence, be now lawfull, according to the particular Services in hand, yet wee affirm, they must be used with observation of that generall Rule, Let all things (in the Church especially) be done decently, and in Order.

A Confes of certaine Affectious of Dr. M. concerning Bowing before the Alter.

The particulars here following, are part of a Letter (as it should seem) written by the Dr. to a friend, concerning his Bowing towards or before the Alter. And the beginning of his discourse is (as I take it) an answer to an objection made against it by his friend, to this effect: That there is little or no difference between his Adoration towards or before the Alter, and Papists adoration towards, before, or by an Image. To this he answers.

S E C T. I.

To worship God by an Image, and to worship him, towards some place or Monument of his presence, are things of a faire different nature. For the one is absolutely forbidden by the divine Law, and the other we find continually practiced by his people, with his allowance and approbation. Thus in the Wilderness they worshipped him towards the cloud, as the monument of his presence going with them, Exod. 33.10, 34.5

To this I would reply by way of distinction. An Image may bee taken either literally for a Statue or Picture, or largely for any similitude used in divine worship, and that either by divine or humane institution. If the Dr. take it in the first sense I grant his Affection true; there is a difference between them, and the reason lies faire, in God's prohibition of the one, and allowance at least of the other. But if he take it in the second sense, and for a similitude of Divine institution, there is little or no difference between them; For such an Image or similitude is a place or monument of his Presence, by virtue of his promise, to be present with his people, in the use of his owne ordinances. On the other side, if he take it for a similitude or Image of any institution (which is, when any place or thing is made, and esteemed more holy, and God more present there) it is all one, and little or no difference there is, between adoration before an
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an Image, and adoration before such a place, or thing, made by men a Monument of his presence. As shall appear hereafter.

Sect. II.

In the Tabernacle and Temple, they directed their postures towards the Ark of Covenant, or Mercy Seat, as the Throne and foot-stool, Psal. 99.5. & 133.7. 28. & Pisc. 17. - When they were absent from the Temple, they turned their faces towards the same, when they prayed or worshipped, 1 King. 8. 44. 48. Dan. 6. 10.

To this second Section thus was reply. In the Tabernacle or Temple, they directed not only their posture, but their act of worship, (as the Dr. distinguishes Sect. 6.) which is more, towards the Ark of Mercy Seat, as the Throne or foot-stool, The reason were, 1. Because those were similitudes of God’s own institution, (as the Temple and Altar also were) Similitudes, I say, and Types of Christ, and means of worship, appointed for those times, to signify that all worship was, and is to be directed to God, by and through Christ. 2. Because God pleased there continually to reside, and there to exhibit his presence to that people. Both which reasons are wanting to our Table, as in the Application will appear.

Sect. III.

And all this may seem (as ought these can be allowed to the contrary) Ex more genitis humanis, without any new or peculiar precept, which is nowhere to be known. Nature having taught them, as in their address to men to look upon their face, in their address to divine Majesty, to accommodate their postures to something, where his presence was more declared than else where, whether as in the Tent or at the Temple, or other sacred places, and Monument of his presence.

That all this was done merely ex more generis humani, is partly true. For Deut. 32. 3-10. there is expressly command, that the officer, presenting his offering to the Priest, should leave it there, before the Altar, and bow himself before the Lord, And besides, there was mutual supplication between God and Solomon, that when any did pray towards the Temple, though farre off, that God should hear in heaven, which is equivalent to a precept. As for the Hebrae then
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then in their addresses to their Gods, they had respect of their Images or Altars, to which they had confined the presence of their Gods. Therefore apprehending there to be present more than in other places, no marvel if they did accommodate their postures to that place. Nature indeed may teach men, that where God exhibits his presence, thither the worship may be directed; but I suppose, no Christian will confine Christ’s presence, more to the Table, than to any other part of the Church; when there is no Sacrament there at the least: And therefore this will little help the bulwarks.

Sect. IV.

Hence it appears, that to worship God, versus locum presentis, or towards the place where his presence is any where specified, is no Idolatry, or forbidden in the second Commandement. For that which was no Idolatry in the old Testament, surely can be none in the New, what ever faults may be otherwise.

Hence it appears indeed, that to worship God, versus locum presentis &c, is no Idolatry, but hence it is suspected, that the Doctor begges the question, in taking for granted, that the Table is locus presentis, when there is no Sacrament; Nor is his reason annexed generally true, For that may be Idolatry or Superstition in the New Testament, which was none in the Old, e.g. If a man should now worship God toward Jerusalem, or the Temple there, (with opinion of Holyghost, or special presence of God there, to make his prayer more accepted, &c.) It were no doubt, Idolatry or Superstition, because those are now ceased to be means of worship.

Sect. V.

The reason of this difference of worshipping God by an Image, and worshipping towards some place, where his presence is specified, is this: because in the former, the creature is used objectively, in the all of Divine worship, in the latter not so.

This reason assigned by the Doctor, of the difference between the things propoised, &c. that in the one the creature is used objectively, in the other not so, is most unfound. For first Papists themselves do not, or say they do not use the Image objectively, as terminating their worship ultimately thereon; but say they worship God
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God or Christ, by, before, or towards the Image. 1. They that worshipped God toward or before the Table, as the Throne of Majesty, as the most holy, and most present all place, doe as much as the creature objectively, making the Table obelium mediatum, or relatio, of the worship, as they that worship God by an image, and where is the difference? The true ground of the difference was given before, because the former is forbidden by the second Commandment, the latter not. But rather commanded. For that forbids us to make an image, and to worship it, or by it, doth not hinder us from making images or likenesses of his own worship, or from requiring us to worship him in, by, or through the image. Yet the alternative part of the second Commandment supports both. 1. Thou shalt worship God, in, or by, his own precepted Images.

Sect. VI.

For take notice that the creature may be used in Divine worship, either per modum objecti, in respect of the act of worshipping, or per modum instrumenti, or circumstance only. The first without question is Idolatry, for the Lord our God is a jealous God, and cannot endure that we create any thing that should partake with him, by way of object, in the worship given him. But he that adorns an image in the act of worship, if he attend it as an image, makes it an object, not of his worship only, which any other creature might, of his act also, because he adorns it as a representation of the object, whereunto his worship is directed, and consequently as an object representative, whereas this act, first reflecting, pales to the Archetype, which though it be no more, than to make it object mediatum, or relatio, obelium & ultimum, yet is it more than Gods jealousy will endure. But as for the other, to use a creature in the act of worship, whether way of instrument or circumstance, if meant of time or place, is not unlawful.

There is in this Section a threefold distinction, which being distinctly cleared, will give good light to the present meaning. 1. The creature may be used in Divine worship, either objectively, or instrumentally and circumstantially. Objectively or circumstantially, then the creature is used merely as a creature, without any respect put upon it. Objectively, when the act of worship is some way or other terminated in the creature. 2. When the creature is used objectively, it may be considered, either as the object of our act of worship, or as the object of our house only; but this distinction is coincident with the former, and almost the same. For to make the creature the object of our worship only, is to use the creature only circumstantially. 3. When the creature is used as the object of the act of worship, that is of our worship in itself, it may admit of this distinction: It is used either as the absolute and ultimate object of our worship, or relatively and mediately, in which case it is to be distinguished from the act of worship, which is the ultimate object, in worshipping of Images. Now apply this to our present case: The Doctor acknowledges, that to use the creature as an object of our act of worship, whether absolutely or relatively, is Idolatrous, because it makes the creature to partake with God in his worship, in which case, which God can not endure, so not when it is used as an object representative of the Archetype, to which the worship is directed. But now I shall add my submission to his proposition; thus he adorns the Table, in the act of Divine worship, as an object representative, as a representation of the object whereunto his worship is directed, as they do, who adorn or use it, with attending it, as the most holy, and most present place, that man uses a creature objectively, relatively, if not absolutely; mediately, if not ultimately, making it not only the object of his Poultrie, which any other creature, any other part of the Church be, but also of his act; Therefore it is Idolatrous, and more than Gods jealousy can endure, in the Doctors own words. But we proceed.

Sect. VII.

For it is not unlawful to use the creature per modum instrumenti, for then it will not be lawful, to use a book when we pray, or song, or give thanks unto God, or to use the Table or Chalice in the celebration of the holy Communion, &c.

It is, no question, lawful to use the Creature in Divine worship by way of instrument. But I appeal the Doctors wisdom and ingenuity, whether, when he bowes towards or before the Table, as Seuflum Christi, or as a place most holy, and representative of Christ presence, &c. heuse the Table only by way of instrument. We doe indeed to use it, when we use it, to hold the elements, which are consecrated therewith. But if they put any religious respects upon it,
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it, as Solium Christi, Throne of Majestie, presbytery, place, &c. What does he less than Papists, in worshipping God or Christ, by or before an image; who (as they say themselves) inhabit the Image only as an object representative, not terminating their worship ultimately therein, but using it as a representation of the object, and consequently as an object representative, whereon the Act of worship itself reflecting itself to the Archetypal. Yet if they will say, they use the Table with those respects had unto it, per modum instrumenti, they may go on, and say, The Jews used the Ark, Temple, Cloud, &c. when they bowed towards them, only by one way of instrument. And by the same reason or divination, they may bow not only before the Font or Pulpit, but also before a Crucifix or Image, and say, they use them not, per modum objecti, but only per modum instrumenti.

Sect. VIII.

Secondly, not per modum instrumenti loci aut temporis: for then it (should not be lawful) to use Oratories or Churches to worship in, or any certain place therein, appointed for the Priest to officiate at; or to appoint any certain days or times to worship God in, or Sundays and Holy-days; but all these, our primitive ones, we esteem lawful &c.

As for this second part of the Application of the divination, it is answered as the former, and further. Thus: It is lawful to use Churches, as also houses, closets, fields, &c. to worship God in; to choose days or times convenient also for that purpose; that is, as places or as times merely considered. But to worship God rewards any place, or in any time, (if he have not appointed any such) as more holy, or efficacious to our worship, is a groundless, vain, and superstitious practice. All places, and times, are alike indifferent, and more circumstances of worship. But to worship God, with relation or respect to such a place as more holy, or as a representation of his presence, is more by much than to use it by way of circumstance, even to make it obiectum medietatis, or relation of our worship, and by the Doctors own conclusion, more than Gods jealousy can endure.

Sect. IX.

If then it be lawful to use a creature for the ubi, or place, why not also, verum quia ubi & quo being alike indifferent circumstances of place? And if this should not be lawful, then would the same,
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Same also, to lift up our hands and eyes to heaven; or if the determination of our posture only, by a creature, in worship, be idolatry, why might we not justly suppose, left the posture of our face and hands to heaven-ward, might make no qualms of worshipping the body of heaven, &c. as Idolaters did.

By that which hath been said already, this conclusion need not be feared. For if we make them objects of our posture only, there is no example, which is being Idolatrous, in so doing: But if we should make their objects of our worship, although but mediately or relatively, as putting more business or efficacy in them, or in our posture, as Gods or mans institution, I suppose the Doct. would not deny, our see were not superstitious, whether others suspected us so or no. And this is that very case, or I understand not what they mean, when they call the Table, the Throne of Christ, and holy place, &c. Although this also may be added, that Christ's corporeal presence is certainly confined to the heavens, by the Scriptures: and therefore to lift up our hands and eyes to heaven there is good reason; yet as more circumstances of our worship. For if we pray, as the Publicans did, with hands hanging down, and eyes directed to the ground, yet should our Prayers be no less accepted. But they dare not yet say, Christ's bodily presence is more confined to the Table, than to other parts of the Church.

Sect. XI.

And for our security herein, our blessed Saviour hath taught us, so say, in the Lords Prayer, which he left to the Church, our Father which art in heaven, &c. For without question, if we may determine the divine presence thus, in our speech, we may do the like, as at the same time in our posture, which is no more, than to express that faculty, by our gesture, which we used usually with our months.

This instruction of our Saviour, in the Lords Prayer, both justifies and secures us, in lifting up our hands and eyes to heaven. But when the Doctor would interfere, that, if we may determine the divine presence thus in our speech, we may do it, at the same time in our posture, he speaks both incongruously, and impermissibly in my judgment. First, incongruously; for, we determine not the divine presence to heaven, but God himself, and Christ hath done it, by no means, we may indifferently determine our posture towards
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wards heaven, or any other place, as place, but to make that place, or that posture (as were said) more holy and effectual to our presence, that we take to be superfluous, and little better than Idolatry. Secondly, the Doctor speaks impertinent to the cause in hand; for though we grant that it is lawful for us to determine our posture thither, where God hath pleased to determine his own presence; yet we deny, that it is lawful for us to determine the divine presence, to what place we shall go, and then to determine our posture of worship towards that place, with such religious respect. And thus the Doctor must prove, or he does nothing.

Sect. 11.

Now therefore apply this to the Hypothesis. The Table or Altar (for the difference is merely verbal) in our Christian Churches, answer to the Ark or mercy seat in the Jewish Temple, being inlaid Christ, and accordingly by antiquity, was accounted of, as oculus Ecclesia, and the most sacred thing; as the place where the book of the holy Gospel, by ancient custom, lay, parallel to the 2 Tables: The part of the Aaron, to the holy Eucharist, that is, the sacred monument of the New Testament, as those of the old Covenant. Why may not then the Holy Scripture be said to be, in the posture of our sacred Adoration, which the Jews, in theirs, had not only to the Ark, but to the Altar, which stood before it, even to the Temple itself, when they could not come to perform their adoration there, as aforesaid.

In this Section, the Doctor begs the question more than once; first in general, to say, that our Christian Churches must answer to the old temple: whereas their temple, being in all parts, is typically, was to end in Christ, the Antitype; and therefore ours should be as little like theirs, as may be. 2. In special, to say, that our table must answer to their Ark, or mercy seat; may rather, if to anything, to their table of shew-bread, as I would think; but to their Altar rather, if they would speak congruously to their own way; for to they should find a parallel to their Altar. 3. He begs again, in saying, The table is the most sacred thing; for we deny the table to be more sacred extra siham, than other parts of the Church: And in the use, the book of the Gospel lay upon it, or the Holy elements consecrated, are more holy than the table: Why then may not the holy elements be left, challenge to be the most sacred thing, and be revered, and to adoration tendered towards them rather than towards the table? 4. He begs once more, in saying, the table is for the Ark and Ecclesia. For what ever antiquity pleased to speak, in their wanton and transcendent metaphors, Christ is not represented on the table, as in his Majesty (for which a throne is necessary) but as in his lowest humility, broken, crucified, &c. for which a Crofle were fitter than a throne. And if any shall say, why the very Crofle was Christ's throne, on which he did triumph, as the Apostle speaks, there is a faire way opened, now, to introduce a Crofle to be hung over the Table, (as some where it is done) without the least profanation, and then adoration pleaded for, towards that, as fishus Christi, &c. If our table represent their Ark, our Churches may also represent their temple, and why not the like respect be tendered them, as to the temple, to pray towards them, when we are far from them. Lastly then, his question is easily answered, The like respect may not be shewed to our table, in our posture of adoration, which the Jews shewed to their Ark, Altar, Temple, &c. because they were media of worship, of God's owne ordination: ours only instrument of decency and convenient, of humane institution.

Sect. 12.

Lastly, all Nations and Religious have been wont to use some reverential gestures, when they entered into their Temples. And our Saviour in the Gospel, would not have his Disciples enter into a house without salutation, Math. 10, 2. Then why should not we think, it is part of religious manners to do as much, when we enter into the house of God. Now of all gestures in adoration, having the body forms to be the most comely, and ready for that purpose, and of all postures therein (and some gestures there must needs be) that is the best, which is directed towards that which is sacred, and of most eminent relation to God in the Church, being the holy Table or Altar.

We are now drawing to the conclusion; and this we have to say, 1. That the Gentiles used some reverential gestures when they entered into their temple, the reason was shewed above; because they confined their Gods to their temple, which whatsoever should imagine of the table, should be ridiculous, to say no more. 2. Our Saviour's directions for civil salutations, makes no rule (but fallible) to order our Religious worship by, when we come into our Churches; but we must have recourse to the revealed will of God. 3. Religious manners require no more of us (for ought I know) but that
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that we do not profane the places and things employed to God's service: But that they require any positive reverence, (not having divine sanctification) is yet to prove. 4. It is therefore another sensible begging, to say, there must be some religious posture or gesture used, when we enter into our Churches: unless the service of God be then in hand, and then the posture must be suitable (as much as may conveniently be) to the particular kind of worship then in being; if at prayers, kneeling: if reading, preaching, or singing, sitting, or standing reverently &c. 5. To say, that of all posture, that is best, which is directed towards that which is sacred, and of most eminent relation to God, is, a conclusion like the premise. For 1. It is taken for granted, which is denied, that the table is the most sacred and of most eminent Relation to God: for which they can allege no divine institution. 2. If that be the best posture which is directed towards that which is sacred: then any other posture, or gesture so directed, might be best, as well as bowing. If he say, that is most ready, and most comely, he begs to the very end, and so will due (I think) ever so many, or else he cannot maintain his cause.

M. M.

A survey of another Letter, written by a learned Author concerning the same things.

After I had finished the former discourse and confute, I thought upon another Letter of a learned man touching the same matters, which he containeth something not used by others, and also hath prevailed with some: (out of reverence and respect to the Author) to sway them, not only to the opinion, but the practice also of the things in question. I thought it very necessary to consider briefly, the strength and reason of what he writes. Wherein I shall proceed, as in the former, taking only the frame and substance of the particulars, without transcription of the whole.

SECTION I.

Concerning Holiness of Churches.

Relative Holiness (of which places are only capable) is nothing else but a state of Relation to Godwards, either in respect of presence, or propriety or Domination of presence, when God is after a peculiar manner present; as when he appeared to Moses in the flame.
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Thirdly, whereas he congregates to say, That dedication or consecration of a thing to the divine Majesty gives God such a propriety in the thing becomes to him, as it is no longer ours: this is contrary to the Churches praxis of speaking of human dedication. For it is evident that Churches themselves dedicated to holy uses, and other things thereto belonging, have ceased to be God's, and consequently to be holy, and have returned unto common uses, that is, to be ours again. Nay more than before, Things consecrated by God, that is, by his institution, now under the Gospel, after the use is over, doe return againe to be ours, and common; as for example, the water after Baptisme, the bread and wine after the Lords Supper is ended, according to the judgement and practice of all reformed Churches. Therefore human dedication or consecration doth much less give God such propriety, as that things doe become his, that they are no longer ours.

Fourthly, it is point a worthy a further serious consideration, whether human dedication, or consecration, doe give any such propriety to God, in things dedicated, as that they doe become his, that they are no longer ours. And upon this, the Holiness of them now pleased for doth depend. For things are therefore said to be holy, because they are God's by speciall propriety, and separation of them to him; not therefore Gods, because they are made Holy. Hence it is, that whereas in the law of the first borne, it is said, Exod. 13. 14. It shall be mine: in the Gospel, Luke 22. 23. It is said, it shall be holy to the Lord: and in the law of Tythes, Lev. 27. 30. All the Tythes of the land are the Lords, holy to the Lord: First appropriated unto him, and then consequently holy, that is, so his, that they are no longer ours. Now the question is, whether human dedication or consecration doth make things properly God's, and consequently holy? For the resolution whereof, that, which hath already been said, conduces much: viz. the practice of the Church and State, alienating things and places, dedicated by men, to other uses, that first they were devoted to: which argues, that in their judgement, there is no such propriety given to God, that the things doe become his, as that they are no longer ours: But this is an argument a posteriori, and perhaps the practice may be unlawful; at least this man, and his co-partners must, for once, say so: we will therefore argue it a little further. And thus wee doe proceed unto some considerations and proofs about it.

1. In the times of the Law, God had propriety by a double right, first his own authoritative appropriation of them to himselfe. 2. By voluntary dedication by the people. For there were not only sacrifices commanded by God, but free-will offerings also devoted by the people. And these latter (as well as the former) were to be made God's, and consequently holy, that they were no longer theirs, nor might be alienated, without express licence from God, upon such conditions as he pleased to prescribe: which are evidently to be found in Lev. 27, where there are many Laws, for the redemption of their Tithes, and things voluntarily devoted and sanctified by the people.

2. The reason of the holiness of things freely devoted, stood not in the dedication or consecration of them by men, but in the acceptance of them as his, and to holy, by God himselfe, both allowing them to doe, and giving laws to receive and order them. Which without those laws, had beene will-worship, and so not acceptable unto God. For which end God had a Treatise appointed to receive things thus offered, as his.

3. It is now in the time of the Gospel, lawfull for men to devote things, to pious (as well as to charitable) uses. But with much difference from those times of the law. 1. That then, the things were immediately devoted unto God, now mediately by men: For they are given, appoofe, to such a Church, such a Parish, or such a Minister, for their charge of, for their maintenance, &c. and doo remotedly, & at last redound to the honoe of God, (as also things given to charitable uses doe) but not immediately and nexeys as those free-will offerings in the time of the law. did. 2. Then it was all in Religion, no part of worship, now it is all in religion, or homina religion, not Religion, and rather all in pious actions than piety. And though the keeping of that promise or vow, to devote such a thing to pious uses, was to him that made it, an act of Religion, as a promise made to God; yet, neither was the making of that promise, any act of Religion properly, or any part of worship, nor the thing by promise devoted, any part of worship. And 3. Then it was utterly unlawful, not only for the persons devoting, without leave, but for any other person, private or publick, to alienate the thing devoted unto God; but now, though it cannot be alienated by the person devoting, yet the State, upon sufficient reasons, may alienate it, which appears by that law of our land, that if any man devote any land to the Church, without the leave and allowance of Parliament, after the Incumbents death, it becomes a Mort, and falls into the hands of the King, which could not be done, without Sacreledge, if the private dedication.
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of humane confession: If hee think that Gods spiritual presence makes the Church to be holy, it is denied; unless he will yield, that where ever God is spiritually present, the place is presentely made holy, and that, not only during the time of the ordinance, his word and Sacraments, but also extra omnes, which he intends, as we shall perceive afterwards, if he mean humane dedication, it is also denied, that this doth make the places to be holy, that they become to Gods, that they are no longer ours. This, wee take it, is the difference between the Temple, and our Churches, in regard of Holiness: That the one was not only consecrated by God, but also made the place of his Symbolical presence, whereas ours are consecrated by men, without command, that we know not; and he is only spiritually present there: and consequently the former was properly holy, with regard to Gods, both consecration and presence; the latter only improperly, with respect to the holy duties there performed. And therefore we may truly say, This Holiness had place under the Law, but not under the Gospel: which thus hee replies upon.

If any shall except, that in the Old Testament indeed, this holiness had place, but in the New, there is no such thing, I would encounter him thus. If any place under the Gospel may be more peculiarly the place of divine presence than every place: If any thing in the Gospel may be more peculiarly Gods, than every thing, then such holiness hath place in the New Testament as well as in the Old, Sed verum praest. Ergo.

In answer whereunto, we must first distinguish of divine presence: It is sensible, Symbolical, and Spiritual. The two first are not to be found in our Churches: For neither did God ever visibly appear in our Churches, as to Moses in the Bush; and if he had, it had made them only holy for that time of apparition, which will not serve his turn. Nor is there in our Churches, any standing symbol of his presence, as was in the Old Temple, which made it properly holy. And for his spiritual presence, as it is there, once during the time of the holy assemblies, and ordinances there administered: So it makes not the place holy, if at all, longer than the time of those performances, which will stand him in little need, to his maine purpose; which is, to prove holiness there extra omnes, when there is no publick worship. Yet he proceeds.
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By this, you may judge, what to think of Dr. Burgess his account, that Temples were holy only in the holy use of them. If his meaning be, they are holy no longer, then such use; would he say, that Ministers are sacred persons, only while they are officiating in preaching &c., and at other times differing nothing from Laymen? Would he say, the Lords Day is holy only for the time that divine service continues, and no longer? Par enim et ratio. I confess I heard one not long since preach so; but he was not aware, that by this assertion, he blew up the foundation of his own Tenet, concerning the reverence due to Churches and Altars; &c.

To this we say these things. First, there are some who will not yield so much, as D. B. doth: that Churches are holy even in the use. And that not without probable reasons at least. 1. It is not found in the New Testament, that over the places of Christian assemblies are called Holy. 2. They are persuaded, that the spiritual presence of God makes no place holy, nor ever did, nor in the Old Testament. 3. Nor (say they) hath the place any influence at all into the Religious Duties (which it should have, if it were, in proper phrase, to be filled holy, even during the use thereof) but is only a physical, Adjunct of the Duties, and at most, but helpful to the bodily conveniences. Let these things be considered; and we add, Secondly, he again confounds things that differ much: persons and Time consecrated by God, and places consecrated by men: The former are sacred, extra suum, so are the latter, for ought he hath said.

Thirdly, he could not but know, that there were many, besides the man whom he called prebend, that held, that the Lords day is holy, no longer than the publick divine service continues, who, as he truly says, are not aware, that by this assertion they blow up the foundation of their own Tenet, concerning the Holiness of Churches, extra sumps publicum, and the Reverence due to them and Altars, at all times, when there is no publick worship. But it is just with God to intimate me, and confound their tongues against their own opinions: For I have often wondered, how men should be so injurious, as to deny the Lords Day, to be wholly Holy, and to be observed, in public as well as private, and yet to affirm, that the Church is Holy; always, when there is no publick worship: in contradiction, says our Author: If any say, the reason of the form is, because ye hold the Lords day to be only an Ecclesiastical institution; the same may be said much more of the latter.

For Churches are, without all doubt, but of humane construction; the Lords day is by many learned Divines maintained to be of Divine institution. And seeing this Author seems here to be of this opinion, he might easily have seen the difference, that there is not jurisprudence in things consecrated by God, and those which are consecrated by men: Or if he thinks, the Lords Day to be of Ecclesiastical constitution too, as after he feemes to doe, he also blows up the foundation of his own precent Tenet, concerning Holiness in Churches, extra sumpum, as well as the Preacher did: unless he can give us some better satisfaction, which thus he offers to doe.

I would desire you to consider well this proposition, That a place may be said to be Holy, in relation to divine presence, not only where God is in such manner present actually, but where he is wont to be, yet was wont to be. Therefore Daniel prayed towards Jerusalem, when the Temple was defaced, and burnt, and the Ark of the covenant was gone. That was the place, where he had once been, in some illustrious and extraordinary manner. Witness Mount Tabor, which only for the glorious transfiguration of Christ thereon, having never had any other divine relation, is by S. Peter, 2 Pet. 1. 18, termed the holy Mount. So that the Sacraments are no longer Sacraments, than in the use of them, yet are they holy, as long as they are for that use.

Here are many things liable to just exceptions. First, if this proposition might pass, the day were his. But I pray consider, how he begs the question, and steals upon us, to grant him what he cannot prove, that a place is truly said, not to have been, but to be holy, when God is not actually present: which is most false, both in respect of the sensible presence, for the bush was not holy, after that appearance, and also in respect of the Symbolical presence, for the place of the Temple was not holy, after the Ark and Alter were gone, and the typical use expired; And as for the spiritual presence, it doth not make the place holy, when actually exhibited, much less, after it is ended, for then more places than the Church should be holy, where God hath bin actually, but spiritually present, which I think he would not have granted. God was wont to be present actually, and Symbolically in the Temple, in Jerusalem; therefore, places only to be said to have been holy, but to be they are still holy, and more holy than other places, is Popish Superstition.

G 3

Secondly,
Superstition revived.

Secondly, his proofs is not sufficient. For Daniel had another ground for what he did, in praying towards the Temple, viz. a promise (which was to last till Christ came, who was typified by the Temple) that if any did pray towards that house, in any place of the world, God would hear in heaven, 1 Kings 8. But if this Author, while he lived, or any now should pray towards the Temple at Jerusalem, or any Church or our, with respect of more holy and sacred than the world, would laugh at his superstitious folly, yet certainly God had willed to be present in the Temple.

Thirdly, the like may be said for Mount Tabor, St. Peter calls it the holy Mount, not because it was so when he wrote, but because it was so during the Transfiguration; as if one speaking of the bush, or the Temple, should call them the holy bush, or the holy temple. Or if he think it was so in St. Peter's time, let him tell us whether it be so still, or when it ceased so to be.

Lastly, his conclusion spoils his project. Be it so (as he is) that Sacraments are no longer Sacraments, than in the use of them; yet are they holy, as long as they are for that use. But first, the difference between the Sacraments, or Sacramentals and the Church is manifest, the one are consecrated by God's institution, the other by men. Next, the Application must be this; so churches at most are but holy in their use (for so are the Sacramentals) during the time of the holy employments; but after that reume to be other places, and to the Sacramentals do, after their use, return to be common, though properly holy in their holy divine institution, and divine presence with his own ordinances, which cannot so well be said of Churches. Unless therefore he can prove some other presence of God in the Church than virtual, namely symbolical, he cannot for ought prove that there is any holiness in Churches, extra eum ipsum publicum, if at all: And this he seems to undertake to do, in that which follows.

Sect. II.

Whether the holy Table may be rightly called Solum Chriis. I expel from the first principle, that if the holy Table be fedex corporis & sanguinis Christi, why not (as some Christi, solum Christi) solum Chriis? And is not the body of Christ Antiquitates? Hence Antiquitatis called the holy Table, solum Chriis, and the place where it stood, aeneae Ephes. xii. cox. c. 4. The odor.
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 odor, lib. i. c. 17. These two places I thought not unfit to cite, that is might appear, how farre the conces of the Ancients, and our differ in this point.

Any other conscience might well scruple that speech, which at least is most improper, at worst, scandalous and offensive, so much as superstitious and idolatrous. For first, the Table is not properly solum Christi, but solum corporis, because it is the place of the Sacramentals elements, and are more likely to be solum corporis, &c. yet they are improperly so called, for they are not solum Christi. Sine signis sacramentalis et figurative. Christ's body is indeed, solum Christi, but I pray, is Christ's body properly upon the Table at any time? Heaven is my throne, is here applicable, so is not the Table. But if the take it properly, it is not only scandalous but idolatrous, and favours strongly of Romish Transubstantiation, the Bread and Wine being in their opinion turned into the very body and blood of Christ, no more if they say, the Altar is solum Christi. 4. They much mistake the matter. For Christ is not represented in the Sacrament upon the Table, as in his Majesty, but rather in his lowest humility, and humiliation; and therefore the Table is most improperly called his throne, rather representing the Crocel whereon he was crucified, than his throne whereon he sits as glorified. Lastly, these hyperbolical expressions, and wanton metaphors of the Ancients, have (unawares to them good men) filled the Church with superstition. It matters no where the Ancients and ours come in their expressions, but how near they come to the truth, and holy Scriptures, which never speaks in such a language.

Sect. III.

Here in the New Testament, God or Christ can be said to have his throne or place of presence in our Churches, when they are not by divine, (as were the Tabernacle or Temple) but humane approximation, and without any such symbolum, as the Ark was.

I answer; To erect or set apart a place for Divine worship, and the exercise of the rites of Religion, is juris nature, and approved by God from the beginning; It began not with the Tabernacle or Temple, made by God's special appointment in Moses. Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, erected places of Divine worship where ever they came, without any special appointment from God, &c. This
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This shall quickly be dispatched. That convenient places (in times of peace) should be set apart, for the decent and orderly performance of God's service, seems to be a dictate of nature; but that those places should ever after be holy, even extra ofiis publicis, and made the Thrones and places of God's special presence, when there is no publick worship there, is not yet proved. Yet thus be it, and go about it.

For the nature of those places, see can no where learn it better than from that of the Lord to Moses, Exod. 25, immediately after he had pronounced the Decalogue, where promising that they should make with him, God of silver &c. he adds, in all places where I record my name, I will come unto thee. Here is contained the definition of a place set apart for Divine worship; it is the place where God records his Name, and communicates to men to bless them. The memorial of God's Name is any Symbol or token, whereby he sets his Covenant, and as it were commerces with men. — Now it is right that Christ ordained the holy Eucharist, to be the memorial of his Name, in the New Testament? Doth this, faith be, in remembrance of me. And there be those that will insist, say, that Christ is at present here, as the Lord was upon the Mercy-seat, between the Cherubins, why should not then the place appointed for the station of his memorial under the Gospel, have some semblable Sanctity to that of old?

To this I answer. First, the description and definition is extended here too far, for they are intended only of such places, as are by God himself set apart for his worship, with respect especially to the Tabernacle and Temple, though neither of them as yet erected. In the places where I shall place the memorial of my Name not in all places that men call apart, but God hath set apart any place in the New Testament, where to record his Name. The promise of God coming unto them and blessing them, was made not only to the sacrifices and services, but to the very places: but now God hath not made any such promise to any place, but to the men wheresoe'er performed, and the persons wheresoe'er assembled. Wherever two or three are gathered together in my Name, there I will be in the midst of them. And therefore the cases are not alike.

2. The Eucharist indeed is appointed to be celebrated, for a memorial of Christ's death, but that as at first it was done in a common room, as is confessed hereafter, so it may be done in any place and convenient, which the Sacrifices of old might not: and that's another difference. 3. Though the Sacramental elements be Symbols or tokens, whereby he tells his Covenant, yet fo is not the Church of Table; therefore all that can be said, is but this, That the Sacrament hath semblable sanctity, to those of old, and that the Sacramental elements are the Thrones or place of spiritual presence, where ever the Sacrament is administered; but full with this difference, that this memorial is not always present on the Table, as at last some of those were in the Law, and therefore the Table can at all be said to be holy, and the place of Presence, but only during the time of Administration of the Sacrament, which will not doe his Service enough, to prove the places holy, when there is no publick worship. Yet something he lays to this.

You will say, This Christian memorial is not always there present, as at least some one or other of those in the Law were. I answer, it is enough, it is worth to bee. As the Chair of estate left not his relation and due respect, though the King be not always there. And remember, that the Ark of the Covenant was not in Jerusalem, when Daniel opened his window, and prayed thitherwards, and was waiting all the time of the second Temple.

This is sufficiently answered before. For first, it is not sufficient to make a place perpetually holy, that God was wont to be present there; and then, God's spiritual presence (which only is now in the Sacrament) never made any place holy. But we add, 2. By the Original he may conclude, that the Font or Pulpit are God's Throne and place of presence, and alike holy with the Table, because God is wont to be present there. 3. The similitude of the Chair of estate will not hold in matter of divine worship. Men may put what relations and respects they please; but no man can put a proper relation holiness upon a place, but only God himself. If he command a place to be set apart, as a place of memorial of his Name, that is sufficient to make it perpetually holy during his pleasure, but no such command is now extant in the Gospel, and that a real difference; For so he says.

You will say, In the Old Testament those things were appointed and commanded by the Law; in the New we find no such thing. I answer, in things for which we find no new Rule given in the New Testament, where we are referred to the Analogies of the Old. Witness the Apostles, prove taken charge for the maintenance of the Ministry, 1 Cor. 9, 1. And the practice of the Church, in Baptizing Infants.
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Infants, from analogy of Circumcision; inallowing every fifth day of the weeks, as in seven, from the Analogue of the seven Sabbath, &c.

But to this, I say, First, this is a dangerous Rule to goe by, especially in the service of God; for thus we might revive a great part of the Ceremonial Law, and some have done it in some particulars. 2. The things intenished to, are not grounded merely upon Analogue of the Old Testament, but are greatly deduced from grounds of Scripture: As: ‘Fam, hapsis’ from divers places of the New Testament.

Sect. III.

The observance of the first day of every week, with the fourth Commandement for the general ground of it, as one in seven, and the Apostles designation, as the first day of the weeke; And as for the maintenance: of the Ministry, how ever the Apostolical alludes to the Old Testament, yet it is expressly commended in the New; God hath ordained, that they which preach the Gospel, should live of the Gospel: And, let him that is taught, make him that teacheth him, partaker of all his goods.

Suppose they be so, yet, when there are so many, why should not the amongst principal draw this respect unto it? A man is present where any part of him is, yet when we salute, or speake unto him, we are wont to direct our fowles unto his face, as that wherein his presence is principally exercized, not to his back parts, &c. perhaps it was chiefly this, with us to the Dollar, intended, when he said, That, Hoc eit corpus meum, was more with him, then the Dollar vebum meum.

This may thus be answerd. First, it is a mere begging of the question, that one place in the Church is more principal than another; and that God is more present at the Table, when there is no Sacrament there, than at the Font or Pulpit, when the services are in act, for he must alter it, or it is not to the purpose: wee say, God is more present at one place than another, which yet he speakes, by the similitude of a mans face: Gods face is seen as much in one ordinance as in another. 2. The presence of God, is not now Symbolical, as old in the Temple, more exhibited in one place than another, which was therefore called the Face and presence of God, but only spiritual, and that equally in all his holy ordinances, and doth not make one place more principal, or more holy than another; and so no reason for our adoration to be directed to one place more than to another. 3. He that said, Hoc eit corpus meum, was more with him, than hoc eit vebum meum, said (as I suppose) he knew not what. For first God is as spiritually present with his Word, as with his Sacrament. 4. It is hoc eit vebum meum, that makes it corpus meum: Accedat vebum, &c. & sic Sacramentum. But these comparisons are fancies of men, without any ground of Scripture; and if there be any principalitie amongst them, the Word may seeme to have the preeminence. But he saies,

I think, for my part, first that the comparison of the Pulpit with the Sacraments, and their places, is here too general, Secondly, that neither the Pulpit, nor the Font, are in this point, or for this purpose make speak of, of the same nature with the Altar: For it ought to be considerd (though it bee a thing now almost quite forgotten) that the Eucharist, according to the meaning of the Institution, is the Rite of our address unto God the Father, in the New Testament, whereas, we are not come before him to offer unto his divine Majesty, our thanksgiving, supplications, and prayers, in the name of his Son Jesus Christ crucified for us; that it is not only a Sacrament, but as the ancients Church used to speak, a Sacrifice also, or that Sacrifice were Rises whereby they invocated and called upon God, as a most unlikenable, &c.

To this I answer: First, how the comparison of the one with the other is too general, I understand not. But the comparison is ill laid, as I conceive. For it should not be made between the Pulpit and the Sacraments; but, if he will needs be making comparisons, either between the Pulpit, Font, and Table, or between Preaching, Baptisme, and the Eucharist: And consideration should bee had in what sense the comparison is made, whether he means in the possession of our Adoration, more respect should be had to the Altar or Table, than to the Font or Pulpit, when the particular ordinances are actually performed, or when there are none of the ordinances actually in being. And in both considerations, I conceive they are equal, and there need be no comparison. For we have said afore, that to direct our pasure or face towards the place where any ordinance is in all senses very reasonable, tending much to edification, not with re-
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To the place of more holy, &c., but to the ordinance there in being. But to have respect to one place more than another as more holy, or God more present there, when no ordinance is there, is fully suspected as superstitious. But let us consider his reason of the difference.

The Eucharist (says he) is the Rite of our address to God the Father, &c., where with we come before him to offer, &c., that is, it is not only a Sacrament, but a Sacrifice. And Sacrifices of old, were Rites of invocation. To which I say: That Sacrifices of old, were Rites of Invocation, is a truth vulgarly known; but he must not beg the question and say, the Eucharist is such a Sacrifice, properly so called, though the ancient Church was pleased so to call it. Nor may he think to delude us by this consequent. In the Eucharist, we represent the death of Christ to God his Father, and beseech him, to be propitious unto us for his sake; therefore the Eucharist is a proper Sacrifice. For in the administration of Baptism, in our publick and private invocations and prayers, we do represent the death of Christ to God his Father, and desire him for his sake, to be propitious to us; yet is there not any proper Sacrifice. And this is that which Mr. Perker, by him cited, says: The ancient Fathers used to call the Supper of the Lord, or the whole action of the Supper, a Sacrifice, as for other causes, so for this. By a »Mystic«, because it is a commemoration, and also a representation unto God the Father, of the Sacrifice of Christ offered upon the Cross. But (says he) this ablation is unintentional, not real; and in this sense (note it), the faithful in their prayers, do offer Christ as a Sacrifice for their sin, in being wholly carried away in their minds and affections, unto that only and true Sacrifice, to procure and obtain God's great favour unto them. Where note, that this learned man says, They called it a Sacrifice by a »Mystic«, not a proper Sacrifice, as some now call it; and then he says, that all the faithfull offer this Sacrifice, not only in the Eucharist, but in their private prayers, intentionally, not really, and so are spiritual Priests, which mark their plot of a proper Sacrifice, and a proper Priest and proper Altar, which yet they plead for. Let us here, how he applies, that he hath said to his purpose, to answer the doubts propounded.

Their premises considered, the answer to your demand, why in the posture of our adoration, the divine Majesty, more respect should be had to the Altar &c., in places and cases, namely, because adoration is an act of address and of tender of homage unto God, and therefore

must be performed, at or toward the place of our address, which is the Altar, &c. The Eucharist is the place where God speaks to us, unto him; the Font, the place where he receiveth his favour unto us, in accepting us to be his servants, or where being initiated, we offer our spiritual service and sacrifice unto him.

But this is little to his purpose, and little satisfaction of the doubt: For truly, Invocation is an act of address to God, made in the reading of Psalms, and therefore, by the same reason, our adoration most fully to be performed at or towards those places of our adoration. Secondly, the Font is a place, where, not only God speaks to us, but we also speak to him: the Font also, a place, where, not only God receiveth his favour unto us, but we also speak to him, and offer up our prayers, and represent that very Sacrifice of Christ's death upon the Cross, to his Father, (Water signifying and representing the blood of Christ, as well as the wine in the other Sacrament.) Lastly, the Table also, is a place, where God receiveth our his favour unto us, tending and giving us the body and blood of his Sonne, represented in the bread and wine. And therefore, there being little or no difference between the places, there is little or no reason given, why in the posture of our adoration, more respect should be had to the Table, than to the Font or Eucharist, especially considering, that they are places of Gods presence, as well as the other, and (for ought appears as much) being God is spiritually only present, in all the places. But for a conclusion, we may, all that long discourse of his, being granted, yet he cannot conclude the point in question. For,

1. This is no good consequence: Sacrifices are Rites of invocation (and the Eucharist is called by the Ancients a Sacrifice), ergo, in our posture of adoration, more respect is to be had to the Altar, &c. For in the Temple, in the posture of their adoration, more respect was had to the Ark, than to the Altar, or burnt offerings. 2. Nor is this any better: The Eucharist is the principal Rite of our address to God, ergo, in the posture of our adoration, more respect is to be had to the Altar (so called) than to the Font or Eucharist. For the most that can be concluded, is but this, that more respect is to be had to the Eucharist or Sacramentall elements, than to the Font or Eucharist, or to the water; and in the one, and word in the other. But for my part, I should have such comparison: And what is this to the places themselves, when there is no ordination there in being, unless we say, that the more principal a te, gives more Hellas
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to the place, or hath God more present, at all times, than other Rites and ordinances do, which wee suppose to be a superstitious and groundleffe conceit, without any proofoe or allowance of Scripture; yet he adds.

Whereas ye seeme to question, whether the Jewes had any such respect unto the Alter of burnt offering; I answer, they had; for it was so placed, that when they turned, worshippd towards the morn, they worshippd towards it also; but the denominatnm of their pafsion is from the Ark, as the principal memorial of the divine presence, yet sometimes from the Alter also, as 1 King 8 32 31 a Chron. 6 1 3. &c. But the Alter of Incense better befits our holy Table, than the Alter of burnt offering; though it may truly be affirmed, if rightly taken, that the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ is to us Christians, both Arca feeders, Incensum, and Holocaustum, being the commemoration of him, which is all these to us.

To this we say. 1. The placing of it, so argues not, that they had such respect unto it: as a man praying, in his face, before the Alter now, as they call it, doth not with any respect to the face before him, between him and the Alter. 2. But were it granted, it profits him nothing, because the Alter was a Type of Christ, and of God's own institution, and so a part of worship, none of all which can truly be laid, of their Alter now. 3. If there be a commemoration sacrificæ, as some speake, and a representation of the death and sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross, it may seem, that the Alter of burnt offerings, better befits our holy Table, than that of Incense: and the Table of Shewbread better than either: but all of them improperly. 4. The Sacrament of the body and blood, may be affirmed to be to us Christians, all thoso above specified, but figuratively, not properly; being indeed the commemoration of him, who is all thoso to us: but then there is no necessity of a proper Alter, proper sacrificæ, or proper Priest: and still the respect, in our posture of adoration, is not had to the Alter or holy Table, but rather to the Sacrament, as a Rite of Christs owne institution; or, which is best and fittest to be said, to Christ himselfe, in the use of his owne ordinances.

And so, no respect at all is to be had, more to the Table, than to the Font, or Pulpit, when there is no ordinance in being. And with this I rest.

FINIS.