This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world’s books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that’s often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book’s long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ **Make non-commercial use of the files** We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ **Refrain from automated querying** Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google’s system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ **Maintain attribution** The Google “watermark” you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ **Keep it legal** Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can’t offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book’s appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google’s mission is to organize the world’s information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world’s books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at [http://books.google.com/](http://books.google.com/)
FRESH SUIT AGAINST HUMAN CEREMONIES IN GODS WORSHIP

UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS, INC.
Ann Arbor    London
Sic fuit Ale. fuit Amelius. Quae funere tante
Cum fore Papali Pelagianus orat?
Quae reddes Hierarcha? Vivi nos arma tenemus,
Astra animam, tellus ossa, sed os tabula.
A FRESH SVIT
Against
HUMAN CEREMONIES IN GOD'S VVORSHIP.
OR
A Triplication unto.
D. BURGESSE HIS REJOINDER
For
D. MORTON.
The First Part.
Psal. 119, 113.
I hate vayn inventions: but thy law do I love,

Printed Anno 1633.
An Advertisement

to the Reader,

Occasioned by the never enough lamented death of
my dearest friend the Author of this
Fresh suite.

Understand Christian Reader, that with
the comming forth of this booke into the
light, the learned and famous Author
D. Ames left the light, or darkness rather
of this world. His name for diverse rea-
sons (not needfull here to be recited) hath been hitherto
concealed, and that which generally was but imagined
before, (viz. that the REPL and this Fresh suit to D. B.
Rejoynder) to be his work, now it is certainly known to
be his, that none need to doubt therof. It pleadeth truth:
 succinctly, yet perspicuously, and with finewy Answers
To B. M. and D. B. poore Sophisms, as indeed his vein
in all his writings and discourses did most admirably
lead him to do. Concerning this matter, I may not
keep back what I heard him speake as in the sight of
God, that he was in his conscience more persuaded of
the evil of these relikes of Popery and monuments of
that superstition then ever, and yet he never had seen
good in them, or come from them: and that moreover if
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D. B.
D. B. or any other of them, would yet be daubing with
screamer the mortar, and not give over to paint rotten
sepulchres, he was by the grace of God resolved still to
maintain the cause, and while he lived never let fall the
uit commenced this way, not that he sought victorie to
himselfe, nor that truth might returne out of the field
with conquest was the highest pitch of his ambition.
And though this worthy of the Lord be with us no more,
yet God (I trust) who is rich in mercy, and hath more
then on blessing, will (as need shall require) supply the
advantage truth bad, and now hath lost in the losse of
his glorious instrument. Together with his life God
hath put an end to all his travailes, wherein be showed
himself a pattern of holines, a burning and a shining
light, and lamp of learning & Arts, a Champion for
truth, especially while for the space of 12 yeares at least,
he was in the Doctors Chaine at Franeker, and having
sought the good fight of faith, whereunto he was called,
& professed a good profession before many witnesses, he
hath now indeed laid hold on eternall life. His spirit
goes to the spirits of just men, and his body committed to
the ground, we commit his labours to thy use, wherein
he being dead, yet speaketh, and his memorie we hope
shall live for ever.

Farewell in Christ, the Fountain
of all welfare.
To the renowned King,

EDWARD

THE SIXT

And so

To our present Sovereign King

CHARLES his Successor.

JOHANNES ALASCO (a Godly Learned Polonian Baron and Superintendent of the Church of Strangers at London) in the Epistle Dedicatory of his tractate Concerning the Sacraments, printed at London,

An. 1552.

Ell doth that Father, and without doubt deserves praise, who having a daughter a Virgin drawn by the guile of panders into some lewd and dishonest house, and there trimmed after the vmborishe guise doth presently rescue her thence and bring her home (c) 2 to his
to his ovyn e house before shee be utterly spoyle d. But the same Father (if he be wise) thinks it not enough for the saftie of his daughter, and the honor of his house, that he hath brought her home agayne, vnles he take from her wholly whatsoever he knowes to be accounted in those houses a vhoris b attyre.

Neyther doth he inquire vvhence such tattire came first: but judgeth it dishonorabole to himselfe, and so unworthy his daughter and vwhole family, that any such thing at all as trompets have used for dressings in their houses, should appeare in his.

Neyther doth hee giue eare to their persvasion, vwho beare him in hand that all things are to bee Esteemed according to the Fathers mynd in his ovyn e house; and so thinke that the Fathers approbation can make that honest, in his ovyn e house, for his daughter, and vwhole family, vwhich in another house, is most dishonest, for any daughters that regard their ovyn e credits: ascribing so much to the Fathers prerogative, that whatsoever he approves, must be of others vwell liked of, so farre as it concerns his ovyn e house. For he knowes full vwell, that although all those things vwhich he hath authorized in his ovyn e house be there vwell thought of, yet that is not enough, since the honor of his daughter, and his vwhole Family, must not only bee cared for within
within his owne house, but also throughout the whole Citie, that he may remove all evil suspicions from his family among all his neighbours; and is heedfull that the panders have not the least occasion left them of challenging or laying clayme to the sayd daughter, as having some of their abhor-house-marks upon her.

Even so in the Church of God, as in a city, Magistrates and Ministers are in place of parents, having the pure and right Administration of the Sacraments committed unto them of God, for to be tended, and tendered as their owne daughter. It is therefore very commendable in these parents of the church (as they may term them) if they rescue the lawfull & pure Administration of the Sacraments from the violence and tyranny of the Romish Panders, by taking it into their owne care and custody.

But heer they ought to remember (Especially they who are called by the holy Spirit, Eminent Ministers of God, and Nursing Fathers of his church. I.E. Christian Kings and Monarchs, that it is not enough for them, thus to have brought this daughter out of the Papists steeves, home into their owne care and keeping, unless they also put off from her, all that dressing, which they know to be abhorish in the sayd steeves, that no such thing may be scene with them, which may be accounted.
accounted vnhorish: Especially in that city where there is great Variety of judgments, the ouer ruling vhereof by mans Authority is not to bee expected, and vhere there are so many bucksters for the steves remaying.

Nor let them heare the delusions of those who suggest, that such kindes of dressing from vvhence soever they bee taken may bee made good & honest by Authoritye. For vvell they know, they are not set over the whole church of God, but only one part of it, as a Family in aCitty, and that thersore though they could bear out such things at home by their Authoritye; yet it is their dutye (as they regard publike Chastity and honesty) to procure the honor of their daughter and familye not only within their owne walls but alsoe througheout the whole city; not suffering anything to be scene within their house, vvhich they know to be held, urged, and maynteyned by the Romish steveses and their instruments as their proper vnhorish stuffe.

Last of all they must bee wary, least any signes or tokens bee left upon their daughter, by vvhich shee may bee questioned agayne by these panders as one of theires.

Nor (if it please your Excellent Majesty) you are one of these nursing Fathers of the Church of God blessed bee his name therefore: and in this high calling (by Gods
Gods providence you have this Ministry of the Sacraments rescued out of the popish Brothells, and brought into your owne care and keeping. Here therefore be pleased to set before your eyes the fore said example of a good Father in those things which yet remaine to be performed, i.e. in providing for the credit of this your reduced daughter and so of your whole Family, not only in this your Flourishing Kingdom, but also in the Catholike Church of Christ wherof you are a citizen, unto whom a principall part therof as an honorable familye is Committed in trust.

This is that which all the Godly throughout the Christian world doe expect from your hand, and that the more earnestly because they know that God bath enriched you with such excellent gifts, placed you in so high a place almost above all others; even to this very end, that you might remove from the Ministry of the Sacraments all those popish trinkets, wherewith it hath bin fearfully prophane, and restore unto it agayne that virgin-like attyre, wher-
wherewith it was of old adorned by the high King of Kings, and lawgiver Christ the Lord in his holy Institutions. So shall your faith and fidelitye bee famous throughout the Christian world: and the Church of England grow more honorable under your Government.

The Latyn vwords of Iohannes Alasco himselfe.

Serenit-
Serenissimo Regi

EDVARD O

SEXTO

Deigratia, Angliæ, Franciæ, & Hiberniæ Monarchæ, Fidei verae, Catholicae, & Apostolicae, Defensori; Omnium (in suis dictioribus) personarum &c.

IOHANNES A LASCO, &c.

Ecate facit Pater, laudemque meretur procul dubio, si Filiam Virginem, dolis lenonum, ad ganeas forte abrepam, rituque jam meritricis ornatam, protinus illinc eximant, incolumi adhuc pudicitia illius, inque suas rursum ipsius ædes reducat: Sed idem (:) (:) latis
fasit non esse putat, ad tuendam suam, filiaeque illius; & toius adeo familiae sua honestatem, exermisse et ganeis siliam inque suas ades reduxisse, nisi illii id tosum plane detrahat, quod in ganeis illis, pro ornatu meretricio haberis videt. Necque disquisit, undenam ornatus ille originem suam habeat: sed indecorum sibi, adeoque et calitate filiae sua, & familiae etiam toius indigivm esse judicat, ut aliquid omnino ejusmodi domi sua conspiciatur, undecunque tandem deductum esset, quod in ganeis ipsis pro ornatu meretricio haberis non ignorat. Necque hic audit eorum persuasiones, qui omnia ex Patris arbitrio domi sua, aestimanda esse dicunt, & proinde ornatum quoque meretricium illum in ganeis, honestissimum jam fore putant domi paternae, cum filiae illi, tum etiam reliquae toti familiae, si quidem paterna autoritate comprobaretur; eoque quod in Patris id potestate positum esse videatur, ut quae illi probantur, ea jam honesta etiam domi sua omnia esse censeantur. Intelligit enim, etiam si domi sua, pro honestis haberentur omnia quae ipse sua authoritate comprobasset; honestatem tamen filiae illius, & familiae suae totius, non intradomesticos sibi duntaxat parietes suos, sed per totam
totam etiam civitatem reliquam, tuendam esse; ut omnem malam suspicionem, apud omnes omnino cives, a domo sua depellat: & cævet ne uillis rursus lenonibus, ullam deinceps etiam reposcenda denuò ad ganeas filiæ suæ occasionem quoquo modo relinquit, pro jure ipsorum; si quæ apud illam notæ adhuc tales, ganeis familiares, conspicerentur.

Ita vero, etiam Parentum loco sunt in Dei Ecclesia, veluti in civitate quadem, & Verbi, & Gladij Ministri omnes; habentque sibi concreditum ab ipsomet Domino Deo, veluti filiæ loco, purum ac legitimum ministerium Sacramentorum. Hic igitur istorum Ecclesiæ Parentum (ut ita jam loquamur) siedem ac studium nemo non merito laudaverit, si concreditum sibi ab ipsomet Deo (veluti filiam quandam) purum ac legitimum Sacramentorum ministerium, ab Antichristi Romani, & lenonum suorum ganeis, in quas vi ac tyrannide ipsorum abductum fuerat, in suas ipsorum domos rursus, in curam (inquam) ac custodiæ suam reduxerunt. Sed hie cogitare debent utrique, potissimum autem iij, qui non frustra Præcellentes Dei Ministri, Altorumque Ecclesiæ Dei a Spiritu Sancto vocantur, Reges (inquam)
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quam) ac Monarchæ Christiani, satis non esse, si
filiam illam e ganeis Papisticis, in ædes rurîus
suas ipsorum, hoc est, in curam custodiamque
suam recipiant, nisi eam etiam omni illo orna-
tu plane exuant, quem in ganeis ipsis, meretrici-
cium ornatum & esse, & haberì lciunt; nequid
ejusmodi domi ipsorum conspiciatur, quod pro
meretricio haberì possit: in ea potissimum ci-
vitate, in qua varia sunt adhuc judicia hominum;
neque ab uno homine gubernari possunt; & in
qua adhuc multam, infinitamque lenonum tur-
bâ superesse constat. Neq; hic audient persua-
iones illorum, qui ornatum ejusmodi (undecun-
que tandem desumptus est) honestum nihilomi-
nus domi paternè fore existimant, si Patris ipsius
authoritatem comprobetur. Intelligunt enim, non
totù Civitati omnino, non totù (inquam) Dei
Ecclesiè, sed parti duntaxat illius alicui, veluti
dominii ac familiae cuidam præesse: et proinde,
etiam si domi suæ, pro honestis jam haberì vi-
deant, que ipsi sua authority comprobassent;
sui interim officij esse agnoscant (quatenus equi-
dem castitatis amìntes, publicæq; honestatis stu-
diosi haberì volunt) ut filiè illius, totiusque adeo
familiae suæ honestatem, non inter domesticos
tan-
tantum parietes suos, sed per totam illam civitatem etiam, omni studio, ac cura tueantur, nihili-que domi sua conspici patiantur, quod in ejusdem civitatis ganeis, ac lupanaribus, maximo lenonum omnium conatu, ac tyrannide, pro meretricio haberi interim, urgerique, ac propagnari vident. Postremo, cavendum sibi modis omnibus esse putant, ne eidem lenonibus rursum, aut eorum similibus, ullam omnino occasionem (pro jure ipsorum) relinquant, quoquomodo repolcendo filiæ illius suæ; si quæ notæ adhuc (ganeis illis familiaris) apud illam conspicere- tur.

Iam vero tu quoque unus es ex hisce Ecclesiæ Dei Altioribus (Rex Serenissime) quo quidem nomine, summas Deo Patri nostro coelesti gratias agimus. Et concreditum tibi, in præcellenti vocacione hactua, a Domino Deo, Sacramentorum Ministerium, veluti filiam quandam, ganeis jam Papisticis, in tuas rursum ædes (Divino beneficio) hoc est, in curam ac custodiam tuam domesticam reductum habes. Hic tu igitur ti- bi quoque sequendum esse cogitabis, in his quæ adhuc restant, propositum jam boni Parentis exemplum, in tuenda reductæ filiæ, totiusque a- [:] [:] 3  deo
deo familiae tuae, publica honestate, non tantum
in Regno tuo florentissimo, sed in Catholica
etiam Christi Ecclesia, cujus alioqui & ipse civis
es, ejus partem pulcherrimam, veluti in signem
iullius familiam tibi concreditam habes. Hoc vero
abs te pij omnes, toto orbe Christiano, exspectant.
Et quidem tanto magiore desiderio, quanto
majoribus atque excellentioribus donis tua Domino Deo nostro ornatum, ac sublimiore etiam,
supra alios fere omnes, loco, positum esse non
ignorant: nempe ut Sacramentorum Ministeriium,
illecebris meretricij, in Papae ganeis, ne-
fandissimè profanatum, omni illarum ornatu
meretriciæ exuas; suoque illud ornatu virgineo
rursus induas; quo videlicet a summo illo Re-
gum omnium Regem ac Nomothete, Christo
Domino, in suis institutionibus ornatum esse
constat. Sic enim nota demum erit toti Ecclesia
Christi, fides tua, in tuenda filia tibi concredite,
non domi modo tuae, sed toto etiam orbe terrarum,
publica honestate.
THE PREFACE.

Hey who put to sea, according to their several scopes & purposes, so doe they steer their Compasses, & proceed in their travels answerabley. Such as sett out meereely to satisfy their pleasure, or some private end; when once the heavens begin to be besett with clouds, the winds grow high, & the storme approaching threatens apparent danger, when their companyes are scattered & severed from them, or when the soulenes of their stomacks and the noyseome humors ther, cause, that they cannot brooke the sea, but with much tedious disquiet & sickness; They turne their courses & make to shoaer with as much speede as they may.

Others who seriously intend to make a voyage of it, & are bound for some remote place, & resolved to fetch some precious commodityes from a farr country; they reckon upon hazards, expect the common calamities of the sea, & determine to undergo, what ever they
they doe expect, or shall befall. The conclusion is: willing they are to adventure the losse of their lives, but not willing to loose their voyage; therefore on they will: extreme necessities may overbear them, but no fears can discourage them in their course.

As thus it fares in traveling, so fares it also, with men in professing the truth; their aymes are several, & their proceedings suitable therunto: Some take up the professsion of the truth, as a voyage of pleasure: such will be sure, to sayle no further, then that they may see the smoke of their own chimneys: they will serve Christ no longer, then they may serve their owne turnes, and therefore such will have no more of the gospell, then they may have their owne private with it, not only within sight, but within reach: And its admirable to see, what falsenes they discover in their course, & yet what faire colores, they putt upon all their proceedings, & would beare the world in hand, they wvishnothing but soundnes, when indeed ther is nothing but shevves & appearances, to please a sensuall eye:

Its not amisse therefor, to take the scantling of both these kinds, that the Judicions Reader may be able to owne them as they appeare in his way, either in their writings, or behaviours: for the lives of men are like
PRÆFACE.

like living books, which a wise man will search into, & observe: To this purpose therefore we shall shortly consider: 1. What is the cause of this declining? 2. What be the pretenses, whereby they labor to excuse it?

The cause of this declining, is the entertainment of the truth upon false grounds: The apple which is unsound at the core, will discover rottenness in the skinne afterwards: when the foundation is not sure the whole frame will synke, when its shaken by the least storme.

Some there be, like the stony-hearted hearers, who from the present apprehension of the comforts & promises of the gospell, are tickled with the sweetnesse the rofe, though but in general conceaved, & have their hearts sudainly cheared, with the confused & unapplyed grounds of good; And therefore they are sayd to receive itsuddainly with joy:

But as they flourish speedily, so doe they fade assoone: for these flashes of comfort, as they arise not from any deepe root of an humbled & self denying heart: So they leave no deepe stamp or impression upon the Spirit: and threfore when sad & heavy pressures of sorrow doe cease upon the soule, these slight impressions of flashy joy vanish away: These
PRAEACE.

These comforts in Temporaries, are like the painting & complexion, 
which is layd upon the face by deformed harlotts, 
which the least violence of cold, or heat takes off immediatly; 
whereas, a sound joy issuing from grounded assurance, is like ruddy complexion, 
which ariseth from good blood, & a wholesome constitution, 
which the greatest heats or colds may increase, but cannot remoue as long as life & strength lasteth:

Others agayne are brought to imbrace the truth because of the company or multitude, 
which they see give credit or countenance therunto: thus the Pharisee 
would not to heaven unleasse he might go in the crowd. 
Or because of the safty & commodity 
which the Lord somtimes voutsafes to sincere Professors. Thus many turned Jewes in Ester styme, not because they 
were the better, but the stronger party; not for the 
truth of their profession, but for the safty of the Professors. These attend upon Christ for the loaves and 
follow the gospel no longer then profit followes them. 
The name of a prison, the noyse of a chaine, makes the 
truth so deformed in their eye, that they dare not, 
& therefore evil not ovnve it. As the leaves of a tree, 
while they be fed with moisture, drawn up into 
the branches by the Sunne in the springe, they flourish and
PRÆFACE.

and cold frost drive back the moysture, they wither & fall. Like these leaves, is the love of these wordly gospellers. An instance of this temper is apparant in many of our Elizabeth Professors (as they are termed) who were whit at the entrance of the Gospel, when company, credit, & profite were attendants to it: but when the frovyne & displeasure of authority, like vynter blasts, plucked away their livings & dignities which were as the moysture, to feed their desires, they dried away in their discretion & retained nothing but the name of auncient Professors, like boxes in Apothecaryes shops, which carr gayre titles on the outsyde, & fill up roome, but have not one healing or usefull drugge in them.

A third sort ther be, who at the first appearing of the gospel in a place, are taken up with the strangenes and novelty, yeither of the Doctrine, or the manner of delivery, & answerablely with some affection make inquiry after it. This was their prætishe, when Iohn Baptist came preaching in the wildernes, then went out to him Hierusalem, & all Iudea, & all the Region about Iordan. This also our Saviour acknowledged as ther indeavor. Ihon vvas a buring & a shining light, & you vwould have a 2 rejoy-
PRÆFACE.

It befalls the Gospel in this case, as it doth with some strange commodity: when it first comes to view, many see & cheapen, until the price proves too heavy, & then they depart & will not buy: So here: when our Saviour sets open the sale of the gospel, in some obscure place, many will be comers, hearers, Cheapners, until they finde that the word grovves somewhat high-rated, & the conditions of the Gospel seeme too hard, & then they for sake it. Herod welcomes Iohn Baptist, & observes him, but at last murthers him.

Others lastly, after some sad conviction of the truth revealed, as also of the necessity and excellency thereof, hold it a point of honor, to persevere in the defense & maintenance of it: and hence for their owne praise, may, & doe Suffer heavy persecutions, as, poverty, Exile in the profession of the truth, the power whether of they never approved in the exactnes of it.

Thus many in Queene Maryes dayes, were exiled for the Gospel, who afterward returned into England, & opposed, yea persecuted the power & accuracies practise of it.

For ther is a nick of temptation, which frustrates the humor of these temporizing hypocrites, & discovers them in their
PRÆFACE.

in their colours: & hence it is, that these of Diotrephes his generation, could endure banishment, because that hundred not, but promoted their honor in that kynd of suffering: yet when they came into place of supremacy, fell to beating of their fellow brethren, as conceiving the strictnes of their course, caryed a condemnation of their carelesse and pompous sensuality.

Ve have seen the causes, consider we now the excuses they would pretend for themselves. And beas mens corruptions are diverse, & all more or lesse strongly, their shifts cary more or lesse appearance with them. Here first your Statist is most grosse, to whom his Religion is as his coyne: All that goes for currant gospel with him, that is stamped with the authority & allowance of the State: He is hovering betwixt severall Religions, that he may take any for his turne, waits & eys, to see which syde is like to prosper, that so he may be of the safest syde: And he he setteth him self with the name of a Christian Churche, & the substance of Religion. And what ever things are like to prove trouble some, these he will make indifferent, that he may take them, or leave them, as he likes best for his ease.

He complaynes much of the restlessse strictnesse of mens Spirits, who cannot see when they are a veil,
PRÆFAECE.

Very, put too great weight upon things, that are of no
worth, and upon trifles. He crieth out for Discre-
tion as that which would umpire & determine all
doubts. And therfore he can run with the bare,
& should with the hound: (by discretion) He will
do anything, rather then suffer any thing: (by dis-
cretion.) He can soder with the tymes, & vinke at the
syntes of men, yea svalow them downe, though with
reluctance of conscience, & that he termes tolerating;
& all (by discretion.) Authority is instead of all ar-
guments to this man, he enquires after no other ground
or warrant.

The Temporary Gospeller having had some touch
of Religion, & light of truth, in his mynde, can fynd no
rest unto his conscience, unless he have some shew of
reason to allege: for he remembers the charge of the
Apostle: ye are redeemed with a price: be not the ser-
vants of men: he recalls the limitation of Gods com-
mand: obey in the Lord: that we ought to be follo-
vvers of the Apostles no farther then they vver
follovers of Christ. That the utmost extent of our
Saviours commision to teach, & for men to obey was:
That men should be taught, to observe all that he
commanded, not that men commanded.
PRÆFACE.

Resolving therfor to decline, they seek to catch at any appearance, which they may plead for their declining. And because they are most led by example, and sense, these are the weapons with which they use to ward themselves, & maintain their course.

Common example carries a persuading power with them, its a sufficient reason for their doing because they see it is done. Here they take up their stand. All men for the most part do so, & why may not they? Thus like sheep they follow the drove though it be to the shambles. Especially if they heare of any noted & famous for piety, & godlines to goe in such a way, they conclude forthwith, it is the right way: reasoning thus: They are wise and godly, & think you, they durst do it, they wou'd do it, unlesse it were good and pious? when the truth hath told us, that all men are liers, & eyther doe, or may deceive, or be deceive, even the courses of the strictest saynts have the crackings: Peter was a good man, & yet dissembled: and Barnabas was a good man, & yet was snatch'd away by example into the same dissimulation. What madness is it, because a wise man happily falls into the mire, that we should foule ourselves & wallow with him? But the mayne bulwark whereby they beat back all assaults, is if they
can hould out some Ecclesiastical Canon; The Church enjoynes it, & are you wiser then The Church? This strikes it dead, no man must dare to dispute any further; nay they count it unreasonable, once to demurr or doubt any more: but expect, that al men should captivate their conceits presently, & put off reason, & pluck out their eyes, to see by other mens spectacles: which is intruth not only to cease to be Christians, but to be men.

Not that I detract any due respect & esteeme, which each man should have both in opinion & affection of the true Church of Christ: I know she is the spouse of Christ, yet but the spouse. It is enough that she is next to her head, the Lord Jesus, she must not usurp to be head, her powuer is subordinat not supreme, ministerium not imperium, she must deliver the lawes which she hath receaved, from her King, not dare to make lawes: And therfore we must beware, lest phyle (for our ownees) we would honor the Church too much, we dishonor Christ, we wrong & grieve both: To crush therefore the former Cavil, & objection: I answer several things.

It is the Romish tenet, to a hayre, & one of the most fullsom poynts, & loathsom dregs of the fylth of Pope-ry. The Jesuits themselves having no other bottom the
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they beare up, or to build up, their blynd obedience. An opinion constantly & unanimously opposed by all our Divines (Chamier de votis, lib. ii. cap. ii.) abhorred by all Christian self denying, and sincere-believing hearts; For what is it else, but to jusle Christ out of his prophetical & Kingly office: to resolve our faith & obedience lastly, into the determinations & commands of men?

2. Why are the Berreans commended for examining Paul's Doctrin? Why are all men enjoyned to trye all things, & to hold that which is good; If we be bound to take our Religion upon trust from the authority of the Churche?

3. If Paul an Apostle & Doctor of the gentiles, displaumeg all such souveraignty as tyrannical usurpaition, what man or Church dare chalenge it? But displaume it be doeth. 2. Cor. i. last. Not that we have dominion over your faith, but are helpers of your joy, for by faith you stand.

4. Had men, or Churches, power to coyne Ecclesiastical Canons, to forge new articles of faith, to make these senses of the Scripture Authentick, which suited their mynds, and to charge these upon the consciences of men, as necessary to be beleived, Believers should not stand by
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by their faith, but they, and their faith, should stand or fall, according to the feeble determination of men.

s. If the faith of particular men depend upon the Church; upon what doth the faith of the Church depend? Either they be the rule; (which is too loathsome to affirm) or else they are guided by the rule of the Word, in their determinations, which begets both saving light in their minds, & sound faith in their hearts: Eph. 20. 10. Rom. 17. And if the Word be able to give them light & faith, why not others as well as them?

6. The authority of the Church, unto which we must captivate our judgements, must either be the authority of the Universal Church, which is étheth nothing but in the particulars; & these have varied in opinion, & practice, touching Ceremonies, & therfor cannot setle us in a certaine determination; Or it must be the authority of a particular Church; but particular Churches have not only erred, but departed from the faith: Vvho Lorded it oter the law? did not the Church: 14. Math. 10? Vvho condemned & crucified the Lord? (did not the Church?) Vvho persecuted the Apostles & forbad them to preach & publish the Gospel? (did not the Church?) And this which
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which is sayd of Churches, is true of Counsels, of all kynds, as experience of all ages hath made it good.

Others of this rank, plead the love of their people, the necessity of preaching, & hope of doing good: how precions mens paynes are, & what need of labours in the vynyard. And therefore conclude, if all men should sit doyvur in silence, as some doe, the ruyn of the Church must needs follow. They confesse (its true indeed) these popish reliques, which are the bane of the Churches peace, being unprofitable & needless, may scandalous & offensive, should be removed. But when they weigh that heavy charge: VVoif I: preach not the Gospel, they are then unwilling to beare all, rather then to deprive the Church of the benefit, & the soules of Gods people, of the profit & comfort of their ministerye: whereas alas al this pretence of mercy is a miserable mistake, & commonly that worldly watch-word (of favour thy self) lyes closely covered under these curious florishes of care & compassion for the common good. For the question is not, whether preaching be precions, or the paynes of faithfull Ministers profitable? But the doubt here is, whether we may come to doe lawful things, by unlawful meanes? To synne, that we may doe service? As though...
the Lord had need of my lye; or else that he could not bring his servants to his own haven, without the devils boat; or that Christ could not uphold his own kingdom without the paynes of preaching of some men; now I conceive, it is undeniably evident, that the suffering in the time of Queene Maryes dayes, did more settle & enlarge the bounds of the Gospel, then all the preaching did in King Edward the sixt his reigne.

Others speak out, & deale downe right; profess, it is agaynst the hayre, & their hearts, to doe this drudgery, but they are not able to undergoe the extreme pressure which followes the refusal of them: Nay its certaine, some have openly protested, that, if it were but half an houre hanging, they would rather suffer it, then subscribe. But for them & theirs, to lie in the ditch, & to be cast into a bylynd corner, like broken ves-

sels; yea they & their families to dye many hunderd deaths, by extreme misery, before they could come unto their graves; This they were not able to undergoe. A condition, I acknowledge, which needs & deserves great deale of pity & commiseration, since it is true, that some kinds of oppression make a man mad: But oh that the God of mercy would put it into the mynds & hearts of those whem it doth concerne, that they would never suffer
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suffer such refuse reliques, longe, to hazard, not only the
comorts, but even the consciences & happines of many
distressed soules.

There is a third & last sort of men, more ingenuous
then the former, who, when they see, that such co-

tours (of excuses, formerly propounded) are not layd in
oyle, & therefore will not continue, nor can give them
any encouragement in their course; such feeble pleas being
like figg leaves, which cannot cover the nakednes of
their cause, being neither true in themselves, nor honora-
ble to their proceedings: They come to the mayne holds
and professe the things are lawfull, & commendable,
& therefore they doe no more but what they may, nay
what they ought. And whereas they have beene
of another mynd, they diversely discover the causes of
their change; as they are diversely affected, or have a
greater stroke of conscience, & conviction of judg-

One man acknowledgeth, he hath beene long stragge-
ring, about the things in question: But now he hath
gott greater light, sees more, & understands better.
And yet no man could ever see, his candell lighted, his
arguments alleged, nor yet were his overswaying rea-
sions, ever offered to slanning.

Nay
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Nay if be put hard to, it will appeare he hath none: yea he is not acquainted with the things he doth, if he come to give an account of what he hath done. Only you must believe, he hath private arguments, which doe overpover his judgement: Otherwise he must graunt, he doth praetise without ground & reason: The summe in short is, he hath gotten a perspective about him, and perceyves that ease, & liberty is good, therefore (Issachar like) is resolved to sit under his burden: he sees the way by sullenlowing of ceremonies, how to sleepe in a wholleskinne, & that course he takes.

If some searching truth delivered in publike, press him, or some sincere hearted freind persuade him to further inquiry, he seeks after the truth, as a coward doth for his enemy, being a frayd to fynd it. Loath he is, to be in the society of such, who he conceaves to be eyther Indicuous in their dispute, or Zealous in their course, agaynst this trash. Secretly desirous, that others should not occasion conference, or that suche should not enter into serions communicatios of these things, & if they doe, he is weary of it, & blames the Author of the discourse, as that more savory or seasionable talk were shut out: When he goes for counsel, and direction, it is to some such Authors, who write for the things he would praetise.

His falshood in his teach.
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practife, or consub stance ly with those men, that professe
to mayntayne them, & so they make up the match at
myndight.

But if yet, their owne consciences, the arguments or
persuasions of others, provoke to a more serious exami-
nation of both sides: How stedfastly & unwillingly goe they to the worke? Commonly they make choice of
the weakest; whose opinion they know, to be crosse,
to their course: or if they advise with other, of more
able understanding, it is upon a start or suddayne, that
ther can be no sad dispute, & if yet such arguments fall,
which they are not able to gaynsay: They goe their way,
& can teel how to forget or neglect them, & professe
they were with such, but could not be convinced,
or see any sufficient reason to sette their judgmen
t. But when they consult with such, whose opini-
ons they know will please their palates, & persuade
them to that, which, they are resoiled before hand to
practise: Though happily they propound no reason, but
only administer some grave counsel, or savory advise to
expreffe their owne resolution, or allege that place Rom.
13: 1. Let every soule be subject to the higher po-
wers, Oh they goe away with abundant content;
admire & thank him for his advise: professe they
never
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never heard so much, & that now he is fully settled, & hath his doubts answered to his desire, gives it out, that such a man is able to give satisfaction to any: when in the mean while, he never asked any argument, but took his bare opinion, because it pleased him, & yet will reject the reason sometimes of another, because it crosses him.

May be, it so falls out, that some new book of great note & expectation, is published, which might clear the cause to these men's contents: After they have viewed it, & wiped their eyes, all things then are so clear, that there is not a cloud in the sky, nay not a mote in the sunne: Ther was never said so much before: Oh this book of D. Burgesse, hath made all things evident to them, even to admiration, & conclude, it will do as much to any that reads it: So that, if men be not obstinate, they cannot, but be convinced.

But alas: these men, have they taken the arguments into serious consideration? Have they labored to search & examine the strength of them? Have they propounded them to such who are held most able, & judicious, of the other opinion, who do not find themselves, yet persuaded? Alas here is deep silence: Where is that ancient rule: Audi alteram partem? Where is that charge
The English of which speech or particular, in the book, persuades but the whole: the argument or argument in the books that prevails on his heart, and he need not say he should not suffer. Some of the arguments or argumets in the books that prevails on his heart, and he need not say he should not suffer. He may needs be of his authors faiths, who purposed to believe all the fables, or to doubt of what he says.

And so the man should be persuaded by his authors, who, he.

This preface to the Apology, for all things. It is not likely 1. That the charge of the Apology, for all things. It is not likely.
resolved to conforme: & I vwill be persuaded by Do-
ctor Burgesse his book to it, but neither I, nor you shall
know, what persuades me; that somy grounds not being
knowne, they cannot be answered, nor if unsettled any
more: oh the desperate folly of a declining heart, to be-
tray & deliver up it self unto the delusions of Satan!

There is lastly another sort of profound disputers in
the world, who apprehending their reache to be
beyond the reasons & writings of other men, have out
of the depth of their judgements, devised a uway judi-
ciously, to deceythe their owne soules; & out of their
pick-lock subtility, count it easy to make uway for
themselves, & mayntayne their uway in any question.
And this they do by making a maze of Divisions, &
cutt things in so many shreds, by multitudes of distin-
cutions, that at length they lose their cause, the truth,
& them selves also in the issue, & must of necessity be wil-
der the reader, unlesse he be of a searching judgement.
Thus kynd of distinguishing is like snuffing of the can-
dell too neare, putting out the light wholly, why se the
intend to make the light burne more cleare: so do the
men darken the truth, professing to discover more of it
pragnable examples of this kynd, the Rej. hath express
unto us, when to avoyd the dint of the argument con-
cerning
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cerning significant Cerem: & worship, his destin-
etions are so many & intricate, that one mem'ber de-
stroies another, & the true nature of worship also, as
may appeare in the 8s. of 136 pag: of the first part of this
Dispute.

All this I speake, not that I would fall out with
any, who is not of the same opinion with my self: for I
professe the contrary, in a word of truth: every man
abounds in his owne sense: Only this seems somewhat
greinous, & I conceaue also injurious to the truth, that
after all hard dealing, she cannot get an indifferent bea-
ring, Seing it is the fashion of the world, to have
mens persons in admiration, to gayne some countenance
thereby to their owne courses, And therefore to blow up
the fame of mens abilies, (as they do bladders) to the
utmost greatnes they can, that the greater warrant they
may seem to have, to follow their opinions & wayes.
And contrariwise, the person must be disparaged, when
we would have his cause, or work come into discredite:
a fashionable, but a shame lese peice of Rhetorick:
Thus the writing of the Repl: must be a pamphlet,
his manner of writing scurrilous, that when both
are thus disfigured, by the dirt and soote, to which the
Rej. hath flung upon them, it may be conceived, they
were
Where are so misshapen in their first frame: whereas the answer of the Rei: must be lifted up & proclaimed, worthy, learned, & judicious: which puts me in mynd of Demetrius his out-cry: 19. Acts: 28. Great is Diana of the Ephesians: the ground whereof was not so much the love of the Goddess, as the greedy desire of that great profit, they reaped therby: So here, the answer must be learned & judicious, that men may conforme learnedly, and judiciously.

Not that I envy the Drs. Honor, or would diminish anything of his due, but I cannot endure davyving, much lesse that the praise of men, should be advanced, to the prejudice of the truth. Laying aside therefore, all prejudice, & partiality, cast we the proceedings of the Repl. & Rejoy. into the scales of righteous consideration, & where the blame most appears, let the Reader lay it on, & let him beare it, to whom it is due by desert: And in this search, let no man think I intend or seek the Rej. his dishonor, for my witness is in heaven, I do not; nay I dare not doe it. I know the righteous judge would require it: but it is for the manifestation of truth, and innocency, where ever it is to be found.

That I may doe the Doctor right then, I will set downe the rules how farre the saylings of others may be lay,
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be layd open. 2. How far, & in what cases, some kynd of tartenes, & sting of indignation may be expressed, in pen or speech, as allowable in holy writ.

That we may lay forth the limits of the farst, & see how far the compass of our Christian Commission reacheth in the discovery of other faults, we must wisely distinguish of persons & synnes that so we may not be deceived.

Persons then undergo many conditions, & relations: some are members of the same congregation, who have covenanted, to walk in the fellowship of the faith of the Gospell: Others are subjects of the same commonwealth only, professing the truth.

Both these agaye; are there repenting or pertinacious, & incorrigible synners.

Synnes also are of sundry kynds; some are private; some are publike: both these agaye, are lesser scandalls: or more bainous & capitall synnes, which threaten apparant hazard to the publike good of a state, or the prosperons successse of the Gospell: Now out of these distinctions, such conclusions may easily be collected, which may give answer to the first question, so far as concerns our purpose: & these be 3.

In private offences, the rule of our Saviour takes place:
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place: If thy Brother offend, tell him his fault betwixt him & thee alone, if he heare thee, thou hast gayned thy Brother: if our admonition attayne the end, in removing the evill, we need not then crave further help, from any other, to redresse it. Beside, our Brother having regayned his honor by repenting, we should not cast the blott agayne upon him, by any fresh report.

2. If under private admonition, a Brother prove obstinate, & incorrigible, we may, & should publish, both person & fault to the congregation, as our Saviour in that case enjoyes it, as a duty to be discharged, & leaves it not to our freedome to omit: for the words, runn in force, & forme of a commaund: tell the Church.

3. If the offence be publike, either left upon record in writing, & made so notorious to all that will attend, & read it: or acted in some sollemne assembly, or in open view before many witnesses, laying aside malice, & envy, which may stir us, or sinfull and sinister ends, which may carry us hereunto, & spoyle this, & the best service. Its very lawfull, may (in case) very necessary, to speake of such miscariages, or write of them, as occasion may require, & that with out
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out all breach of love: whether we looke at others, who are but standers by, That they may not be scandalized, infected, or plucked away by the error of men: Or if we looke at the offenders themselves, by way of Caution, & wholesome prevention, we stopp the poison of their practice, that so they do no more harme to others; nor bring any more guilt upon their owne soules: then which what greater love and mercy can be showne, to our fellow Brethren?

And out of this ground, and after this manner it is, that we shall bring some of the Doctors miscarriages to consideration, and present them to the view of the Reader: but such only, which he himself hath made open and notorious, either by writing or practice: and that for this end alone, that the false colours which he hath putt upon his course, and proceedings, may not prejudice the truth in the hearts, or judgements of the ignorant, and unvary Readers; or any that are willing to decline, who would very fayne have the Doctors words without contention, that so they might follow him without feare, and this may suffice for
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answer to the first question, & the warrant for our way to wwalk in.

The second admitts satisfaction in short: to wit 
How far, & in what cases, some kind of tartnes may 
be expressed in pen or speech.

And ther be two instances in Scripture, which 
are plain & pregnant to this purpose, & left for our 
direction in this case.

The first is the behaviour of Elias, towards Idol 
laters & their Idolatrous practises. Whom he jeares 
to their faces, & out of a holy kind of indignation, 
sings with a bitter & a deriding Irony. For so the text: 
And it came to passe at noone, that Eliah mocked 
them, & sayd crye aloud, for he is a God, either he is tal 
kine, or is pursuing, or he is in a journey, or peradven 
ture he sleepe, & must be awoken: And hence it is, the 
Lord casts such loathsom terms of detestation, upon the 
Idoll, that he besparches the worse bippers therof with 
disdayne.

The second instance is touching ambitious false 
56. Say 10. teachers, or Idol shepherds. So Isaiah, his wwatch 
men are blynd, they are dumb doggs, they cannot 
bark, they are greedy doggs, they can never ha 
ve enough. So the Apost. Paul gyrs the consciences, 
of those
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of those silken Doctors of Corinth, & their followers: which slighted the simplicity of the Gospel. Cor. 4. 10. He are foole for Christ, & ye are wise in Christ; he are weake, & ye are strong; ye are honorable, & he are despised; These tart Ironicall speeches stab the heart, with a secret disdain, of their groundlesse, & ambitious folly: And indeed when the Lord enjoyns it as a duty, & makes it a note, & argument of a happy man, that a vyle person is contemned in his eyes; what expression of words, can suit such a contempt in the heart, unless they carry some tartnes of disdain, with them.

Ve now see our limits & allowance: let the judicious Reader according to this rule, consider of some Keene passages of the Reply: and I suppose it will be found, that the most of the, if not all, are pointed against the unwarrantable standings, & places, the intollerable, & ambitious courses of our Prelats, or else their seeming & self-deceiving arguments.

If in any he hath exceeded the bounds of sobriety, I profess, neither to defend, nor excuse it. I know the Replier himself will not allow it. For he hath silenced all such expressions in this second Reply; though he had never so just cause, to provoke him thereunto, & never
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never so great advantage given him by the miserable mistakes of the Rej. in many places: which if the Rej. had found in him, (He that can hauke after words with such eagernes) we should have had exclamations, Proclamations, & outcrys enough to have filled up a wordy & wryndy volume.

However, was the Reply: never so unworthy, to have the reproach of scurrility cast upon him, or his work; the Rie: was most unworthy & unfit to do it, who hath (I dare say) much exceeded in this kynd: How unseemly is it, & how ill sounds it, to heare the eues complayne of Robbers, harlots of adulteresse. The proverb is homely, but true: its a hard world, when hearring-men revile fisher-men. For proose whereof, I appeale to thyne eyes to be witneseses Christian Reader. And that I may proceed, according to Allegata probata, I will not look beyond my lyne: Only that picture which the Rej. hath made of himself, I judge it not only lawfull, but in this case necessary to present agayne to his veiw; that the world may know, & if God will, Doctor Burgesse also, may know himself, & what his spleen hath beene, against the people of the most High God, blessed for ever.

A tasi
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A TAST OF THE TARTNES OF DOCTOR BURGESSE HIS SPIRIT, IN THE SEVERAL PASSAGES OF HIS ANSWER.

This tartnes will appeare in 3 kindes.

1. His heavy Censures, and that of the very hearts, & consciences of men.

2. His open reviling of the persons of the no conformists; or secret inducements to bring them into distaste:

3. His keene & scornesfull jests, which are his pastime, frequently expressed through the whole.

Heavy Censures.

1. They who tell us, that all the Church may doe touching ri

CERTAINE QUÆRES, BY WHICH THESE PASSAGES MAY BE WEIGHED, IN THE BALANCE OF SERIOUS CONSIDERATION.

Of all, in general, the quæres are these: 1. If the Replier did any where give sentence of conformists consciences? 2. If he uttered any one bitter speach against all conformists? 3. If the former being negatively true, the rejoyners (in his over & under-lashings) was not overcon of his owne evil, rather then the repliers?

QUÆRE. 1.

1. If a man upon probability affirmes such a point, or out of ignorance & mistake, conclude i
PRÆFACE.

certaine, & so relate it, as by him conceived, doth he hereby necessarily manifest a spirit of contradiction, or the weakness of his owne apprehension?

2. If charity hopes the best, that can be conceived in reason, to judge mens spirits by grounds weake, & feeble, out of which nothing can be concluded.

Quære, whether it be not uncharitable censuring?

3. Do all those who contradict the like conceites of the Rej: as false, manifest a sinfull spirit in lusting after contradiction?

Quære 2.

Whether may not a man mistake a thing plaine, & be of no contentious spirit?

Whether in such a mistake, is it certaine God smites with giddines?

Whether is not this to judge mens consciences, beyond warrant of any word of God, or the nature of the work wil beare?

3. The
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3. The Convocation house is not so likely to conclude &c. as this Libeller, is to come to shame for his factious, and intollerable comparison, unless God humble him. p. 62.

1. Whether these words come from a calme loving & meekful spirit?

2. Whether God may not abate a man, for his false executing judgments here: or may lay many punishments on him beside open shame?

3. Whether these definitive determinations of judgments upon men, for some light differences, & those not so cleare, but not to jussle God out of the place of justice: & to cast thunderbolts where he doth not?

But if the replier make his expression good by his defense, and he hath; is not this a strange censure, upon so small a thing, to strange a mistake?

Quære 3.

Quære 4.

Whether this charge issue (they...
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(they) must either be condemned of grosse corruption, or excused, as having some good meaning: yet much weaknes with all, scil. in (comparison of them) and this pride makes them so scornesfull: p. 65.

not out of a principle, desirous to make the Persons of non conformists, odious to all, proclaiming them as such, whose intollerable pride, scornes & contemnes, all men in regard of themselves?

Whether the Rej. his passion did not transport him beyond himself in this accusation, when it makes him contradict his owne confession? Preface: p. 5.

There be some moderate learned, Godly, loving, &c.

Whether his spleen is not great that would spare none, but even destroy the Nation of Nonconformists, in the esteeme of men: As Haman the Iues? For of all he speakes: They: Them.

Quære 5.

Whether he be not more charitable to Fryars, then Nonconformists since he knowes, what they have printed?

Quære 6.

6. And
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6. And see how these men that talke and write in so haughty, 
and magistrates all a fashion, doe but gull, and deceiue them with the 
names of worthy men.

Which is so great and shame-
full a sinne, & in this Replyer, 
so frequent, that I wonder he 
dares dispute about Cerem: be-
fore he have learned the substan-
ce of common honesty: p. 83. in 
his alligations.

7. How can you beleue any 
truth, crosse to your opinion? 
When as you seek glory one of 
another, & presume of your new 
traditions, as if the spirit of 
truth came to you, or from you 
alone. p. 103.

Whether if this Repl. were 
faulty, was it reasonable to 
in the face of all Nonconfor-
mists? These men.

Whether the Rej. his con-
sience in cold blood dare sa 
that their is not amongst the 
NonConformists, the truths 
worthines, but only the name.

When in his preface he that 
writes p. 3. some peacable & v 
very Worthy Ministers were ca 
out.

Quære 7.

Whether they that cannot en-
tertaine truth crosse to their op-
inion, & seek honor one from 
another, can have any truth 
grace? our saviour seemes in 
gainst it 5.Iohn. And therefor 
whether there be any color 
of argument, for the Rej. to con 
demne al Nonconformists, or 
such, whom this charge con 
demnes?

Quære. 8.

Whether doth the vilefyin 
ment.
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...ments, y which he would be lasth, one should apply to the baire of his heade, It savoureth of a spirit of rancor, as doth the like foule speech, in the Scotch Dialogue. God will judge them for these reproches, by which they labor, to breed scorne, and abhorring of these, in the minds of ignorant men. p. 131.

Quære 9.

This slim-slam Master. Jacob let you, and both he, and you take it up, merely for a shift, Not out of conscience, or judgement; but of haughty desire of defending, what you have once spoke. 207.

How knowes the Rej: but they might do it out of ignorance, & an error of ignorance may stand with a good conscience?

How knowes the Rej: that it was a haughty desire, & no other passion?

But if all this be mayntained, is not the Rej: extremely harsh in his censures, when no room will serve him, unlese he sit upon mens consciences, & Pilar-like condemne the innocent?

Quære 10.

If one call a non-conformity:
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A good Christian, doth he press he a strong favor of separation?

He that names a Nonconformitant a good Christian, he conclude, that the adversaryes to the Bish. are the good Christians;

Quære whether reason, opinion agaynst all colour of reason make these consequences, whether the Rej. would us to make the like out of words, when he calleth Comists, the faithful servant Christ, as he doth pag. 628.

Quære 11.

Would not the Rej. Nonconformitant a good men, who shall commit sin as condemnation of hell, and being voydo of calling, reason, conscience, doing.

Where doth this Repl. condemn all that are not his part, not of their part, but part of their part.

160. QuærEncode error in text.
The text appears to be a historical or religious document discussing the differences between Non-conformists and conformists. It mentions the necessity of the Church of England and the consequences of non-conformity. The text also refers to the judgment and conscience of those who dissent from the Church's teachings.

The document seems to argue for the superiority of the Church of England and against the dissenting views of Non-conformists. It touches on the importance of faithfulness and the role of Christ's servants in upholding the Church's teachings.

Specifically, the text states:

"Whether these hundred and one ministers, having met at the conclusion of the year, were accused, or against the several conscience of unreasonableness of the opposition (Ecclesiastical) speak, (or) whether they suspect, or whether there is no guarantee of the serenity of the dissenters, or whether they are for the body of the unity of common prayer, or whether the Non-conformist gather themselves together, (or) whether they gather as such. In all this, the name of brethren, The Church of Christ is the good Christ, and as such they have had the like affections, and it is also said in the conformists, page 628. Whether this imputation is..."
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him quite away: 222: pag. not to bring them into f & dissatisfaction of the state?

13. The taming of our Cerem: Popish, is done out of faction, &; to make the imposers, 
&; Observers of them, hatefull with the people of God, which I beleue no Church would suffer, I am sure it should not: pag. 238.

14. This man forseth his writ, & I feare his conscience also, &; doth not beleue himselfe, when he sayth, that these Cerem. are imposed as parts of Gods worship, but only for faction &; opposition, would sayne have it thought so, that their opposition might be justified before men. 243. p.

15. For a vvarangling spirit, yea an ill conscience, is so playnly to be observed, while he studies...
Præfæce.

Nor is it rightly taken up, that these men are counted factious, for neglect of Ceremonious Canons, upon conscience, but for stiffe opposition to Ecclesiastical lawes, which they despitelys speake, & write against, & for contempt of these statute lawes, by which the book of common prayer is established. For that they draw as fast as they can into a body of themselves, ingrossing a forehand, the name of brethren. The Godly the Church, the good Christians, as though we had lost our Christ, they had found.

Quære 12. 13.

Whether these hundreds of ministers silenced at the beginning of K. I. were despitful speakers agaynst the cerem: or conscientable forbearers of their use?

Whether these, who desire to subscribe according to law, be despisers of the law, or those who deny them the benefit of it?

Where is that body, into which the Non-conformitants gather themselves?

How appears it, that they ever ingrossed such Titles to them selves, so as to deny them to all others: or more than the Rej. ingrosseth the title of the faithfull servants of Christ, unto conformists, pag. 628.

Whether this imputation be

him
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Thus masterly to judge the Lords worthyes? 387. p.

18. This answer you think good to give: because you are resolved to sinke the reputation of all men, ancient or latter, how learned, & zealous soever they were, rather then to confess your own mistake.

Open Revilings of the Persons of Non-conformists: or secret inducements to bring them into distast.

In s2. pag: of the Preface: some Nonconformists are brought in, & sayd to be of that temper: that when the removall of Ceremonly was mentioned: Their answer was. They must not have a hoof-

Quære 18.

Whether ther can be a he charge layd agaynst a man rotten hearted & unfit to be in the society of men? And yet lighter ground, & more in sient can be pretended to it up?

Quære, 19.

What if no man should knowne, what Mr. Knew told Dr. B: in private, conce of him of the same judgement: ergo Quære.

Whether it be safe for brethren, to betray their f to the Rej. his keeping?
1. It is a ridiculous supposition that all these furious bundles of rage, unless it be ingraft himself into the affections (which he calleth the confidences) and up-right railing. vol. 3, p. 633, Preface.

2. Whether the Rei. did not take up all the blind corners of his memory, to fetch out what Toldr. Knottfils of whom men into dith? world?

3. These two notes, note you to be an egregious prangler. p. 6.


5. I should be sorry to finde so much rudency, &c. fall, to lend more holinesse than their Ceremonies, did not prehend more holinesse than the Confront. Whether the Pharis., is more like the.
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6. How ever these men, who in effect say to all other men, stand backe, I am more holy then thou, &c.

7. What a shame is it for men to glory of sincerity, for refusing Cerem. And use no sincerity in all leading authors, 284.

8. But that use which the learned divines call Historical, these men call Religious, that they might by a false care-mark, bring us into suspicion abroad, & into hatred viht our Religious people at home, and yet they vwould be counted sincere men. 303.
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His tart jests & taunts are not as graines of salt, but so frequent, that they seeme as Pickle, in which the passages of his book are layd to steep, & therfore I wille but poynct at some number of places, to ease the reader, & my self.


And he not only takes, but seeks an occasion: yea is content to goe some miles about, to reache men a blow, who vvere of Godlines & vworth, by some slighting taunt to disparage their person, or vworks.

That judicious & paynfull laborer, & faithfull servant of Christ he flights, on this manner: Mr. Parkars Gaudye & passionate treatise of the crosse. A vvorke in truth, of that strength, & beauty, that it pleares & dazells the eyes of envy it self. And therfore men out of hope, either to imitate it, or ansvver it, vwould beare the vworld in hand, it was not vworth the vvhyle to spend labor in it.

But the Rej. vwiseth, some vwould reduce it to Logical
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Logical arguments: & then he doubts not, but it would soon be answered.

Which is such a mere put-off, & so unbecoming the skill of a Logical disputers, much more the champion-like confidence of Doctor Burgess, that had not his heart secretly misgiven him, in this seeming bravado, such an expression would never have faine from his penn.

For let any rational man be judge in this case. Are not Logical arguments plainly expressed in a continued discourse, & by a Logician easily collected? & what needs a reducing to a forme then?

Beside Mr. Parkars discourse is either empty, & void of senseves of sound reason, & then the weaknesses of it, is soon discovered, & may be confuted; yea disgraced with more ease; or else ther be arguments, of that solidity, & strength, which either the Rej. cannot reduce, or else is not able, or not willing to ansverse. To say he cannot reduce the to forme, is a thing too meane to imagine, nor will the Rej. graunt, nor will I, or do I thinke. To say he is not willing to ansverse, is to gaynsay his owne course, the profession
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Sign of his care, to traverse this cause, & his love to our Cerem: & the peace of our Church, so much pretended in his answer.

The third therefore must be concluded, for I do not see what fourth thing can be given.

Only, Did ever any answerer, serious & judicious, amongst Divines, of any kynd, Protestant Papist, Lutheran, propound such conditions, did ever any grant such? nay is it not to common sense ridiculous? For any Lutheran to send to a Calvinist, any Protestant to a Papist, having printed some serious treatise against them, to send I say this message; Wvell: you have printed a treatise here, & you place some, yea great confidence in it; if you Wwill (reduce it into syllogismes,) you shall be soon answered, & that there is nothing but bumbast, & painted vermilion put upon it? Spectatum admissi risum? Would not the Papists laugh in their sleeves, at such an answer, I will say no more: but only propound this forme to the Reij. & say him a labor to reduce it.

He that propounds such tearmes of answer, which never were yet asked, or granted, & indeed are unreasonable to yeeld: professeth he can no
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not make an anfwer, being unwilling therunto.
But such termes the Rej: craves. The like jirkes
he lends to M'. Jacob, p. 16. To Godly learned
Fenner. p. 38.
And he hath such a mynde to chide, that upon
the occasionall mentioning of one vword excre-
ment, he fetcheth a vagary into Scotland, as it
vvere, & sitts in judgement upon the Author of
the Scotch dialogue: pa. 131. I. 20. vwithout any con-
futation of any ground, vvhich I supose had better
suited his place, being an anfwerer, and not a
judge.

In like sort, he vilifies M'. Bradshaw: A pam-
phlet of things indifferent of M'. Bradshaw. pa. 188.
(your M'. Bradshaw) vVhom vve are not ashamed to ovvne, & suppose the Doctor vvould
haue beene afraudy to haue grappled vvith him, in
an arg: had he beene aliue.
Venerable M'. Cartwright he taketh up some-
time, as if he had vwritten upon præjudice,
vwithout judgemet. Thus much I thought good,
to adde in short, to vwipe avvay that supercilious
disdayne, cast here by the Doctor upon divers
of the Lords deare servants, many thousands of
vvhom
PRÆFACE.
Vvhom together, he accuseth after of stupiditie, or prejudice, even all that allovv not of Organs, in Divine service, or Psalms-singing. VVe shall novv summarilvly poyntt at the rest of the places, as an inventory or treasury of the Rej. tauts p. 47.l.22. p.50.l.7.8. p.52.l.33.34.35. p.55.l.26. p.113.l.32. p.120.l.12. p.130.l.10. p.141.l.latl. p.180.l.32. p.182.l.16 i7. p.213.l.18. p.247.l.21.22. p.312.l.6.7. p.315.l.11.12. p.316.l.10.

These are some of the many common places of scoffes, to be found in his booke, & are all containd vvithin the compasse of the three first chapters. as for the last, I had neither leysure, nor lift, to trouble the good reader, or myself, vvith vvriting them out.

Only to giue thee a guesse, hovv prittily the Rej. can play vvith vvords, fynd himself talk, & fill up pages: I shall take so much paynes, as to transcripte a place or tvvo: Thus he vvrites. p.66.

So this & those rules after added, are as the proverbe is, like a rope & butter, that if the one slip; the other may hold: So agayne.

p. 73. The truth is: Mr. Iacob could never get over the block, which Mr. Cartwright, & the Admonitors had
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had laid in his way (how ever Mr. Cartwright himself a man of more activity, made a shift to leap over it) namely thus: What soever is not commanded in the Word, must not be in the Church:

And yet Mr. Iacob, that he might seeme to hold fayre quarter vith Mr. Cartwright, & other learned Divines, who acknowledge, that certayne Ecclesiastical rites & Cerem: appropriated to holy actions, were left to the determination of the Church, under some generall rules of the Word, vvil seeme to allow somewhat, he cannot tell what, some circumstances only civil, or occasionall, as the tyme & place, which he rather calleth circumstances, then Cerem: that so, if any shall say, be allowveth nothing to the Churches determination, to be squared, by some rules: He may answer for himself & say: yes, certayne circumstances are; namely such as are necessary in civil, as sovell as sacred actions. If on the other side, one challenge him to give some liberty to men, for the ordaying of rites, which are but extrinsecall circumstances about the worship of God: He may answer for himself, he hath protested against all meere Ecclesiastical Rites, which are ordayned by men, & not left so much as one, to their determination.

Thus
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Thus, as he, that by turning of his picture of an horse, made it running, or a tumbling horse, which you would, so hath Mr. Jacob provided for himself, ther to square some circumstances, by 4. rules, or to put of all by another, as the market shall require.

This is the substance (Christian Reader) of a whole page almost: Touching which I would propound these Questions to thy consideration.

Whether it was not easy to make up a mاسب volume with such talk as this?

2. If a man should sett downe such like passages, word for word, & add an answer suitable, filled with such vvynde, would it not rather be accounted, & that justly, a blotting of paper, & abusing the reader, then rendering an answer of any vworth & satisfaction?

And by the survey of these particulars, collected out of the three first chapters, & comparing the Reply therewith, I am confident, it will soone appeare, to any not forstalled with prejudice, whether the replye, or ansvver, may most justly challenge & beare the name of scurrilous? And it will beasse evident that the Rey. had no cause to accuse the Repl. of scurrility, unless he would condemn
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demne himselfe not only, of the same crime; but of some what beside farre more synfull. For, though it be easily incident, I confesse, to our corrupt natures, out of a pange of pride & passion, to cast unbrotherly contempt upon such, who seem to crosse us in our opinions, & practices, when it comesto poynct of opposition, bevvixt some particular men & our selves; yet to vent such a masse of venome, in heavy censures, harsh Revilings, sligting Scornes, & that not agaynst one particular, which may appeare in competition, & opposition agaynst us, but even agaynst the generation of those, which refuse humane Ceremonies in Divine vvorship, many of our penne, & concesences acknowledge vworthy & Godly; Nay not only to vent these expressions, but to keepe them sovving, & leavening by us, in our hearts, & writings, many yeares, wherin we haue beene persyyvaded by freinds, & after persyyvations resolved, rather to haue the burned by others, or to burne them our selves; And yet after all this in colde blood, in saddest consideration, upon review, so far to approve of the, as to print & publish them to the vworld; Hovv such a mans
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An honest spirit is principled; & whether it was root of bitterns, or Godliness, yet it was thing issue: I leave it to the Almighty to judge, & to the wifehearted to dicene.

Therefore the vine of which I have to produc out of the Reis, his own writings. All that I define is that their depositions may be impartially weighed, & in this defines & indeavours ther is no wrong done.
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passionately by him, nor forged by me; he hath left the proof of them, under his own hand upon record, which I now have by me, and shall be bold, for fuller satisfaction, to set downe his own mynde in his own words.

In the 19. pag. of the Preface: The Rey. expresseth himself on this manner; I doe ingeniously confess two errors in that my Apology; one that I trusted too much to the quotations of the Abridgement, which then I had in writing:

To which Mr. Hildersham thus replies in his notes: How false the quotations are in the Abridgement, will be seen hereafter. But this is manifestly false that he was (before the writing of his Apology) deceaved thereby, or that he had a Copy of it in writing before that time. For the Abridgement was not made till after he was deprived: and therefore no man could have any copy of it, either in print or writing. Nay the large book (whereof it is an Abridgement,) was not delivered to his Majesty before that day he was deprived: and the Abridgement was made sundry months after. He proceeds Ibid: 19. p. It is true that the Ministers were resolved to have chosen him for one of those three, that should have disputed for them, (such profession he had made unto them of his full consent with
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With them in judgement, he had beene one of the disputants, if that (not the Deane of the Chappell; but the King himself, had not expressly (in his message) excepted against him: which also argues, that his Majesty did hold him to be fully of the mynde, that the rest (who had sent him the foresayd book) were of.

In his notes of the 20. pag: he hath these words. That ther is no colour of truth in this that he sayth here: i. e. (That when he was chosen to be one of those, that should mayntaine their cause by disputation, he professed to his Brethren, that he could not speake against the things as unlawful; but only as inconvenient) may appeare evidently to any reasonable man. For seeing they had in their book delivered to his Majesty our Kings Father, stated the question not against the inconvenience, but the unlawfulness of these things. Who will imagine, they would ever have chosen him to be one of the 3 to dispute for them, if he had professed to them at that tyme, that he had nothing to say against the unlawfulness of them? These be the dying words of that deare servant of God, as I have them to shewe in black & white.

If yet the witness of the dead deserve no credit:

The
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The Rej. may with some small consideration, recall to mynd, how after the Revolt, or change of his former opinion, in an occasionall concurrence & meeting of many fellow Brethren; when they out of humane Civility desired him to take his place according to his yeares & gifts; I say, he may (if he will bethink himself) easily recall, what words he then openly uttered to this, or like effect: He told the he was unworthy to sitt with them; to have respect from the, since he had betrayed them, & their cause. Now the cause which they mayntayned was not inconveniency: but unlawfulness in these things. If the Rej. his memory serve him not about this particular, let him repayre to Bambury Syde to his auncient friends there, & they can testify so much to his face. If then the construction that the King, & state, made of his course, the apprehension his fellow Brethren had of his practize: may his owne profession may be trusted: Let all the world, & Dr. Burgess his owne heart judge, whether he hath changed his opinion yea, or no?

In his preface, ther is not much that expects answer. For to omit his biting language, & devouring words, where we have cloyed the Reader in the foregoing Catalogue, and unto which ranke many Gibes here may be referred: as That pag. s. These do commonly call any small company of their party:

The
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The Church & the Christians of such a towne, 
As if Christ were (I say not divided amongst us) 
but wholly taken away from us, to them, & what 
wants this of Schisme in the heart, And that: pa. 9. 
The glory of suffering for (as they call it) the good 
cause: And that pa. 12. Others ayme at Schisme & 
Anabaptistical delusions: to let these pangs 
of spleene, & other distempered carriages, which he 
himself cast upon some passionate people & Strongly 
conceited. All of which being justly blamed, it neither 
hurts the cause against which he writes, nor helps 
that which he defends, since the most glorious Gospel 
of Christ hath such blotts cast upon it, by reason of the 
sinfull weaknesses of some, who take up the profes- 
sion therof; Leaving (I say) all these, as not worthy 
the consideration, we shall intreat the Rej. at his re-
turne to give some satisfaction to these queres.

1. Why Athesists, Papists, prophane varletts, 
brutish drunkards hellish blasphemers, together with 
the accursed crew of the most riotous vvretches; yea 
the Generation of Neutrals, morall formalists, igno-
rant sotts of all sorts, are so zealous for these Cerem. 
Are so violent to urge, so carefull to practise them, who 
ever had care of piety in all their lines?

2. Afte
PRÆFACE.

2. After the Lord's bath cast in some saving illumination into the mynd, convicted the conscience, & converted the hearts of scandalous sinners; after such have gained sweet peace of conscience, & assured evidence of God's love, sealed unto their souls; why do the hearts of such, rise in some strong indignation against these Popish reliques; when they have never beene persuaded therunto by teachers, nor had tyme from their owne inward troubles, to consider of them? That this is the disposition of many, I can speake by proof; I would have the Rej. speake to the reason of it.

3. When it is notorious to all the English world, that the most of the people (who live in the bosome of the Church, & professe the sayth) be wholly taken up with conformity, both approving & practising of it, countenancing those that do it: Why is the Doctor so troubled, that a few silly despicable people, void of wisdome (nay if his former charges be true) void of grace, should distast the Ceremonyes; when I know no Judicious Non-conformer, is disquieted that the crovde of the formall Gospellers should imbrace them? Why do the Rej. is searching the reason of these things, it may chance, he may either search or see his owne heart somewhat more clearly. Leaving then these to his considera-
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Proceed a little to survey the preface, & the substance of it may be referred to three heads: 1. He chargeth Non-conformity to be cause of many mischeifes. 2. He debateth the cure, & administreth that, which he conceaved most meet for redresse. 3. He makes a defense for himself, & writing: Against all which he except thus.

1. That his charge is not just.
2. His dealing in the cure not playne & through.
3. His defense in that where the firese lyes, either not equal, or not sufficient.

Come we to skanne the particulars: The mischeifs which he conceaves to issue from Non-conformity at no lesse then Separation & prophanesse. A heavy charge, I confess, but the best is, his reasons have such the voyayt of a rush.

1. That of separation, p. s. is supported upon so stend a grounde, that he bewrayes only his desire to have surpased his power: thersfore Rhetoricates in stead of reasoning. If these (sayth he) be Idolatrous vv worshipps, hovv can you? hovv dare you ioy vv with us, in those acts of Religion vvhierin the are used?

VV herein he neither concludeth the question, beca a man may refuse to ioyne in such acts, without sep
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deration, or utter condemning & renouncing all Church-communion: Neither doth he proue that, which he concludes about joyning in such acts, by any other argument but only by how can you, how dare you? To which I answer, we so can, & dare joyne in good acts, to which something participating of Idolatry is added, as Christ (our teacher) & his Apostles did joyne in the Ierusalem worship, unto which were added many superstitions, as unlawful, as we had our Ceremonies. Nay I will add one thing further, that, if D.B. be resolute in this point, i.e. that he must separate from all Churches, & Church actions, in which any superstition is exercised, then he must be one of the greatest Separatists in the world. For he holds the error of judgment to be superstition, & those superstitious Brethren, that absteyne for conscience sake from things lawful, though only upon error in judgment, must upon the former ground separate from all those Churches in whose Religious acts, anything in his judgment lawful, is so absteyned from; & much more if anything in his opinion unlawful, be put in practice: from one of which faults, few or no Churches will be found wholly free. Yet I vwould have another opinion of D. B. & I think, that though he hould be bovving to the altar, to be superstitious or Idolatrous, yet would he not,
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he not thersore seperate from the good prayers, & followv that ridiculous Ape of Idolatry.

That Other charge of prophaneness p.s. preten to come from praefenes, is so strange a consequenc, it can hardly vith deliberacion, be fathered in Non-conformity, vithout Non-conscience.

For strictnesse in matters of Cerem. hath no force, to bring forth loosenes in matters of subst then zele in matters of faith, & charity hath to forth carelessnes of both, nay then pure Religion be breed Atheisme.

Goe vve to experience: view the places Non-conformists liue; the people vvhom they the wayes of those vvhom they walk they be that haue reference to, & dependenc their persons, or ministervyes; & I suppose the the Churches, & the stones of the streets, vv testmony agaynst this accusation. Nay I su may speake it truly, as I profess, I think it, th one Non-conformable minister, hath beene a under God, to bring more soules to grace & then all the Cloysters, or Cathedralls in all Eng the same time, vwhere all Conformity hath dayly diet, v linelehood, of the people.
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Goe vve to reason: the best that either the Rej. or any beside, can make of our Cerem: is, that they are things indifferent. Now that vveake ones may doubt & stagger about such, That doubting, they ought not to practise them 14. Rom: last vers: is made a duty. That mens walking according to conscience, should be the cause of others disobedience; That keeping the law, should be an occasion in it self of prophaning the law; that stopping the very appearance of the least evil, should set open a gappe to the greatest; If appeale to any reasonable man, whether it be not a consequence void of common sense, unless men have a miraculous skill to sodr quicksilver, or tysande together, or make heauen & earth meet!

Last of all, it is remarkable that Doctor Burgesse himself pa. 8. doth impute these mischeifes unto civill vvarrs about Ceremonies: which if it be vwell weighed, it vwill manifest too much prejudice, in his former discourse. For in Civill vvarrs, the mischeifs ensuing on them, are not vront to be charged upon one part alone, & that poore, passive, overpowred, obnoxious to the suffering of what-soever pressures their opposites please to lay upon them, which is the Case of the Non-conformists in these Commotions: Tell us if pray b

your
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If in your conscience, the Prælats Canons, courses, Courts, & proceedings, have had no hand in working mischeife? nay diverse of these mischeifes, which you have affectedly placed on the other syde?

If non-residents, double treble beneficed men, unable, perverse, scandalous, half-Popish Ministers, have not had a finger in them? If those trumpetours, & drummers, who proclayme the innocency, & justnesse of our Prelats proceedings, have not brought something to the furtherance of these mischeifes? If you speake your conscience, it must needs say, yes; & so confesse, it was your passion, not your judgement, that obtruded all upon Non-conformity.

The state of this arrr is this: uvee (as it becometh Christians) stand upon the sufficiency of Christ's institutions, for all kynde of vvorship: and that exclusively, the vword, (say uve,) & nothing but the vword, in matters of Religious vvorship. The Prelats rise up on the other side, & will needs have all or uve, & use certayne humane Ceremonyes of Religion in our Christian vvorship. We desire to be excused, as houlding them unlawfull. Christ uve known: & all that cometh from him, uve are ready to imbrace. But these human Cerem: in divine vvorship uve known not,
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not, nor can have any thing to doe with them; upon this they make fierce uvarr upon us, & yet by the penne of D. B. lay all the fault of this uvarr, & the mischieves of it, upon our backs. Now all yee that passe by, consider, & judge, what equity is used, in such dealing? They will say, all things are to be done decently & in order. To which we unwillingly consent, but alledge agayne, thay we cannot apprehend these Cerem: to be necessary for order, & decency. They (as our Lords) tell us, it is enough for our Consciences, that They esteeme them so. Our Consciences tell us, this is to usurp the place of God, what can we say lesse, then that we will followe our Consciences, rather then their uvills?

To conclude, the Rej. p. 28s. maketh Circumcision lawful to be imposed, upon the same grounds, that our English Cerem: stand on. Now if it should please our Prelats in a Convocation to apoynt, that all English men should consent to the cutting of their fore-skins, & denounce uvarr upon those that should refuse this goodly Canon; was it not a grave Accusation, to lay all the mischieves of such a uvarr, upon those which would not conforme to such a Ceremony? But the weakest must alwaies goe to the uvall, & the Lamb

b 2 must
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must dye for troubling the water, if it please the Lyon, so to determine it.

VVe have done with the disease, & mischief together with the cause of it. VVe are now come to consider the Remedy the D' administers: & VVe except against his dealing herein as not playne; nay not profitable, even by his owne rules.

1. He deals not playnly. For making the Abolishing of the Cerem: by authority, to be one, & the chief course for cure, as despaying to obtayne that, he refuseth to perswade thereunto: Because forsooth: to judge what is most convenient, & to determine thereof, belongeth only to those, who to gether with power of doing what they shall well likke, haue judgement to make choice of the best way. VVhich is a vweake and a very unworthy conceit. For. 1. D. B. cannot deny, that those, who impose, urge, and with capitall punishments inforce these Cerem: upon Christts, Ministers and people, do therein abuse that authority, which they receaved for the procuring of the quietnesse, peace, & safety of those, that desire to serve God according to his word, & not for the troubling, vexing, & scandalizing of them, by opposing their
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Their meere wills, in Religious affayres, to mens Con-scences: depending wholly and only upon Gods Word; He cannot (I say) deny this to be a greivous sinne of those in place, & yet refuseth seriously to admonish them of the same, being called to give counsell, & advise about this very cause:

2. It is to be supposed that worthy Ministers of the Gospell, are not destitute of wisdome, and judgement concerning Religious affayres. By this reason therefore D. B. might as well have forborne to judge, what they should choose, as to determine so peremptorily thereof. Lastly, I would gladly know of D. B. whether the Scriptures be not able as well to make Magistrates, and Governours, perfect to every good worke, as they can do Ministers? Whether either Minister, or Magistrate should doe, or ought to doe any thing, which God hath not commanded them? Whether a saythfull Minister, in his office, ought not to understand, what that word reveales: ought not to teache all Magistrates what out of the word, he so understands? If all which particulars be playne & undeniable, it will appeare that it belonged to D. B. being called to give counsell, declaratively to judge & determine, what was convenient to be done:

h 3
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Which if he durst not declare, he durst not doe his duty. And that I may fasten this nayle yet more fully, I thus force the conclusion.

What ever duty of any calling, the word teacheth that the Minister by the word ought to judge determine, or deliver. Else how can he teach the whole counsel of God? how can he give every one his portion?

But the duties, and doings (if good) of all Magistrates the word teacheth.

Ergo the Minister ought to judge, or determine of those by the word, so to deliver them. Ergo it doth not belong to those onely, who have power, and in place, to judge or determine; which was the Doctors assertion.

Agayne: What ever God commands, that, and all that, the Minister should teach, or judge, or determine, else the trumpet should give an uncertain sound.

But what ever men, or Magistrates ought to doe, that Christ hath commanded. Both the parts of the argument are in 28. Math: [last v.] thersfor the conclusion followes: what ever men, or Magistrates ought to doe, Ministers should teach and
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and consequently judge, and determine.

And as thus the Rej. dealt not plainly in his case, so whether hath be dealt profitably, in that his receit, is agaynst his owne rule; as it shall appeare in the scanning of his defense: Which we except agaynst as insufficient in those particulars, wherein the stresse and weight of the pleasyes: And those appeare in three special obijections he makes: the dynt of none of which, he is able to decline.

The objections are pag. 12-13 & the summe of them in short is, this writing stirrs strife: ob. 2. exasperateth authority; Obj. 3. hinders the removeall of the Ceremonies.

Hear vve now his defense to each of these, in order: To the first he answers in truth by denial, that this course of his is so far from stirring the fire of contention, that its casting on water to quench it: & to this also belongs that p.n. there is a necessity that some should speake for the cause, unless vve shall suffer ourselves, not only to be rooted out of our livings, but which is worse, out of the hearts of our people, vvhom vve serve in the Lord.

Answ. bare denial without reason, yields small releif.
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releife to a cause, but when it is contrary to the word & it self, it betrayes a cause, doth not defend it: & such is this.

1. It is contrary to the word, & that staple was delivered by the Apostle, which he setts downe, as station, & shelter for the weak in the faith to take themselves unto. 14. Rom. 1. where the toleration of those, who are weak in the practised things indifferent, is ever the ground of contention & disturbance in the Church. And therefore this course of forbearance he infers, 19. v. as the way to follow peace: hence teacheth it also: when a company of passengers are confined to one way to passe, or one door to enter, it causeth them to crowd & jumble.

2. This Deniall is contrary to the Doctors own doctrine delivered in 3. pag. where its granted by him, and proved by the experience of threescore yeares: that opposition begetts opposition, & the which was given to stirr the humor, did only sharpen it. Putt we now the case to the College of Phisitians; may let D. B. himself be judge. Is it rational course? Or like to work a cure? that while the body hath beene distempered many moneths with phisick, we should still continue the same receipts.
And it is marvellous to see, how conviction wrests truth from a man, even against his own passion & purpose. Weigh these two passages, & see if they will accord?

The Doctor must write, that he may not be wrought out of the hearts of his people. pag. 11. And yet he confesseth by writing, he hath wrought himselfe out of the hearts of the godly. His defense to the 2. obj: is yet more feeble, though more ingenious: For his answerere is nothing but yeilding the cause, in some compasse and circumlocution of words.

For (1) when he grants: that he forbore some yeares this course of writing, that he might not exasperate authority: be privily, yea plainly yeilds, the objection had such rationall face in it, that it did not only press him, but prevayle with him also: Where as 2. he adds: that by this means he hath some hope to persuyvade some to conforme, & so to avoyd the lash of authority. By this he doth not only yeild the objection, but conforme & establish it. For if only those, who are persuyvaded by his answerere, shall avoyd the lash, therefore they who will not be persuyvaded, must expect the blow, and shall be sure to feel it.
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3. He adds for his owne intention: Sure I am that I desire not the vexation of any sober man: But his owne bond will not be taken, because he hath so often broke his word; he must seek for other sureties: (Quid verba audiam, cum facta videam:) Little power have words to persuade any of common understanding, when the practise goes the contrary way. Nor yet can I discern, how to judge of any mans desire, but only by his induavour. Those heavy accusations, uncharitable censures, whereby he chargeth & that with much bitterness, the generation of Non-conformists, from what root they come, & what desire they imply, let any rational man determine: For it cannot be to ingratiate them, or procure favor for them, in the affections of the Governors, when he makes them appeare such as deserve none; nay such as ought to receyve none, but the contrary at their hands.

Lastly when it is objected: That this course hinders the removeall of these things, which authority otherwise might possibly remove; His defense is: That he will never beleive, that authority will remove them, with dishonor of it self,
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self, as yeilding the things to be unlawfull, which it hath so long mayntayneed.

In which answer: these two particulars offer themselves to consideration.

1. To remove Cerem: as unlawfull, being long mayntayneed is a dishoner to Authority.

2. D. B. beleives, authority will not thus dishonor it self.

Answ: The first of which is a most dangerous assertion; & is made a chiefie barr to stay Papists, & others from reforming of any thing, that others have opposed, & they defended: And its usuall in the mouth of false flatterers, & back freinds to all reformation: & I would hope that D. B. did utter more in this, by his penne, then he meant in his heart. Beside the consequences are not so dangerous, but the ground is as weake. For the long continuance, or mayntenance of a thing, if evill & unlawfull, is so farre from bringing dishonor upon any, for the removeall of it, that retayning therof, encreaseth both his sinne, & shame: & it argues a greater measure of humility & power of grace to abandon it.

Nay, were the thing lawfull, if yet by circumstances it did appeare, that Gods Honor, the common good,
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The edification of our brethren, might more be promoted by the removal of it, though it were hoary headed with antiquity & continuance, it argued greatest love to God & man to alter it, rather then to keepe it in use: & that would bring greatest honor to him that should so doe; since by the verdict of God's Spirit, he is most honorable, that most honoreth God.

2. From these grounds, how rotten & unsavory the second particular of the Rej. his defense is, will easily be granted. For if in such a removal, the duty of Authority doth consist, the power of grace doth appeare, the glory of God, & good of the Church & common wealth, will be advanced; To be of that beleive, with D. B. that Magistrates will never be brought to doe what they ought, how uncharitable is it thus to lay their honor in the dust? And not to press them hereunto, when we may, & by our calling, ought, how unconscionable is it? And how contrary to that love we owne to the Almighty, & our Gournours?

The crown of objections, which he makes concerning himself; I conceyve, as so many Strugglings of Spirit, which stood in the way, to withstand him in his course. His conscience, as it should seeme, gave the onset, & let in some such intimations as these to him.

why
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Why is not Popery coming in fast enough; but you must make a preparation thereunto: yea become a purveyor, & barber to make Roome, & lay in provision for it? Is it not sufficient, that the wicket is set open, that the Popish pack may be drawn in; but you must set open the great gate, that a Sumpter horse may amble in, with a load of reliques & Cerem? For if the patent of the Church be so enlarged, to appoint Cerem: at their pleasure, to admonish and teach, and it is in their power to appoint what, & how many, as seems good to them; why then let images be erected, let crosses & Crucifixes be set up in every corner. These are lawful admonitors, & instructors, & we cannot have too many good Companions, to put us in mynd of our duties.

Consider beside, how many poore Ministers are under pressure, some fled, some imprisoned, many suspended, themselves & families undone. Why will you not suffer them to lie in the dust, but will you trample upon them, even unto death? Is it not enough, they make brick, but must they be beaten also? Oh consider, as before the Lord, to whom you must give an account. Do you well to blow the fire in the Chymny, why the flames in the thach? Is not the fury of the BB. yet
yet seire enough, their rage sharpe enough, but you must
sett them on, and strengtheen their hands, to strike har
der: lastly, is not Cringing at Altars, bovving
at the name of jesu, like to be brought in, & prac
tised with great forwardnes, & will you, dare you
encourage, in such courses, yea give an approbation and
commendation to them? For they will say, they are
but significant Cerem: they place no merit, putt no effica
cy in them, only they are admonitors of our dutyes.
Thus is the fondation of superstition layd, the Gospel
Stopped, and an open way made for Popery, and you
are the persuader, the encourager, yea defender of all
these: how will you answer this at the great day?

Yet do I not speake this, as though I were troubled,
with the weight of any thing he hath writt. For
I proffe unsaynedly the way of his traverse synds
welcome with me; wherein the nakednes, & inde
sensiblenes of his cause I hope will be discovered. On
ly one thing I would most earnestly intreat, that he
would shouw us but fayre play in these proceedings: to
writ, that he would not breake our heads, where
others have bound our hands: Let him but graunt us in
different termes, ev'n the common curtesy of the court, an
impartial pleading: we desire no more favour then
the cause by its owne credit will procure: Lett the law
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be open, as the rigour of Justice allows: To which purpose shall be so far prevale with his Lord BB, that we may enjoy, the use of our books, the liberty of the press, & if not the benefit of our charges, yet freedome of breathing in our native soyle, & with our poor desolate families: And I dare promise him he shall not want those, that will joyne issue with him, in this traverse, either by writing, or printing, & that without any gaudy expressions, (whereof he accuseth M. Parker) but by playe dynt of Syllogisme: & we will take our oaths, as he in desireth, that each man of us shall write his conscience, which I wonder why the D' putt in, since its openly knownne to all that will not shutt their eyes, that all conscience doeth not live, & dye alone with conformable men. But if we neither have, nor he will procure us leave, or liberty, either to preach, or write, or print, yea scarce to live; then he must know, we are denied the benefitt of the law, & the Curtesy of the Court & in wayne he bragges of his traverse.

To pursue all the particulars objected, & answered in his owne bes half, is not wvorth the wryle, since no weight of the cause lyes ther upon: Only one trava-do here vented by the Rej. is not to be borne: which is observably set downe in the 14. ob: D. Burgel hath parted with more profit, by taking up con-
conformity, and a benefice, then any novvin England hath done by his unconformity, and losse of a benefice. Surely he myndeth not so af
fectionately as he should, the affliction of his brethren. What did D. B. part with? Nothing but future, contingent, uncertayne profitt: which made him liable to be envied, and opposed by the colledge of phisition; Profitt, which was not necessary to his life & being, depending upon extraordinary paynes: such as in all probability, he could not have long endured, or at least with contentement of mynd. His Physick practise made that change, which Tully commendeth in Merchandize: Satiata quæstu, vel contenta potius, ut sǽpe ex alto, in portum, sic ex ipso portu, se in agros possessioneque contulit. After sufficient gettings, it forsooke both sea & sea-haune, and betooke it self to quietnesse and plentie in the countrie.

On the other side, what have not? What do not men lose by unconformity? Even all their meanes of living, all their liberty, not only of providing for themselves, or their families; but even of breathing in any ayre, saving onely that, which may be dravven out of flinking prisons. Nay somtyme all the Commodity of their
their Country, or National habitation; being forced to fly even unto the Indians for safety, to say nothing of their losse of life itself, by cruel imprisonments. Now let our Saviour judge betwixt us, & D. B. The poore widow (sayth he,) that parted but two mites, parted with more then they did, who out of their plenty parted with many shekells, because those two mites were all that she had.

If this be true, then many & many a one hath parted with more profit for Non-conformity, then D. B. did for Conformity, for so much as they have parted with, all they had, & he only with part of that which he had, or might have hoped to get, superfluous in comparison of that which others have lost. To conclude all, I suppose if we were unwilling to suffer, we should be more unwilling, both to search, & see the truth, & I doubt not, but the Lord would settle the hearts of such, & bless their endeavors in that behalfe. All that I would crave at thy hands (Christian reader) is this, that thou wouldst read without prejudice, and judge without partiality; judge not the person, or cause of the distressed the worse, because of their pressure or paucity.
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Welcome Christ with his cross, any truth though with trouble. Be willing the truth should fall on any side as worthy to be prized & loved for itself. That is all I desire for my money: & Religion, conscience, reason will not deny this.

Rules for to direct the weake reader how to read the booke with profit.


2. Because the Replyer is forced to follow Dr. Burges in his far fetched, & newly coined definition, & the maze of the multitude of his distinctions, the weaker understanding will be at a loss, as not able to comprehend, or catch his meaning suddenly, & therefore, if I were worthy to advise, I would intreat such, to crave the help of some judicious Minister, who is faithfull, not to betray him for having the booke, but willing and able to informe him how to conceive of it aright.

The
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The Replier his manner of writing being presse & mensus, & therfor setts downe too much of the Replyers wordes, as he conceived needfull, if any difficulty arise therefrom, the Reader is to be entreated to consult with the answere at large.

The faults escaped correct thus:

An Alphabetical Table
Of the Principall Occurrents in this FRESH SVIR.

Where note that 1.p. and 2.p. at the end, sometimes of the number, directing to the page, stands for 1. part, and 2. part.

|  |
|  |
| B. Ezas expresseth the Commune sentence of our Divines, of the ancient Bishops, viz. that they were ever too busy about Ceremonies. p.228 |
|  |
| B. Bucers wish about Holydayes, viz. that there were not so much as one left, besides the Lords-day. (••) p.360 |

Adjuncts called Parts by Ramus. p.156.2.p.
Anabaptists occasioned reformation of Cermon.
Baines his Syllogisme against our Ceremonies confirmed p.258.
Brightmans answer to Iucl. p.503.
Babingtons Comment on Levit.10.1. observable against our Ceremonies. p.24.2.p.
His Proof for the Churches liberty to institute Ceremonies from Purim and the Feast of Dedication. p.246.
He faith as much for their, as we for our Cer. p.488.
Bernards answer to the Virgin Maries Image, bidding him Good mor. row. p.364.
C. Asuits admit nothing beside their order. p.65.1.p.
Chokim the Hebrew name of Ceremon. finely laid open. p.35.1.p.
Ceremonies their dispute how ancient; opposed by Waldenses, Martyrs, removed in Helveria. p.8.15.1.p.
Other things ridiculous yet as tolerable, if they had but institution from the Convocation howse as a May pole ith Church, or a straw in a Childs hand at Bapt. p.17.
Ceremonies such as ours, why naught. p.18.
Ceremonies how defined, examined. p.21.
Ceremonies laid out in 4. things. p.23.
Their
Their Worship. p. 132.
Ceremonies must have a rule for number. p. 144. 2.p.
Ceremonies Popish may yet be Jewish. p. 218.
See also. p. 273.
Ceremonies by Institution to what Commandement they belong. p. 301.
Ceremonies condemned for speaking out of place. p. 364.
Ceremonies, Clowts that have layen on the plague soares of Idolatry. p. 67.
Ceremonies cannot be deduced from the kinds named by the Rej. p. 482.
Ceremonies used by us never objects of Idol:answer'd. p. 401.
Ceremonies consequently imposed as belonging to giving honour to God, yet Superstitious. p. 103. 1.p.
Ceremonies single, double, trebble. p. 91. 2.p.

Ceremonies the Gärmed of Religion whereof the Scots mans jest. p. 94.
Church representative, to the life represented. p. 88. 1.p.
Church English and primitive compared. p. 402.
Calvins account of additions. p. 121. 2.p. 376.
What he faith to Cassander, and to our Maiters of Cerem. p. 122. 2.p.
His moderation toward Popish Ceremonies, what See. p. 400.
His inference, that, if the 3. Children in Dan. had followed the Counsell, and witt of our times; they needed never to have stood out against the Kings Commandement. p. 127. 2.p.
His judgement of Ceremonies cleared. p. 240.
His opinion misinterpreted by the Rej. answerd.
Chamiers answer to that of no new Ceremi, brought in these days. p. 293.

His famous Censure of Ceremonies Analogical and Sacramental, as idly doing that over againe, for which the Sacraments were by Christ appointed. p. 384. p. 1.


Chemnitzus his famous testimony about additions. p. 249.

Cajetan a Cardinal of Rome would not be buried with Church. p. 469.

Conformity disuaded fro by one that Conformed himself. p. 474.

Circumcision Defended to be now lawfull by Def. & Rej. p. 274.

Convocation house not Cleared by all that the Rej. can say. p. 113. Found Guilty of much evill: of perverting the Articles of religion, and setting the out far worse, then they were in good K. Edwards time, decreing lese good, then the Council of Trent. p. 115. 23.

Comlines. p. 77. 2.


Contrariety of Deceit and edification displeasing, yet Contrariety of rites serving thereunto, not so. p. 117. 2. p.

D.

Dr. Humphreys letter to the Bishops. p. 269.

Dr. Davenats doctrine at Cambridget p. 79. 1. p.

Dr. Morton calls for abolition of Superstition without delay. p. 371.

Dr. Andrews speech to the Convocation. p. 419 & 421.

Dr. Fullc
Dr. Fulck foresook the College for the Surplice p. 473.

Distinctions of popish writers brought together by Rivesius, p. 299.

Distinction into Coma d and allowance, Symbolizing with papists, p. 142.


Distinction of traditions into Divine, and Apostolical rejected by Iunius p. 335.

For denying of which distinction the Repl: was charged with unlearnedness, yet all the Rej. learning, and more put to it cannot make it good. p. 336.

Dipping 3. times p. 242.


Easter, the first apple of strife, from the Bp. of Rome. p. 85, 448, and

449.

Ewill of our Things to be put away, finely explained p. 151.

F.


Free will offerings, no will worship. p. 153.

Nor do warrant appointing of Cer. p. 132, 1, p. and 151, 2.

Feasts of love, their original uncertain. p. 334.

G.

Vnpowder stoppt into an image. p. 513.

H.


Hooper a Bp. refused the Surplice. p. 135.

What he speaks of Bps. state. p. 408.

Holy, either by infusion or inha: the Def. absurd distinction p. 179.

Human, with Bellarm. and the Rej. in one sense. p. 302.

Hezekiah, whether he let
the images stand, set up
by Col. p. 369.

Intended observation.
Infants Communicants,
Iunius his remarkable
speech about additions.
p. 892. p. and 252.
His sentence of images.
p. 286. and 290.
Images for use religious
maintained and con-
demned by the Rej. p. 237
283.
Images in Churches, not
indifferent by the Homi-
lies against Idol. p. 289.
Iuel's prophesie about the
crosse p. 290

Neeing &c. proper
worship by the Rej.
grant p. 138

Others advise about
How he placed the Images
to make them ridicalous
p. 285.

Latimers speech to the
convocation, for which
he was committed to the
tower p. 1231. p.
His comparison of Cer.
and in a Sermon before

Elancht free speech
against mans invema-
His meaning opened p.
1412. p.
He disalloweth the Col-
lectio of some from Act.
15 Ibid.

Mat. 15. and Marc. 7 of
pharises washing p. 186
&c. and 221
Ministers how they enter
upon their Parishes in
Engl. p. 412

Onresidents a carefull
sort of them p. 417
Negative argument usual
with the best writers p.
432. p.

Opiniō whether it were
worship p. 125. 2. p.

Organi
their answers to the place alleged, against adding to God's worship. p. 415
They deny operative virtue to holy water p. 294
Papish idolatry compared with Heathenish p. 548
Policie of old Bps to win the Heathen by observing their holy dais, condemned. p. 432. See also p. 500
P. M. refused the Surplice in Oxford p. 463
A remarkable speech of his about mens devises to stir up &c. p. 211
Prælats power if they please to command all Englishmen to be circumcised p. 107. p.
Prælats in a præmunire p. 111.
Prælats greise when forced to deprive ans. p. 108
Prælats office to make canons faith the Rejoynt. p. 107
Parliament against silencing for such non-conformity p. 108 r. p.
Parl. 1610. check the prelates p.106. 1.p.
Praying toward the East as ancient as any Ceremony.

R.
Rejoynders bulls frequently observed. See p.44.83.92-1.p. again p.69.25.32.36.44.92.108 217.2.p.
Rej. noted for palpable error concerning inward worship p.127.1.p. For Error again in divinity p.138.
His dangerous speech that Christ had laid snares if etc. p.68.2.p.

S.
Sacred proper and reductive, examined p. 63.1.p.
Sacramentals what p.226. Denied by pap. to work etc. p.227
Condemned by Beza p. 244.
Sacrament and Sacramen-
above order and decency in worship. p. 72, z. p.

Worship must be essential, if worship. p. 113, z. p.

Worship figurative what p. 147, 1, p. ult.

Worship applied to the Cer. by the Rej. p. 154, z. p.

Worship proper, essential, necessary, how understood by the Rej. p. 158, z. p.

Worship Circumstantial, or accessory not permitted only, proved by a Syllogism from the Rej: tels contradictions p. 139, 1, p.

Worship true and good, if according to the will of God, not hindering it, the Papists Plea, as well as our mens. ibid.

Worship; the parts of it, what. p. 113, 2, p

Worship indifferent none p. 171.


Yet will-worship may be (**) with
without that opinion ibid. Worship Popish and Sac- 
crilegious maintained under the same Colours of reverend manner, order, decency among Papists p. 143. p. Worship in Cer. p. 38. p. Willworship distinguished into lawfull and unlaw-


Gentle reader take notice that through some oversight or casualty, there are the second and third answers wanting in the 16. page of the first part, neare the beginning of the 3. chap. which the author finding after the impression, he says he would supply after, but death now preventing speech with him, I cannot as yet finde it in his papers.

Because
Ecause many orthodox writers have been abused and others in them, by spurious bookes which have bene obtruded upō the world under their names, was thought meet to represent to the reader in this ensuing Catalogue, the names of all such bookes as were undoubtedly knowne to be made by this Author.

Catechismus.

Puritanismus Anglicanus.

Casus Conscientiae 12. 1632.
Coronis ad Collationem Hagiensem 12. 1628.
Antisinodalicia 12. 1633.
Contracricincho-vium 12. 1633.
Demonstratio Logica. 12. 1633.

A Replye to Bishop Morton,
This fresh suit against Ceremonies.
A first and second Manuduction.
In Psalmos commentaria, yet to be printed.

FINIS:
A FRESH SVIT
Against
HUMANE CEREMONIES IN GODS WORSHIP.
OR
A Triplication about Ceremonies, Opposed unto
D. BURGESSE HIS.
Rejoinder for
D. MORTON'S
'Defence of 3. Nocities
Ceremonies.

With a Catalog.
1. Of the chiefse heads here handled.
2. Of the Rejoinder his unworthy personal speeches.
3. Of divers errors which crept into the preffe.

The First Part.

Printed in the yeare of our Saviour, 1633.
A direction to the Reader.

The author being constrained to be absent from the press, by reason of urgent occasions and being altogether destitute of any help from other, who were willing and able to correct the Impression (as it is the common Lost to poore men under pressures to be forsaken of friends and meanes) there be many faults escaped in the printing, & some such, which pervert the sense, and will prejudice the truth, and Reader: and therefore he is to be intreated, before he read the book to mend the grosser mistakes with his penn: or else so attend and consider of them, that he may have recourse to them as occasion shall serve: the other faults which are of lesse consequence, common curtesy will easily pardon and passe by.

*2* Faults
Faults escaped: thus to be corrected:

Pag. 3. lim. 21. read certes p 4 l. 14. for acquired v. aymed pt. in the margyn: for v. r. ne p 13 l. 18 r. pollute p 16 l. 16. for the, your. p 19 l. 15. for add r. med. p 20 l. 2. for simplicity. sifting p 21 l. 15. for novelty. v. p 29 l. 22. for if r. of those p 31 l. 8 for thrufu. cross p 32 l. 8. for conserving v. conferring p 32 l. 23. for is an ath. r. revelations p 33 l. 3. for acts v. arts p 35 l. 10. for are all, are mt. p 36 l. 22. for onward v. onward p 39 l. 13. for ioyne v. coined p 41 l. 28. add a living creature p 45 l. 15. for number v. whether p 48 l. 11. for the meanes of the use v. meanes of the same use p 49 l. 17. in the marg. for qui v. qui p 49 l. 22. for it is r. it is not p 52 l. 8 for lawfully v.awfully p 53 l. 11. for there r. three p 55 l. 8. for Wakenb. Worksb. p 56 l. 6. for are supposed v. are not supposed p 63 l. 9. for needed to v. needed not to p 66 l. 1. for if r. of p 67 l. 19. for mayne. mayne p 71 l. 20. for in r. from r. p 75 l. 24. del and p 77 l. 12. and p 85 l. 14. for this r. thus p 94 l. 11 for his r. he p 98 l. 14. for ad v. and p 128 l. 16. for mid. dwelr. indiv. dwall p 139 l. 7. for with r. work p 131 l. 30 for beings. bring p 133 l. 7 for base r. base p 136 l. 17. for princip. r. principal p 14 l. 17. for conduct r. conduce p 14 l. 9. for man ever r. man did ever p 145 l. 18. 20. for fasting r. fasting p 146 l. 14. for defends sb. ud r. defends and p 148 l. 5. for words r. woods.
A Generall table shewing the contentes of every chapter.

Chap. 1.
The rise and proceeding of Ceremoniall contentions with variety of tenents about them: p.7:

Chap. 3.
Concerning the just and proper title of our Ceremonies p.16.
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The 9th consistory opened: p. 50.
Confuted & the contradictions in it discovered p. 51.

Chap. 5.
The 2nd partition confuted as imperfect and false: pag. 54, 55.
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The 4th partition handled: p. 65, 66.
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Chap. 7.
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The judgement of the Governour, is not the rule receyning cerem. 80.
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The first partition handled and examined p. 82.
The Rejoy; his contradictions in his divisions p. 83.
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Chap. 8.
The nature of a representative church discovered p. 88. 89.
The association of churches doth not require the orders nor officers of the Hierarchy. p. 91.

Chap. 9.
Answer to Colossians 2. 23 p. 96.
When Cessation of an evil, comes to be worship p. 96.
No definition of superstition will evince that the sense of the word beareth...
bearing of Cerem:is superstition p. 99. 100.
he not doing of things forbidden in the first table (though upon conscience to God, is not always worship, p. 100. 101.
The examples alle ged by the Rej. for to make non-conformitants superstitious, are shewed to be vayne p. 103.

Chap. 10.
Parliaments allow not superstition as now it is vrged.
p. 105.
The Prelates proceedings are against Parliaments.
p. 106.
The greife which is pretended in Prelates for depriving and silencing, is fayned p. 109.
The Prelates are subject to a Premunire p. 111.
A minister cannot be deprived by law for not v'ing Cerem. 112.

Chap. 11.
The canons of the convocation 1571. are worse then those which were enacted to their hands 1552. p. 115.
This is shewed in severall particulars, p. 117. 118.
That our convocation cometh beynd the counsel of Trent in making provisions for good canons for preaching p. 121. &c.
That they made ill canons and executed them, they made some good, and so left them. pag. 121.

Chap. 12.
The definition of worship: in the generall is examined p. 125.

A mistake
A mistake about veneration and adoration. pag. 126.
Inward worship, may be as well performed safely, as so pretended, 128, 129.
The definition of subordinate worship examined, and found faulty, 129.
The holiness of the person, and the present intention of the worshipper, is not essential to external worship, pag. 130.
4 reasons of that, 131, 132, 133.
The distinction of mediate and immediate worship explicated, 135.
The definition of mediate worship is found faulty, 135.
The distinction of immediate worship into proper and improper is discussed and confuted, 136.
Several contradictions are discovered in the Rej. his distributions, 136, 137.
That allowance is not enough to legitimate and worship immediate, 138, 139, 140.

All examples and authorities alleged in favor of the former false distinctions are explicated, and prove nothing at all to favour the Rej. 145, 146.
Taste of the Rej. his intemperate expressions, unworthy, as well of him from whom they come, as of them against whom they are directed.

2. Dancing without a fiddle. 14
3. Hee compares the Replyer to a curre, saying hee runs away from the cause, lookes back at the Def: and shews his teeth somewhat angerly. 19
4. A false Reporter. 22
5. The man is troubled. 35
6. They that say the church may not ordayne one or other Ceremony meerly Ecclesiasticall doe manifest a spirit that lusteth after contradiction: 57
7. Mock Dighton. Ibid.
8. Nameles libellers as this Repl: Ibid.
9. This poore distressed man knowes not what to doe. 35
10. Not very apt to blush for any thing. 47
11. God hath smitten his contentious spirit with giddines. 62
13. Some men in Q: Eliz: dayes were not contented that these Ceremonyes should be removed, unless all went out with them. 52
14. This libeller like to come to some shame for his factions. 61

It is a malicious surmise, scurrilous and of no use, vn-...
lesse it be to ingrafs himselfe into the affections (which he calleth consciences) and applause of
his owne party.
15. You that make a faction.
16. Sooner let the moone with a new coate, then these
men with pleasing Ceremonies.
17. Your superstition esteemeth this your abstinence
to be a singular poynct of piety, and true sinceren
ty.
18. I see no cause of this outleap but eyther to eas
his stomack, or to please these of his side
19. Most of their writers are nameles libellers.
20. The replyer may hang downe his head, he is a fil
lly man
21. This fantasye is the very top and root of separati
en, and Anabaptistry.
22. The replyer worse then a fryer
23. The repl: gulls and deceives.
24. Hee hath not learned the substance of common
honesty
25. A spirit of contradiction hath carried him to
shifting.
27. You seekke honour one of another.
28. And presume of your owne traditions as if the
spirit of truth had come to you, or from you a lone.
29. The repl: censures the universall milita

church.

30. Not
16. Now well fare a good stomack.
17. Boggling and security.
18. The Repl: wrung on the withers,
19. Hee need heare some lecture of logick
20. A Beetle brought out of the Repl: head
22. The Repl: liesting vp his hart to God, is much
yeing and little wool, as he sayd that sheerd his
hogs.
24. These men say to all other men stand back I am
holyer then thou.
25. Salt Scurrility,
26. These men if it were safe would spit their gall in
the face of the magistracy.
27. Full of froth and venome
28. A Spirit of separation hunted after in the chase of
inconformity.
29. Inconformitants of a high strayne beyond other
men.
30. Doth this Repl: and such as hee who without
law, without calling, without Reason, without con-
sience, smite with their tongues, and condemn to
the pit of darknes the Bishops, the conformed mi-
nisters, and in a manner all that are not of their par-
ty.

See also 220. 221. 222. 226
31. The Repl: for Faction and opposition would have
that thought of others, which he doth not beleue
himselfe
himselfe.
46. A wrangling spirit and ill conscience
Ibid
47. The Inconformists are of all men that ever I knew
the most impatient, which is a signe of much partiality if not pharisaical pride.
21
48. Counting their opposing Cerem: a high point of devotion, and their stiffnes therein constancy in the faith.

49. Tinkers luck.
50. It is your trims to fly upon the faces of our Bishops.

51. This Repl. is the childe of strife not of judgment.

52. You are Godly men, all others are carnall: time servers, formalists that have no conscience, no sincerity, no zeal, you are the only men.

Many other flowers, of this sent, might have been gathered out of the Rej: his Garden. But I will not trouble the Reader with them: Because I perceive the Author of this Fresh Suit doth not much regard them. Nyether would I have noted these, but for the Rejoynders Bishoplike objecting of Scurrility to the Replyer.
A manuduction to the following dispute.

Although it be but dead work, void of whetting pleasure or hope of great fruit, to spend much tyme, about humaine formalities, when as the divine substance of religion is in present danger, yet seing the leaders of that course, which tendeth to this mischeife, being themselves marched with a great part of their mayne body, through the sens and quagyniers of non residence, pluralities and ambition, towards the quicksands of Armintanisme, popery and prophanesse, have left these, as thaire passe and bagage to be kept and defended by men of good note, and worthy of better employment (such as Dr. B. is) to the amazing of many good soules: It seemeth necessary to take into some consideration (though short, as such an unpleasant busines doth require) what strenght ther is in these their new works: To proceed therefor in order.

C A P. I.

First touching the title of D. B. his rejoynder.

In which two things are observabe: First; that he stileth the reply a pamphlet of a namelesse author: The first Part. A in dis-
A fresh suite against Ceremonies.
in disgrace, as clearly appeareth in his second part, pag. 38. where he stileth not onely the replyer, but many others, for this very cause, Libellers: But it cannot be esteemed any disgrace, for any writing upon just occasion, to want the name of the author, without involving, many excellent Divines, and divers penmen also of holy Scripture, in the same blame. As for the term Pamphlets, I understand it, as noting a little contemptible writing: But the worth of a writing doth not consist in bulk and bulk, but in synewes, veines, and arteries, which with good blood and spirits, may be couched into a little body: If he meane by Pamphlets the same which after, he expresseth in the terme of scurrilous, that is, take it, ful of jesting, without respect of the persons: he hath to deal with. My answer is: That if the Repl: had written to the convocation house, an Epistle with this inscription, To the superstitions fathers of the Church of England: as the Def: entituleth his epistle to us, to his superstitions Brethren, (and yet this Repl: is not ashamed to adopt this scurrility, and make it his owne childe, by maintaining of it, even against the very nature of D. Burgesse) there had beenie more occasion of such a censure, then now is found, in all the Replye, as after shall appeare.

The Repl: doth not any where to my remembrance, vilifie the person of his adversary, but only his arguments, and answeres, together with the vyle courses of our Hierarchy, in which kynd of jesting the Repl: his scurrility is far greater, then the Repl: saving the difference, which ariseth out of the outward greatness of Prelates,
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...and the poor condition of them, which are oppressed by them. Now the Repl: is no admirer of Br. persons, nether are disputations acquainted with such our language, as they are used unto: if it please your Lordship &c. but such is the condition of those, that have so loke with Prelats, that they are usually censured either for scurrility, or flattery, and there is no doubt, but some will accuse the Repl as much of flattery in blazing his Diocesan admirable wisdom, as he doth the Repl: of scurrility, though I will not: Those who write against Prelats, are wont to expect such a censure from them & theirs. So Zwinglius in his Epistle touching the authors of sedition I doubt not, saith he, but ther will be many, who having heard or read all these things, as length will be ready to say, what meant this scoffer? Calvin among others, was often accused of the same fault, not onely by those, whom he calls usually, cornutos Episcopos, horned Bishops, but even by their diminutive emulators among the Lutherans, his answer therefor unto Westphalus about this imputation may serve the Replier. It is easy for loose-rum to object against me, the odious tarturs of unseemly scurrility, and slanderous bitterness of language, but it is as easy for me, to wipe away that calumny of his with one word &c. For what course should I take, since either the truth should have beene betrayed in silence, or otherwise by an easy and toosble expression, the suspicion of fearfulnes and distrust would have beene discovered.

And in very deed, let any indifferent man judge, of...
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This imputation, by any place of the Reply, where the Rej. noteth scurrility, and he shall sayn the Rej. himself, far more guilty: As for example pag. 63. in few lines he may synde these five terms packed together. It is a manifest untruth and calumny: It is a ridiculous supposition: It is a malicious surmise: It is a scurrilous bundle: It is to ingraft himself into affections which he calls consciences: These are baser terms, then are to be found in any one place, or (I think) in all the course of the Rep. And what is the occasion of them? Forsooth, the Repl. sayd, the Prelats have power, to suspend, deprive, excommunicate nonconformists, at their pleasure: That the Defend: called for further help from Buckingham: That the Defend: may be acquired at a better Bishoprick: In the former whereof, ther is nothing sayd, which the Rej. could with colour denye, before he himself had added for matter of accusation, interpretations of his own imagining: And in the last, there is nothing so much suspected of the defendant, D. B. himself knoweth, that it is scandalously true, almost of all Bishops, viz. that they ayme at greater Bishopricks: But on the other syde, what honesty is there, in adding unto the repliers words. Further then the Lawe of the State and Church require: And yet that also is true, de facto, though not de jure, that the Prelats take power to themselves, more then the lawes require: What charity or religion is ther in slighting the consciences of all that hold with the Repl?: As if they pretended conscience upon perverse affections: What wisdome is ther? In talking of the Repl. ambition, to ingraft himself into the affection of a few poore people, from
from whom he cannot expect either gayne or worldly credit? This I am sure of, that the Repl. being twice putt out of all meanes of living, for that cause, never in those extremities gayned from that party, the Rej. speaketh of, so much as the Emoluments of a ten pound Prebendary, which the Rej. so much fligheth Pag. 15. As for his credit, untill he either putt his name to his book, or seek by other meanes to have it knowne, it cannot without injury be objected, that he sought it.

The other thing to be noted in Rej. title, is, that in opposition to a namelesse Author, he nameth himself with such a name or title, as neither by our Prelates rules, nor by the Scriptures doth admit a good construction. Pastor of Sutton Coldfeild in Warwickshire, Our booke of ordination acknowledgeth no such pastors, from whence also it is, that in our convocation-church-language, we never heare of a Pastor of one Parish alone, None of our divines in the Synod of Dort, would take to themselves that title, though most others did in their subscription. D. Andrews an Archbishop in esteeme, censureth this title for a Novelty. The names of Pastor and (in this sense also) of calling, were novelyes, nor shall you read, that the Auncients ever stiled in these termes, any, who take the charge of distant parishes: The Scripture indeed doth warrant this title, even to D. Burgesse, (and I do not detract it from him,) but not in such a manner as he taketh it: For wher he writeith...
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writeth in defence of a Lord Bishop over that Diocese, where Sutton Coldfield is contained, as a part: and every Ecclesiasticall Bishop is a Pastor, he seemeth in one breath, to take and resigne his pastorall office: If he say, that this variety is by humaine institution. D. Andrews resp. ad Ep. 3. Moll. will take him up: It seemes then, there is no divine right, in ordering the frame of the government of the Church, and then wel-sure Amsterdam: which our Hierachicall men do so much traduce and despise. If he shall say, that one is a Lord Pastor, and the other a ministerial Pastor, inferior, and subordinate to him, especially in jurisdicition, then I would have him consider, what D. Fulke saith against Allen, of the Popes pardons Pag. 381. God hath made all Pastors stewards of his household, and dispensers of his mysteries: And if every Pastor over his charge, be a steward of Gods mysteries, why hath he not the Key of jurisdicition over his parish, in a large and ample manner, as the Bishop hath over his Diocese, or the Pope? Seing the Keyes are not given to one, but to unity, as the fathers teach: why should the Bishops and the Pope have two Keyes, and they but one: resolve these things (sayth he to Allen, and I to D. B.) out of the Holy Scripture. It might be here also required how a faithful Pastor can defend a Bishop of Bishops, in obtruding humaine ceremonys upon the church, whereof he is pastor, and so partake in the obtruding of them. Certainly this is not agreeable, to the commissio of Pastors, who are to teach only that, which Christ hath commanded to observe: Which I have commanded, Matth. 28. not what ye shall command or invent.
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Cast the place. Neither is it to preserve the Church, from the dominion of usurpers.

CAP. II.

Of the rise and proceeding of Ceremoniall contentions, with variety of tenants about them.

The first records the Rej. bringeth for contentions about Cerem: are from Rom. 14. but he might, (and would also if it had served his turne) have fetched it further, from Math. 15. where the Pharisees contend against Christ, and his Disciples about their ceremoniall observations: Or from the first authors of that Sect, Sammays and Hilles, prophane dissipators of Gods Law, by their traditions, as out of their very names, Cardinall Baronius himselfe noteth. Neither is that contention Rom. 14. agreeable to our Question, because the Ceremonies there questioned, were not of humaine institution, nor urged by authority of any Church or Prelates.

The second instance which the Rej. bringeth, is about the feast of Easter, whereabout he faileth, the world was set on fire. And this indeed is worth the observing, that so soon as Victor-Bishops began to urge humaine cerem: upon the Church of God, all was presently in a fyre, but were not these presumptuous Victor, the byndlers of that fyre? The next stepp which the Rej. taketh (over a thousand yeare wyde) is to Illiricus, about permitting the use of a surplisce, where it is to be noted, that
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that before Illyricus, ther had beene effectuall pleading against Ceremonies, even Crosse and Surplice, in Helveria, at Tigure, wherupon they were removed, as Zwinglius relataeth de baptismo: And a long tyme before that, the Waldenses (of whose blood were made torches to light us in the right way) did contend against all humane traditions as unlawful. So Reinierus cap. 5. All customs of the church, which in the Gospell they do not read, they do conceime. They affirme that those things which are appointed by the Bishops and Prelates, are not to be observed because they are the traditions of men and not of God. Where also the answer given by that refuerter unto your Waldenis is very observiable, for by that, it will appeare, that humane Ceremonies in Divine worship, were then impugned and defended after the same manner, they are to this day. Our allegations being the same with those, which the Waldenses used, and our adversaries answers the same, which the Papistes opposed to the Waldenses. Answ: the Church is not content with those things which Christ taught, and therefore might make competent constitutions, as the Church of the Iews: in the 9. El. i. Maccab 2. and 4. Touching the authorities alleged by the Haretikes, Deut. 10. and 13. you shalt not add. &c.

Answ: is: The Iews might not add any thing to the law, least it might have seemed insufficient at that tyme. To that place Isay 29. Mat. 15. Answ: is: That the constitution of the church come not only from men, but God also: To that of Gall. 1. Answ: is: Beside the word, that is against it.

2. That
2. That Illiricus in this part stood against that, which Calvin wrote against, and many excellent Divines were silenced and deprived for. 3. That this contention of Illiricus was not properly about the Surplice.

Quod de Magdeburg. les de line yelte riexas: vere, 'quo: pertineat: video: Li enim vestu- tum (cun: is inestilla) apud vos quapd: idos temus rec- o


The first Part. B Gods
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Gods worship as appeareth in this Rej. cap. 3. sect. 7. For
the Protestants most receaved opinion of humane Ceremonies, Cassander (whole stepps the Def. and Rej; follow in this cause) is a good witnes. They have not ony omitted these Ceremonies as leffe profiable, & superstiuos, but the most have esteemed them, as soppish, babish and ridiculious, yea that they were to be condemned, and abandoned noxious & pernious. And our Martyr book doth give sufficient testimony, how diverse of the Godly Martyr, did absolutely condemne all humane Ceremonies in Gods worship. To name one for all: This was the first occasion of Mr. Tho. Hawkes, his persecution, and this he defended unto the death, against Bonner: Harpfield, Fecknam and Chadlye: No ceremonies (faith he) but those which Christ hath appointed: In which story, it is to be marcked, that Bonners Chaplayne, and Knysman Darbyshyre, granted as our Def. and Rej, doe, that their humane Ceremonies were not necessary to salvation, but onely to instruction: In this cause of Ceremonies, Dr. Willet, Richard Gibson gave up his life p. 111

Synop. In the beginning of Queene Elizabeth Reigne ther was a company of honest men, that for the Ceremonies, refused to joine with the Parish assemblyes of London, as appeareth in the examinatiō of John Smyth W. Nyxson &c. exstāt in the book called part of a Register, will any man think, that they esteemed those Ceremonies for which they made a kynd of separatiō to be lawfull.

The first example then of humane Ceremonies, any orthodox church imposed upō Gods people, which the Rej. brings, is in the Church of Engl. And here I begin.
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beginneth, with famous Queene Elizabeths dayes, though he feth that very story, out of the History of Cranford troubles, which were in Queene Marys dayes: about the same Cerem: and before that in King Edwards: To say nothing of the manyfold testimonies, of Martyrs against such corruptios, before King Edward: is this any illustration of your Question to be debated?

Now for the Tenets, which have beene and are about these Cerem. the Rej. noted out of T. C. that the oul\n
tenet of those, who opposed our Cerem., was to hold them inconvenient only, not unlawfull, But he she-

veth no such thing about the Crosse: 2. Nay the contrary appeareth in D. B. himself, who pag. 16. confesseth, that 39. yeares agoe, he did at the least doubt, that the Crosse was unlawfull, and for that cause (not for scand-

dall, as he did the Surplice) he refused it even to Depri-

vation: He would not have us think, I am sure, that he had then a singular new Tenet by himself, but inclined to the ould. 3. M. : Hooker P. 246. observeth, that the first pleadings of T. C. against other Cerem: either in-

ferred unlawfulness, or nothing. 4. The last rules, and resolutions of T. C. doe evidently speake, of unlaw-

fulness, of all significant Ceremonies: Although the Ce-

rem: of Crossing were indifferent and convenient, yet to rayse a doctrine of it, is unlawfull, for as much as it is not enough, to teach the truth, unleffe it be truely taught, and thus is only out of the word of God. 2. Reply: P. 227. This was his judg-

ment in these, and we have no other Tenet of signifi-

cant Ceremonies untill this day: Now if in the Hypo-

thesis of one or two signif. Cerem. he swarved a little there
there from out of extrinsecall considerations, yet that doth not make his tenet such, as the Rej. would have it, but rather it is to be held, as an occasionall declinatio from his Tener, which also (he is sayd) by faithfull witnesses to have confessed, as an error before his death: 4. That tenet of inconvenience, or inexpediency was never yet sufficiently explynyed, and therefore had beene sitt work for.

The commo Protestant tenet was alwayes, as Mr. For, Mart. P. 4. expresseth it, that it is reproveable to adde unto Christ's intention, new found rites, and Phantayses of men: And Mr. Burgess in an Epistle to King Iames, in the beginning of his Raigne,-witnesseth, that in those dayes, many hundred worthy ministers thought our cer unlawfull, and would surely dye, rather then use them: which worthy men, surely were not the first authors of that Tenet: If they were, why did he call them worthy, who now judgeth otherwise of us, for maintaining the same sentence. 5. That tenet of inconvenience or inexpediency, without unlawfulness in such Cer, was never yet sufficiently explained. And threfore had beene fit work for the Rej. Civill inconvenience, or incommodity may stand with lawfulness: But how a thing morally inconvenient, or inexpedient, whyle it remaineth such, may be lawfull, is not so cleare: Nothing is thus inexpedient to morall or spirituall good, but it is expedient, or an impediment to it, and all such impediments of good, whyle they are such, seeme to be opposite to good, & in that regard evill. I remember, I heard it once defended, in Cambridge, in these termes: What ever is morally inexpedient, so far as it is such, is unlawfull. 6. This Tenet of the Cer, to be inexpedient, but yet lawfull, hath confounded the thoughts.
thoughts of many, & made them to doe that with grief, which they were ashamed of. Mr. Hooker P. 246, maketh a speech in their persons, which I will here write out, because I remember my self, at the first reading, to have beene much affected, & as it were basted out of that contention, which stood somewhat that way. Conformers of that sort are fayned thus to declare their mynds; & excuse their practise: Brethren, our hearts desire is, that we might enjoy the full liberty of the Gospel, as in other reformed churches they doe else where, upon whom the heavy hand of authority hath imposed no great burden: But such is the misery of these our dayes, that so great happiness, we cannot looke to attain unto: Were it so that the equity of the law of Moses, could prevail, or the zeale of Ezekias could be found in the hearts of those guides & governours, under whom we live; or the voice of Gods owne prophets could only be heard; or the example of the Apostles be followed, yea or their precepts be answered with full & perfect obedience, these abominable raggs, pallused garments, marks & sacraments of Idolatry, which power as you see constrained us to weare, & conscience so abhor, had long ere this day, beene removed both out of sight, & out of memory. But as now things stand, behold to what narrow streits we are driven, on the one side we feare the words of our Saviour Christ, woe to them by whom scandals and offences come, on the other side, at the Apostles speech we cannot but quake and tremble, if I preach not the Gospel, woe unto me; Being thus hardly beft, we see not any other remedy, but to hazard our soles the one way, that we may the other way indeavour to save them. Touching the offence of the weak therefore, we must adventure it. If they perish they perish: Our Pastorall charge is Gods absolute commandement.
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Rather then that shall be taken from us, we are resolved to take this filthy, and to put it on, although we judge it to be so unfit, and inconvenient, that as oft as ever we pray or preach, so arrayed before you, we do as much as in us lies, to cast any

your souls, that are weak minded, and so bring you unto endless perdition: But we beseech you brethren, have care of your owne safety, take heed to your steps, that you be not taken in these snares, which we lay before you, and our prayer in your behalf is, that the posion which we offer you, may never have power to doe you harme. This is the miserable Apo-

logy of a man, putting on the Surplice, which he thinketh inconvenient, upon such grounds as the Rej. did hold, and doth not yet condemn: This all such do speake either in deeds or words, that put on a Surplice in that manner: The State of the question is now changed faith the Rej. and the Cerem. held unlawfull, whereupon many mischeifs follow: It may be the compasse of our Prelats intention, to which the former tenter had reference, is varied by some degrees, towards the Autar-
tique, as Dr. B. speaketh in his Apologye, if ther be no other change, but that after more mischeif don by these ceremonies, then was before, they are now more strictly urged then ever (which the Rej. confesseth) they are now at the least more hatefull, if not more unlawfull then before, This is also considerable, beside the change is little or none, the same mischeives which the Rej. imputeth to the new tenter, Mr. Hooker in his preface chargeth that Tenter with, which this Rej, calleth the ould: Yet neither accusations have any force or colour, but upon the supposal, that the ceremonies are inno-
cent and lawful in their imposition and use. The plain truth is, that in the beginning of Queene Elizabeth’s days, and before, in King Edwards tyme, the Cerem were accounted weeds of popery, as that zealous and famous preacher, Mr. Anthony Gilbye doth intitle them, in his letter to Mr. Coverdall, Mr. Turner, &c. Mr. Whittingham, D. Vmphryey, and others, who then laboured the rooting of them out. They were not curious of distinguishing of unlawfulness and inexpedienty, but contented themselves to reject and oppose them: Some as Mr. Greenham refused to give their reasons fully, until they should be constrained: In the mean tyme they utterly refused them, as unlawful for them to use: This appeareth out of a booke called a part of a Register &c. Since that tyme, we have beene forced to shew more distinctly, what grounds we stand on, and so pronounce them unlawful. In the following pages spent principally about answering of objections, made or feared, or at least imagined, against the Author of this Rej. few things are found capable of any great dispute: Neither can many passages be touched, without odious grating upon D. Burges personall credit, which I tender so much, that I would wish more added to it, by other works, then is detracted from it by this: I will therefore leave these things to stand or fall, without any paynes or perill of myne, or the cause, and passe forth unto the title of our Cerem: in giving and maintaining whereof the Def. and Rej. are so tender, as to proclaime them innocent.

CHAP.
CHAP. III.

Concerning the just and proper style of our Cerem.

Answ. to the preface, Pag. 54. 55. 56. 57.

In answ. to the Reply, his preface; after certain words spent concerning the number, and such like circumstances of Mr. Sprynis arguments, not worth the repeating &c. The Rej. cometh to Dr. Morton his title, which he gave to our Cerem: that they are innocent: whereunto was opposed, 1. That Calvin accounted them in the most favorable sense ineptissimorum, soppertia, and in proper speech noxious, pernicious. To this the Rej. answ. that Calvin meant not these titles to our Cerem: but some other things which were in King Edwards' book of common prayer, as lights, and crosstes at the supper. Concerning which answ. 1. not only D. B. was wont otherwise to understand Calvin as we do, but the Prelats themselves, for so we read in D. B. his Apologye pag. 44. according to D. Covells disposition of it. The ordinary speeches of the Lordship and other Bishops were, that the Cerem: are trivias, raggs, beggerly rudiments; that in the books were multis tolerabiles inepxia, which if it pleased the King to remove they would be glad.

4. The Rej. cannot give us any probable reason, why lights should be more foppish, then the Surplice or crosstings in the supper: Nay he undertaketh to justifye both lights and crosstings in the supper, and a hundred other Cerem: upon the same termes, that he defendeth these.

5. Cal-

The puppy good of popish superstition, those superfluous trifles. Mr. Fox in Mr. Hooper's Story, trifles tending more to superstition then otherwise, like unto stage players attire. 6. All humane religious mysticall Cer. are the byrths of folly, because every man is foolish in fynding out of religious worship, according to his owne imagination. 7. These Cer. are of the same kynd with confessed sopperies, as the placing of mysteries in every weather cock, upon church steeples, as some doe: the Ludi Sacri among the papists in frequent use like unto stage players: The rocking of a babe in a cradle all night, at the Nativity tyme, the Harrowing of hell at Easter; The representation of fighting horse and foot, according to the Custome of Mozarabo: Hist. Concil. Trident. P. 642. If a May pole should be brought into the church, for children to dance about and clyme upon, in signe of their desire to seek things above: If a
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Rife strawe were putt into the child's hand, for a signe of fighting against spirituall enemies, as with a spear, ther would be no more folly in these the is in the cross.

Sec. All experience telleth us, that such humaine inventions are not apt to any spirituall use, as they are appointed unto, and therefore may justly be called according to the notation of the word inepta.

Againe it was opposed, that these Ceremonies were found by wofull experience to be very nocent and hurtfull in that use, which hath bee and is still made of them. To this the Rej. answereth: that these mischeifs (which he cannot deny to follow upon our Ceremonies, as they have beene and are urged, are accidental events or sequells, not proper effects of them,) and that the extreme opposition of them as unlawfull, hath been the cause or occasion of these evills. But 1. these mischeifs have followed upon these Ceremonies by more continuall or contiguall succession (then the Pope can plead for his chayer) even from the tyme of the first urging of them, untill this day. Mr. Fox speaking of a wicked persecutor, one Blumfeld, who threatened a good man, one Symon Harelston, to present him, for not wearing the Surplies: Addeth it is pitty, such baines of Popery are left to the enemies to take the Christians in, God take them away from us, or us from them. For God knoweth they be the cause of much blyndnesse and strife among men: In his iudgmem: the Ceremonies were then nocent, and infamous for these sequells, and yet the Rej. sayd, they were not untill of late so extremely opposed as unlawfull. 2. Our opposition of them is no more guilty of these mischeifs, then the messlage of Moses and Aaron,
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Aston, were of the cruelty which Pharaohs talse make used, towards the poore Israelites, Exod. 5., though some people now may think so, as many Israelites did then. 2. When the Anabaptists in Helvetia opposed humane Ceremonies as unlawfull, they were by publike authority, and with common consent abolished: And the very Anabaptists were thanked for that opposition. So Zwinglius (their arch-adversary) Tom. 1. P. 70.

And here truely I shall graunt to the Casabaptists, and will freely confess, that some commodity hath accrued, from that contention, which they have stirred about Baptisme: For hence hath come to passe, that those things which the foolish superstition of humane conceits had added: (as namely the use of Exorcisme, spitle and salt, and many other of the like kynd, which were brought to light) are accounted of all for vaine and frivolous. Who or what is in the way, that the contention of so many worthy (I dare say) of no lesser respect then Anabaptists, against the same kynd of Ceremonies should be accounted a just cause, or occasion of so different a resolution, as the severest urging of them, is from the utter shaftering of them: Certaine it is: the proper cause is to be sought in some other box, then extreame opposition, and esteeming of them unlawfull.

3. Suppose these Cerem. in regard of some places, tymes, and persons not unlawfull, and the mischeifs accidental, yet that makest not the generall urging of them innocent, no more then seirce-gallopping of horses through London streets, where many men, women, and children, are indangered, want of intending mischeif, would make that mudd hurry innocent.

4. The mischeifs being so great...
great as fearfull horror of conscience in some: Rej. P. 4.
hardening, spoiling, and distempering the conscience in
other, silencing of so many hundred good ministers,
and keeping off more from the ministry, troubling, un-
settling, and vexing of thousands among the people, en-
couraging of Popish and prophan men: with discon-
gaging, and martyring the myndes of many good: the
mischiefs I say being so unestimable that they can in no
proportion be recompesed, by all humaine ceremonies
that are in the world, the ceremonies which have such
sequells, yeare after yeare, are much more hurtfull, then
the Cart and horse, that are driven over children in
the street, and their urgers of them more guilty, then
such Carters or Coach men, as drive them: The De-
therfore & Rej. which pronounce both innocent, and
do not rather fynd the Cerem. forfsited, and call the
drivers of them to she barre, are neither good Crow-
ners, nor fit to be of that Iurye: Luther Anno. in
Math. 15. giveth a better verdict Viz. all humaine tradi-
tions or ceremonies (even those which in his judgment
may in some cases be observed) have two properties of
the Divell, as being lyars, and murthereers, when they
continue and are not conuemned. Such innocents God
deliver his people from. 5. It is the very nature of such
humaine ceremonies as ours, where they are urged and
used (as with us) to do hurt: 1. because they are vayne
toyes (as formerly was shewed) and therefor prejudicial
to so grave a business as Gods worship: They trayne up
the people of God in subjecting themselves, and their
worshipping of God, unto the pleasure of men. 3. They
make
make way for open imagery, and other grosse superstitions. They challenge that to themselves which is proper to Gods ordinances, &c. It is the very nature of our Ceremonies; as they are imposed upon all our ministers, and congregations, in such dispositions and relations as they are known to have, to scandalize many in and out of the church, to disgrace the ministry, to force the consciences, or undo the outward state of many good Christians, to encourage Papists, to arm the prophane, and to quench zeal against both.

Concerning the nature and definition of a Ceremony: Pag. 29, 30.

Here we have the chief hynges, whereupon the doores and wyndowes of the Rej. doe alwayes both open and shut, brought as it were into one box, by the examining of these therefore, we shall perceave what strenght is in all the building.

The beginning of this doctrine is orderly taken from the definition of a Cerem: A Ceremony is an outward action designed and purposely observed and done, in reference to some other thing, to the substance whereof it is neither a cause nor a part. I will not here use Scaligers saying: Nothing more unhappy then a Grammarian adventuring to define. For this is not the fault of this Definition, that it is too Grammaticall, because no Hebrew, Greek, or Latyn Grammar, nor nor Dictionary neither, hath any such word, as bareth the sense of the thing here defined: Let any
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man make triall, and he shall fynde this true, that there is no word Hebrue, Greek, or Latyn, that hath any such meaning. But I may well apply that rule of Lawyers: A definition is a dangerous thing in law: i.e. in those humane lawes, which have no ground, but mans will, such as those are wherby our Ceremonies have their being: The unhappines of this Definition is, that as it is recorded of Doria the Admirall of Genoa in a great Sea fight against the Turkes, he steched his course so far about to gayne the wynd, that he could never come to strike one stroke, before the fight was ended: So this Rej. seeking to get some advantage of wyndye words, doth in this definition, goe so far about, that by this course, he is not likely to come orderly unto the graple.

An outward action may be designed or referred to another thing very many ways: now the Rej. taking in to his definition, reference to another thing in generall, and excepting nothing but causes, and parts, he maketh all other references as they are found in outward actions Cerem: D. B. wrote this his Rej. in Reference to the Church of England, his Diocesan, and other ministers, and people, as also in reference to the Replyer, neither is his book any proper cause, or part of these, shall we say therefor that his book is a Cerem. of all these? In reference to Dr. B. many taylors, shoomakers, bookbinders, Apothecaries, Chyrurgions, Sextons, Paritors, Church-wardens (and who not?) have performed many actions, which yet were never esteemed his Cerem. The Bishops corrupt and cruelly dealing in troubling of many congregations, and depriving many better then themselves,
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selves, have reference to the Ceremonies, but are no proper cause nor part of them? Are they therefore the Ceremonies? To prosecute the wyldnes of the definition, was too tedious a chase; but yet we must consider how he explaineth the termes of it: remembring alwayes, that this explication is a Cerem: to that definition, and is no proper cause nor part of it.

Concerning the generall, that a Ceremon: is an action and externall: Zwarez a great Master of the Ceremonies, telleth us, that a Ceremony is not only a transient action, but also a permanent thing: De Regig. vol. 1. ar. 3. lib. 4. cap. 14. and that Ceremonies may be distinguished according to the number of the ten predicaments, of which action maketh but one, and an externall action but half a one: But let us heare the Rej. express himself: The Crosse and Surplice, are not Cerem: but the wearing of the Surplice &c. P. 30. Touching which we must understand, such outward things have a fourfold consideration: 1. According to their nature, as they arise out of their principles, as the linnen cloth of a Surplice, the wood of a crucifix. 2. That artificiall frame, or fashion that appeareth in these. 3. The impression or ordination, which is put upon these to this or that end. 4. The using of these, or stirring up the heart by these in practice: So in the bracen Serpent, we may attend: 1. the brasse or metall out of which it was made: 2. the fashion of it: 3. the impression of God in or by this fashioned to such a purpose: 4. the using of this, erecting of it up by Moses, the seeing and beholding of it by the people: whence it is easy, to see the deceit of the Rej.
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Rej. his assertion: Things in the second, & third senses, formerly mentioned, are by all writers truely called cerem: either not attending, yea excluding in our consideration, the fourth respect which is the use: Namely that habitude or impression which was imprinted upon a crucifixe, or brazen Serpent, by which they had a morall force, either lawfully, or unlawfully putt upon them, for their severall ends, are Cerem. lawfull or unlawfull.

Thus the current of writers Papistcall confesse: the church hath power, to make and appoint Ceremonies and enjoine the using of them, so that they are ceremonies, before they be used; their high Altar is a ceremony, yea holy all the tyme, before it be used, in bearing the unbloody sacrifice: Thus all Interpreters, terme the types of the ould law cerem: for that spirituall disposition they have, and typicalnes which the Lord set upon them, as well when no man used them, as when they were used: The brazen Serpent being once set up: had beene a Ceremony in the wildernes though the people would never looke upon it, yea I ask, whether the malling vestments of Papists, such which carry a consecrating virtue with them, are not ceremonies, when they are kept, as well, as when they are worne. All men to speake, so write, so judge: and the like may be said of our Surplice &c. In a word: These which were properly types, were properly Ceremonies, but Legall institutions & rites amongst the Jewes were properly rites, as well before and after they were used, as in the using. And therefore they were properly ceremonies, as well when they were not used, as when they were in use, i
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the night as in the day, when men are in sleepe and cannot use them, as when they were awake, and did employ them in worship.

1. If we be truly and properly said to use Cerem. then Cerem. are properly such besides their use. True it is some Cere. consist in actions, and all actions being in motion, when the actions cease the Ceremonies grounded upon them must needs cease: but it is not, because they are Cerem., but because they be such Cerem., whose foundations are in actions: In summe then it appears, that the being or existence of the fiction, the being or existence of Serpent, and the moral impression or appointment to its end, this being, or existence, I say is a ceremony, when it is not used by any: and therefore some being or existence is a ceremony point blank to the Rej. determination. He adds:

It is an external action, because internal actions of the mynd, being matters of substance cannot duly be called ceremonies.

Pendadventure these words, may have some true sense in some specialties, but they serve not his turne in this place, because though he only mentions outward actions, yet he requires a purposed observation of them, which carries the work both of mynd and will, and therefore includes an internal action of the man, for no man can purposely observe, but he must both judge what he should doe, and affect what he judgeth, so that the Rej. here speaks daggers, nor can I see, how he can excuse a contradiction or two.

He that requires a purposed observation in a Cer. he requires

Rej. Secund. dict. i.
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requires an act of mynd & will, & so an internal act. But D. Burg. requires a purposed observation in a ceremony. Therefore he requires an act of mynd and will, and so an internall act, whence defining a Ceremony to be an action externall, and yet making it internall also, he crosseth hymns with himself.

Or thus:

He that duly and of right judgment requires a purposed observation, he requires an internall, and so a substantiall act or a matter of substance.

But Dr. Burg. requires duly and in right judgment: (I mean in his apprehension) a purposed observation:

Therefore he requires a substantiall matter in a Ceremony, which he denies should be done: and that is a contradiction.

The second terme, is designed or purposely observed and done, and as he explicates himself: Institution or that which is all one, intended observation, is essential to a Ceremony: P. 30. Which words are confused, and draw with them dangerous inconveniences, when Institution and intended observation, are made simply all one: For neither is all institution, an observation, because many things are instituted, which are not observed. 2. Neither is an intended free observation for one time used: an institution, 3d. an institution with authority implyeth much more in it, then intended observation. Dr. Jackson in his original of unbelief, pag. 334. 335. very aptly to this purpose notes, that some expressions may sometimes be used, and obser...
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Well, which to use ordinarily, (much more to institute) would be ridiculous or impious. As Jacob did blameable bind his son Joseph's coat, yet to have bunched it about his bed, or table, so that it might receive such salutations, evening and morning, or at every meal time, might have countenanced many branches of superstition: once and use it not, may be discretion of those things whose continuall use degenerates into abuse. All observers of Ceremonies are not instituters of them, I thinke D. B. would be loath, to institute the Cross, and Surplice, with other Cerem: which yet he doth observe: In his interpretations of subscription he refuseth to defend, how well these be imposed (that is as I take it instituted) and yet acknowledgeth, the intended observance of them, to be very well: Besides all this, it is to be marked, that the Rej. by confounding institution and purposed observance, doth exclude or forget all natural ceremonies, such as bowing of the body before superiors, imbracing of those, who are dear unto us, lifting up the hands and eyes to heaven in ordinary worship, which nature itself doth teach all nations to observe, without any institution, though not without some government of councell, nor without such variety, as nature itself is subject unto: Againe if by this phrase he meane that a purposed observance of an outward act, with an ayme and reference to such a thing, is of necessity required to make up a Cerem: or a Ceremonious action, in worship or otherwise, it is a miserable mistake: Instance thus: A carnall Protestant presents himself amongst such, as are at Masse, he professeth to his companions, before he goes in, and doth in the pur-
pose of his heart seriously loath the pix and Idol there; yet when its lifted up, he bowes as others do.

Lett any man in reason tell me, did he not use or abuse rather a Divine Ceremo. in that bowing or no? If the Rej. say yes, as he must, unless he will speake against all reason & truth: I then reply upon his owne ground: That outward action which is not purposely referred, that is not a Cerem. but this action is not purposely observed with any ayme to that end for the party intende no such thing, purposed no such matter, but did it as a thing of course, as a man should bow his knee for exercis when he is alone. 2. Peter withdrawing himself from the Gentiles at the coming of the Iewes, he did not purposely this, with reference to any Judaical seperation, as judging any legall pollution in joyning with the Gentiles, or holines in parting from them, and therefore he did not practise any Iewish Cer. according to the Rej. conceit, but directly contrary to the text: there is no end of these absurdities.

The differenting terme is placed in reference to some other matter, of the substance whereof it is neither necessary cause nor part, Pag. 10.

Where he seemeth to expound that, which before he called a proper cause by a farr differing terme of a necessary cause: what should be the intention of this variation I cannot guess: It may be the Rej. forsook, that he was in giving of accurate rules, and so fell into a loose varying of phrases: So likewise in illustrating of this difference, in stead of pars he nameth a substantiall part, as distinguishing parts into substantiall and accidental, of which addi.
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addition I cannot tell what to make: How ever this is no forme or essentiaall difference of a Cerem. from other actions. D. B. hath preached a thousand good sermons, in reference to his flock or people, yet I do not think, he esteemed them Cerem. of his hearers: This Paradox he enlargeth with many similitudes, and examples, I looked he should have allledged some scripture, from whence this might have beene gathered or concluded: at the least adjoyned some convicting argument, which might have cleared this so mayne poynct of his definition, or if none of those, that yet he would have shewed some authority or author, who had so writ and spoke, but here is deepe sylence, and we must take all upon the Drs bare word, but by the Drs leave we are purposed to trye his novelles and not to take them upon trust.

Here (1) it is justly to be faulted, that he goes against all rules of ait and reason, making up the chief part of his definition, of a negative, and so in yssue tells us, what the thing is not, not what it is: For having said, that a cerem. must be in reference, the demand might be, what reference is that, he adds it is not a cause, or a part. And any may in reason still enquire, if it be not either if those two, what is it then, or what intend you by it, here he leaves himself not a mule or a hole to escape, but even a broad feild to walk at liberty in, either to affirme, or deny what he will: For presshe him thus: If it be not the reference of a cause or part, is it then referred by way of comparison? No: Is it by way of opposition? No: And thus where shall we hould him, or make him stay, Nay D 3
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where will he himself fynd foothold to stand: Just for all the world, as if he should defyne a man to be a living creature, which is not a byrd, nor a fishe, nor a lamine, nor an ox, how senselesse and sapplesse would such descriptions be, and yet this of the Rej. in this place is the like. And hence it is, that in stead of a clearer knowledge, and apprehension of the thing, which should begayned by definition, I dare be bold to make it good (for I speake but what by experience I have found) that the most ordinary, yea judicious readers, when they thought they knew some thing of a Cerem. before: after they had read this definition, they knew, just nothing at all: Thus his defining is like filling dust in the eyes of a mans understanding, to delude and deceive, at the least to dazell and trouble his reason: I hope by the next returne, the Rej. will be content to acknowledge this fault, and will tell us in plaine English, what he meanes by this reference: which if he do, I am verily perswaded he will be forced to see, how far wyde he was, when he mynted and vented these feeble conceits. How ever we will see, what we can make of it, and in this our enquiry, it must not seeme strange to the Dis learning, that being simple men, our dull capacity es compasses severall ways that we may fynd out the foundation, upon which this assertion is built, In which we proffesse in a word of truth; our desire is not to pervert his meaning, but to understand it.

This reference then in the generall wherein it is pro-
pounded can carry but two significations we may con-
der both, that we may guesse at the mynd of the author.

1. Its
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1. It is taken for relation, in open phrase, and so also he declares it, and in a faire construction seemes to intend it, for so he writes. It is not divine nor humaine influence that makes a Ceremony: for that it is the relation as both be said which consisteth. If this be his meaning, then the two relates, betwixt whom this relation is, must be their action referring, and the manner or thing unto which it is referred: but in this sense it doth thrust it self & caries a contradiction with it: All relates are mutual causes one of another, and doe consist of mutual affection between each other. As there cannot be buying without selling, giving without taking: assume we now in this sense, but the action outward to the thing whereunto it is referred, are relates: Therefore they are mutual causes one of another, therefore how can they be in this reference, and yet be not a cause one of another, which the Rej. expresseth and requireth: this sense not houling, let us see how the other will serve his turne.

2. This reference in a large sense imlyes any kynd of notionall respect, which can be considered and conceived, beside that of a cause or part, and this drawes many absurdities with it.

1. That which belongs to substantiall worship, as well as ceremoniall, that cannot be the difference, or proper nature of a Ceremony, for then they should not be distinct one from another: but to be referred to some thing not as a cause or part, belongs even to substantiall worship as well as Ceremoniall: For each worship of God hath proper and particular causes of which it is made, and unto which it is referred, as an effect,
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1. The Induction of particulars will make it undeniable, profession of the true God, and the truth of the Gospel is referred to both, not as a cause or part of either: ergo, sound profession is a ceremony: Prayer in all the kinds of it, confession to God, petitioning from God, are referred to him, not as causes or parts; ergo, they are ceremonies.

Hearing attending conserving, examining things heard, are referred thereunto, not as causes or parts of the things; ergo, they are ceremonies.

Nay to believe and hope in God, to love and fear him are referred to God not as causes or parts: ergo, these are Ceremon. If it be here said, yea but these are inward actions, whereas our Ceremon are said to be outward by the Rej: I answer: be it granted, yet this kind of reference being the proper forme of a Ceremon: the reason still holds good (though we have no need of this example having so many before mentioned) for whereabouts the forme or proper nature of a thing is there the thing formed will be, as its a sound kynd of reasoning, where ther is a reasonable soule as a forme there is a man: Lastly to deride contempt, rayle, revile Christ, his truth and servants is an outward action purposely observed with reference to these, by persecutors not as causes and parts of them: ergo, these are but Ceremon: sylnes, and is not here wyld work, thinks the Christian reader.

3. That which is common to all actions, and a things, can not be a forme and difference of a Ceremon to make it differ from all other: but thus to be referre
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To another, not as a cause or part is common to all outward actions, natural, civil, religious, yea to all natural and civil things: Thus all acts may be referred one to another, and all other to Divinity, not as causes or parts of Divinity: are they therefore all Cer? Nay all precepts of art are referred the former to the latter, not as causes or parts; ergo are they in this Rej. conceit, and by the verdict of this definition Ceremo? Amongst the examples of this difference, the last is to be attended unto because it hath a remarkable note added unto it? Convening in one set place as an honore appointed unto worship saith the Rej. in that relation a ceremony of worship: and yet as it is in observance of order it is no Ceremo. Of this there can be no doubt, but the observation of time and place, in reference to another thing, is according to the definition of the Rej. a ceremony: But how an observation of this time and place, can be considered as an order, without reference to some thing to be ordered in that time and place, that so it may be differentiated from the same order, as it is a ceremony, this is a metaphysicall abstraction, as I cannot conceive of, let others therefore judge: When the Apost. chargest the Corinth, to doe all things in order: could he be so understood, that he spake of order, and of the ceremony of order, and that by doing of things in order, he meant a Cerem: because there is a relation of order to things: but by doing orderly he meant no ceremony, because there is no relation to things: Order without relation to things ordered, is like the accidents in the Popish Sacrament, without any subject after transubstantiation: If the doctrine of humaine Cerem. cannot stand,
stand, or be understood, without such miraculous subtilties let it goe seek for those that will receave it. The note added to the former example is: that they who oppose matters of order to matters of ceremony, as if the same thing could not be done in double relations, do confound several notions of things, and oppose things coincident. Here first may be marked, how he crosseth that in this conclusion, which he layd for the ground of it: before he sayd reference or relation to some other matter doth distinguish a cerem. from order, because a Cerem. hath such a relation, and order as order hath not: but now he tellleth us of double relations one in order, and another in cerem. Secondly he fighteth here without an adversary, except he understand by matters of order, mere order, and by matters of Cerem. such observations, as are significant by institution, for no man doubteth but Cerem. lawfull and unlawfull also may be done in order.

In the example of this rule, the Rej. is so sublime in his subliming and refining of notions, that he hath these words: The observance of the order appointed for reading, singing, praying, &c. is in respect of that order of the substance thereof, but referred to divine service is a cerem. In this (I say) no more good sense appeares then needs must, for putt those words together: The observance of order, in respect of that order is of the substance thereof: without all question: as a man in respect of the same man is of his substance: So also the observance of a cerem. in respect of that ceremony is of the substance thereof: Here is no difference, neither indeed can any difference be intelligibly sayned betwixt order of divine service, and order
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order in relation to divine service, but humane Cerem. 
must thus be handled.

For a conclusion of this, that we may not altogether 
send the Reader away with these uncertainties, with-
drawing ourselves from the Rej. his by paths, we will in 
a word or two, a little enquire, what the word of truth, 
gives us to consider, touching Ceremonies, and see if 
we can hit the ould and the good way, the Kings roade 
of righteousness.

If then we look into the Scriptures, which are all to 
informe us, in all things we should doe, we shall fynd no 
other names of such Cer. which the Lord hath either 
required, or the church used, but those: **TORAH CHOKIM 
MISPAT**: but the Cer. part of Gods service, was made 
known most usually by the last word **CHOKIM**, coming 
of a root, which signifies, to grave, frame, carve, fashion 
in manner of a statue or picture, and is applied as the 
Hebrewes observe, to appoint or make the first rude 
draught of a thing, and so it fittly imports those services 
which were enjoined the Israelites, by means of out-
ward sensible, carnall things, all which were but like 
the home-book or prymmer, for the church to be schooled 
by, when it was in its infancy and nonage, and therefor 
are called, elements of the world, carnall rites, beggerly 
rudiments, to witt, because these were only **supplemenle** 
to those spirituall ordinances, which are called morall 
or substantiall: for wheras there be some ordinances of 
God, which carry a constant and perpetuall equity and 
necesstiy of our honouring of the Lord: As that there 
should be a rule made knowne, to counsell and advise 
us, how
us, how he will be worshipped: requisite it is, we should hear, read, meditate, confer, suffer our selves to be squared by this rule and word: Equi y, necessity requires we should pray, that we should have scales of the covenant to confirm us in regard of our infirmity, however needed none in regard of Gods immutability, but to let out his love to us, in the full course of it: Again equal and necessary it is, we should in the name of Christ, cast out what is contrary, and will destroy his kingdom, his propheticall and Priestly office, and to his honour: But to have outward elements carnall, and sensible rites, to teach our mynds, to carry up our hearts to God, laying aside the minority of the church, there not a perpetuall necessity of these, nor add they to the substance of the service, but only help me, because I am weake, and dymme sighted, like so many spectacles, to succour my dazeling eye: and therefore are Ceremonies, the first draught of outward ordinances: Now all the outward types appointed thus by God, which foretold Christ to come, and those other rites which by way of signification taught our mynds, and so helped and stirred our hearts outward to grace or duty, all these are ceremonies: And consider them, and practise them, as they are in the word appointed, whether it be with any reference, to any other worship, or without reference had to any other worship, they are then and ever were at all those tymes in themselves, and in their use ceremonious worship: Instance thus: To put on frontlet before the eyes, &c. commanded 15. Numb, and by them to be admonished and stirred to the obedience of ...
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Law: take this Ceremony, in the work, and in its own nature, as a mean signifying, teaching, and so working, this is a Ceremony, and so to do is Ceremonious worship: refer it; refer it I say to no other thing, but only to this, unto which it is appointed of God, as a mean to work & as a cause doth work so is, I say look at it, as a cause to work, (which the Reformed in his definition) in this sense it is a ceremony and ceremonious worship: the like of the rest. At a word: It is the veridic voice of the scripture, and consent of all men, to divide worship into moral, ceremoniail. Whence I gather thus: If ther be a ceremoniail worship, a distinct species from moral or substantial worship, then is a ceremony in it owne proper nature, as such a worship without reference or consideration had of moral or substantial, as a man in his owne nature is a living creature, without any consideration of a beast. Againe hence its cleare, that as well as moral worship hath a compleat nature of it owne, without ceremoniail: So ceremoniail hath its compleat nature without moral, because they are contradistinct species.

Againe hence it followes, divine ceremonies as such, are parts of worship: every species as it is a species, is part of his genus: but divine ceremonies as such, are species of religious worship: whence that is false which the Reformed in the seventh confecctary: That actions in some consideration may be real acts of Divine worship, and so be no ceremonies. For its evident, he doth and must needs speake of acts ceremoniously religious, and then byside the former argument, I would reason thus:

If a...
A fresh suite against Ceremonies.

If a man, as he doth refer a religious action to another, doth worship God, then is it a species of worship even in that reference: but as he doth refer a religious action to another, he doth worship God: ergo, that action in that reference is a species of worship: And thus much his own words in the same consectary seem to me to evince: The outward elements and acts in respect of the inward things they do represent and exhibit are cerem. So the Rej. Consect. 7. P. 34. But I assume, God is worshipped by them, or they be parts of worship, in that very use, and thence as ceremonies they are parts of worship: Hence lastly the vanity of the first consectary, is plainly discovered, as containing empty words without any worth of matter. For when its sayd: To acknowledge anything to be ordained a Cerem. by man, to be used in the worship of God, and yet to affirm the same to be a part of that worship to which it referreth, implies a contradiction: The answer is easy: It is confessed by all men, that Ceremonies are not part of that substantiall worship, I say that particular worship, which they do accompany, and unto which they refer as none of the types in the oulde law, were either hearing, praying, beleeving, &c. and yet were reall and proper ceremonious worship, in themselves considered, as being a contradistinct species thereof: So also the Sacraments, are no part of that particular inward worship whereunto they refer: namely, sayth in God and his promisses, and yet by signifying, sealing, according to Gods institution, they are true divine cere, and reall true parts of worship in the Generall: So also our humaine Cer. as the crosse: it is not, nor we affirm it to
it to be, part of our faith in God, or our constant obedience to him, and yet we say as its made a token to import these, and so made a teacher of these, its a ceremonial, yet a real species of worship in the general, though false: So that either the Consec. is to no purpose, carrying only an empty sound of words, or if it be taken in a proper sense, it will not free our ceremonies, from the charge of false worship: Thus far we have made a little digression from the Rej. but nor from the latter (Christian Reader) may nor yet wholly from the Rej. because all this, adds still, to the manifestation and confusion of the desperate seebleness of his definition, joyned merely out of his owne conceit, and vented to the world, without either proofe or authority.

From these premises certaine consequences are deduced, the quality whereof may easely be guessed at, by that which hath beene found in the premises viz. that they are either to little purpose, or false: For the conclusion being false, all the collections which hence he others, must needs be as untrue, so that either they are not found, or else they take no force or foundation of soundnes and truth from hence, if there be any in them, and therefore I need add no further examination, for the see it self falling, the boughs must needs followe: For any collection he makes must in this, or the like forme be concluded: If a Ceremo. be an action' externall, &c. then this and that and the other will follow. Let me reason, and on the contrary syde assume: but a cerem. not an outward action instituted, &c. nor is that defi-
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itation true, as hath beene declared by the reply: ergo, none of all those courtiers, may be concluded, can be collected therfrom.

Yet for more satisfaction sake, let us take a view of the several; but very shortly: The first is, that therefore the same actions one at the same times may in several respects be cere, & no cere: But if the nature of a cere doth not consist in reference or relation, as hath beene evinced before sufficiently, then the change of the respect or relation, doth not bring in the change of a ceremony.

Second Consequent is: That institution and observation, makes a ceremony not a natural habitude or aptnes of any action to express this or that: Now if no natural aptnese or habitude make a Ceremo. what will the Rej. say, to things of Decency, Comlynes, and order which are ceremonies in his sense. 42. pag. and in a large sense of the word may truely be so called, do none of these arise out of the natural aptnes and habitude of the action? The whytenes and cleannessse of the communion cloth, doth not the decency thereof yssue from the habitude of the thing, which if it was soule and nasty, would not be decent, let all institution do what it could: That a minift should turne his face to his people in the pulpit, when he preacheth, and not his back, is not this comlines the natural aptnes of the action: That people should stand or sitt in hearing the word, and not ly along upon their faces, doth not this yssue from the natural aptne of the action, without institution, is there not decent in these, or can institution make the contrary decent? Therefore decency and comlines of some actions, to sh
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or that, issue from the natural habitue, then some cerem. doe issue out of this aptness, because these are such, and so this consequ. is false.

The third is: that mystical signification is not necessary to make a ceremony (as some would have it) but relation only as search in diverse observances of the law: though mystical signification added, may make a double and perhaps a triple ceremony. If this be granted no inconvenience follo-

with to the Repl. because the question still remaineth, about double and triple Cerem. such as the crosse is, whether it be lawfull for men, to institute such in Gods worship. And to argue, from a single Cerem. to a dou-

ble, and triple, this is not from the head of parity. And as for the observances in the law, I deny all of them to have beene properly Cerem. although they be some tymes so called improperly, and that with Judicious Iu-

nius. Exod. 25. Some Cerem. are taken up to figure the

truth of the thing, and those appertaine properly to the nature

types by Gods appointment, others are taken in, not so much,

for the resemblance of the things, but for the nature of the fig-

ures: As in these Cerem. there be many things, that make no-

ting to the nature of a Cerem. as such, but only to the nature

of the thing, which thing after the manner of some master

liable to sense, is applied about the Ceremony and the Cerem-

nial figure.

The fourth is: That the difference which some make be-

twist circumstances and Ceremonies is a mere nycetey or

fiction: This is a strange nycety as ever I knew. The turning

Ceremonia: fed tanum ad naturam rei, quae materia aspetabilis modo, ad Ceremoniam & figuram Ceremo-

nial figure.

The first Part. F or jog-
or jogging of th' hour glass in relation to the measure of tyme for a sermon, the sweeping of the church before the church meeting, the carrying of some notes for remembrance upon occasion, the quoting of scripture without, or by the book, and a 100. Such were never esteemed ceremonies properly so called, before men began to bring a mift upon religious observances, that humane presumptions might not be discerned.

The fift hath his answer before.

1. To a ceremony Institution is essential, pag. 30.
2. It is not an action, that makest it a ceremony, but Institution. Conf. 2. Pag. 32.
3. Now here we are roold that Divine, or humane institution, do not make an action a ceremony, whence I reason thus:

If neither Divine nor humane institution make a ceremony, then no institution doth: for all institutions are either Divine or humane, and from the denyall of all the species to the denyall of the Genus, the consequence is good: as it is neither a beast, nor a man, therefore it is not.

But this fift corallary faith, its neither divine nor humane institution make a ceremony: ergo, I conclude, no institu-
instituition doth make a ceremony; which is a direct contradiction to the second: which affirms, that institu-

tion doth make a Ceremony.

The seventh hath been discussed and confuted before in the substance of it: Pag. 34. onely that strange kynd of expression may here be observed as we passe by: It is no essentiall to a ceremony simplye, that it be no proper part of Divine worship: where let it be observed, that to be no proper part of worship, is a bare negation, or not being of worship: now plaine it is, and manifest to all that have but common sense, that a bare negation, can-

cannot be essentiall to any thing, that hath being, neither simply nor comparatively. And by the same proportion, and upon the same ground, he might as well say, to be no part of worship, is not essentiaall to any thing, and therefore not to a Ceremony: now to what profit, or pur-

pose are such expressions, which serve nothing to the cause in hand, but to darken the truth with words, and to dazzell the mynds of the ignorant.

The eighth is; That it is not the use or end, which maketh a ceremony to be part of divine worship, or not, but instituition: Divine instituition maketh any circumstance a part; but hu-

maine institution, though to the same end and use, maketh only an adjunct of divine worship, because the observance thereof cannot incurre the act of any proper worship of God. How this is a confectary following upon the premises it doth not appeare. The contrary seemeth to follow from the first confectary, where divine and humaine instituition is denied to make a Ceremony, or no Ceremony, but rather to difference arbitrary, and necessary Cerem. For
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by the very like reason; Divine and humane institution doth not make worship, or no worship, but rather maketh a difference of necessary or arbitrary will worship. The reason of that is rendered, because relation doth constitute a Ceremo. And the same reason houldeth here, because relation doth constitute worship: The Institution Divine or humane doth onely difference the efficient cause, not the matter, forme, and end, wherein the essence of worship doth consist. If Gods institution did make any circumstance of worship to become worship, then the ceasing from worship should be worship, because there were circumstances of tyme appointed, when men should cease from Solemne worship: The reason which supporteth the other part of this assertion viz: That humane institution cannot make an acton part of worship, because the observance thereof, cannot incurr the act of worship, is just as much, as if it had beene so sett downe: humane institution cannot make worship; because that which it maketh, cannot be worship. If men appoint even places, and tymes, in the same manner, to the same ends, that God did, they are worship as well (though not so good) as the other: If this were not so, then wherefore doth the Scripture tell us, of will worship, taken up at the pleasure of men, or according to the institutions, doctrines, and traditions of men? For by the Rej. his rule, there can be no such thing, and therefore it is vain to forbid it. This may suffice for this coniectary, yet because the reflexion of it doth often occurr in the dispute. I further undertake to prove, that it is neither true in it self: nor is it truely inferred from the definition, and both these
these charges we will indevour to make good.

For our right proceeding to discover the fallhood of the collection, when he faith: The same use and end makes not a ceremony to be part of Divine worship, we must understand true worship, for that all the world of orthodox divines, especially his opposites, against whom he saith this controversy, do confess, that only the Lords institution makes divine worship true, but there is religious worship which is false: So that the meaning is, whether the same use and end of a Ceremony, make it not to be in the kynd of religious worship, as well without the institution of God, as its made true religious worship by it. Or whether: when the same use and end of a ceremony which was religious, when Gods institution came, the institution being taken away (neither I say) the same use, and end, is not now religious properly: we affrime against the Rej. that Divine Institution being taken away, continue the same use, and the same end, there is still religious worship properly though false.

Again this also is especially to be mynded, that we are then sayd to keepe the same use and end, not when we employ the same thing or action: but when we use them as under the act of the same rule, as in the same way, as in the like virtuall respect unto the same end: I often mention that particle of similitude as, because though the ordinances of man, cannot have the same virtue as Gods have, nor can attaine the same end of honouring of God as his doe, yet if we take them, and use them as such, they are false worship to us, so abu-
Sing of inventions, as the use of God's own ordinances are true worship: So that where both these are, the same means in a proper religious use, to attain the end properly religious, there is Divine worship. And this that opened, now comes to be confirmed.

Where the essentiaall causes are of Divine worship, there is Divine worship.

Where there is the same use and end, properly religious; there be the essentiaall causes of Divine worship.

Ergo, there is Divine worship.

First reason. That the same use and end make Cerem, a part of worship reasons.

The first part is beyond all exception, nor cannot suffer a denyall of a man, that hath not forsaken and denied reason: The second part or the minor proposition, is thus made good:

Where there is the same operari, i.e. working or act of essentiaall causes of worship; ther is the same effet or being of the same causes.

It being an ould receaved rule, amongst not only Logitians, but even reasonable men, idem operari, idem esse, the same working, and the same being, goe both together.

But where the same use and the same end is properly religious, there is same operari or acting of the essentiaall causes of worship: Ergo, there must need be the same essentiaall causes: For when God had appoin
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appointed such means to be used to such an end, the appointment being past, the worship is not yet, before those means and end come, and they carry the essence of the action.

2. We may borrow the ground of another argument from Mr. Jennex, where, for pag. 38, speaking of superstitious Ceremonies, be hath these words: Ceremonies are superfluous, when men worshiping only the true God, yet place and depend upon their own ceremonies, the title of Divine, as in effect, when the proper service of God is placed in them, or merit, necessity, holiness and efficacy, though by virtue of the church’s institution: For what can be said more of God’s ordinances than this, 'tis not all this truly, I mean, for merit &c. whence I reason diversly.

If the superstitious incroaching in God’s service, by appointing means of the same use, efficacy and end with the Lords, be a breach of worship properly divine. Then also is it really and properly though falsely divine worship; for a synne directly contrary to the duty of a command, is even of the same kynd with the duty: but the appointment and use of such means, in such a virtue, in such an end, is a breach of true worship really divine, so it is really divine, false worship.

3. Again: That which makes a Ceremoniy properly of divine false worship; that adds more then an adjunct to divine worship, for an adjunct, doth not vary the kynd, or make a new species, but only alters the same species.

But institution thus superstitious, makes an action, a species of divine false worship: by the Rej. consent, nay
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may by the confession of all Divines orthodox, that knew what they writ or spake: Ergo, it add more then an adjunct to Divine worship, for it makes it a species, which is professedly contrary to that which the Rej. hath in this confectary: namely; that humane institution makes an action and junct to divine worship not a part: whereas herein plaine it makes it a species, and so a part of Divine false worship.

4. Againe its lawfull to add an adjunct, which is properly Divine to Gods worship, by the Rej. learning, 
Pag. 36. 37. but it is not lawfull, to add the means of the use, to the same end, which God hath appointed: As it was not lawfull to the Iewes to use other bracellets about there necks, frontletts upon their foreheads, wherein they should write the law, answerable to the Frontletts, and fringes, which God appointed.

That which the Rej. adds, touching the appointment of the place of meeting, is a most miserable mistake: His words are; The Lords appointment of one place for sacrifices, and of some feast days for the solemn worship of Gods the Sabbath, and their feast to Israel, made the observance of that very place and these symes, to be part of worship: But the churches appointment of a set place, or syme, unto the celebration of the acts of religious worship, because it incurr not the worship itself, leaves the observance thereof as a mist ceremony.

Hercin (I say) the Rej. missed the mark miserably: For the Temple was a type of Christs body: Pull down this temple, and I will rayse it up within three days: 
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If he spake of the temple of his body, John 2:19.27., and the very frame of it, by God's institution and ordination, was holy, had an efficiency, and virtue through God's appointment, to carry up the heart to God, by that small respect, and efficacy which it had, as his means to that end. Now let the Church institute, and appoint place, and put this virtue, & efficacy in it, by their institution to the same end, to which the temple was appointed, and I suppose the Rej. himself will say, its superstition and false worship: But our temples have no such thing, put upon them, to no such end, & therefore are not in the same end and use: unless the Rej. will would, that prayers better ascend in Paul's church, when he rounds a pillar in the care, then when he prays abroad: and that he is of opinion, with Bishop Andrewes, that we are heard, not because of the prayer that is made, but because of the place in which it is made: but I hope the Rej. is far off from such delusions.

The second thing we charge upon this confection, is, that it is collected by any force of reason, from the foregoing definition: for cast it into a form, and the very expression will be confusion enough: for the frame must stand thus:

If a Ceremony be an outward action instituted, and purposely observed, in relation to some thing, whereof it is neither cause nor part: then it followes, that the same use and end, maketh not a Ceremony part of Divine worship.

These things have so ill connexion, and fement of reason, that when they are sett in a form, they fall all in

The first Part.
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pieces, as though the consequent was afraid of the antecedent, so far it is from following from the definition naturally, that all the cords of reason cannot draw them together, as it will appear, if any man will put it to trial, by all the topick places of invention: we will therefore rest, until we hear what Balsame the D. brings to heal this wound:

The nynth and last Consecfary is: That Ceremonies may regard of their generall kynd and end be worship, so far as they are in their kynd parts of order and decency, and in their particulars, not be of the substance of order comming, worship. We are at last threfore come to a strange reckoning. Cer. are in their kynd, parts of order, & yet (as we were told pag. 31.) that order so far as it is order, is in that respect no ceremony. 2. A Ceremo. in respect of the genus and end is worship, and yet in the consecfary immediately going before, it was peremptorily pronounced, that use and end maketh not a Ceremony part of Divine worship: I take the cause of this crosse Doctrine to be, that humane ceremonies in divine worship, are such a crosse knott, that he who seeks to open the conveyances of it, must needs run crosse in his thoughts and words. To make this crossing more plain, let us first debate (a little more fully) the truth of this collatie, and then see what followeth therefrom. We have here three conclusions.

1. Ceremonies in their kynd, as they are parts of order, and decency, may be acts of religion.

2. Yet the particulars may not be of the substance of order.

3. That
That the particulars are not Divine; which propositions are plainly expressed in the corollary, if they be not contradictory one to another, I must confess; I must bid all reason and logick farewell, or else the Rej. hath a new logick, which yet never saw light: And therefore I reason thus.

If every particular have the whole nature of the Genus in it, then the general being divine, the particulars must be divine; but every particular of order and decency are species to general nature of order &c. therefore they have the whole nature of order in the general; & ergo are divine: & to affirm the contrary which here is done, is to say a living creature hath sense, but the species man and beast hath none: Or; the nature of man is reasonable, but the particulars: Thom. or Iohn are not reasonable; and thus the 3. conclusion implies a contradiction to the first conclusion.

2. Againe the second also is more grosse, if more may be added, If the general, give his whole substance & nature to the particulars, then if ther be any substance of order, the particulars have it, but the general nature of order gives all the substance to the particulars; ergo, they have it: the maintaining of the contrary conceit, is to bidd battell to all reason, and to deny a confessed common, and receaved principle of art. General is that kind of whole, which gives his essence to the particulars. For how should a man be forliken of common sense, who should affirm, that manhood, or the nature of man in general, should have the substance of reason: but con-

G 2
sidered in his species and particulars. Tho. and Iohn, they should be wholly destitute of the substance of rea-
son: And assuredly (good reader) when I considered, the wonderfull confidence of the disputer, arrogating so much subtlety and learning, and yet to fall so soule and offend so heavily, against the very rudiments of lo-
gick, and principles of reason, I could not but look up to heaven, and lawfully as I could, and tremblingly re-
member, that of the Prophet: That the Lord is layd to put out the understanding of the Prudent.

Thus we have discustied the falshood of the Corall-
ry, we will now reason from it, for our owne advantage, taking the false graunt of the Rej. in this place.

Every species under a command, stands by virtue of the same command the Genus doth, as that is a com-
mon rule in reason, the generall and speciall appertaine to the same place, and it is a rule in Divinity receaved without gainsaying: the generall command by the same stroke and compasse comprehends all the partic-

erals under it; and when that, by way of precept is en-
joyed, all the rest by the same rule, & by virtue of the same command, are also required. We must preserve the life of our Brother, that is the generall of the 6. Command, by the same precept, all the particulars of wayes and meanes which are the specialls of preservation, are re-
quired: but the particulars of order and decency are un-
der the generall of order and decency; ergo, these partic-

culars stand by virtue of the same command they do. And by the Rej. graunt, these standing by a command of divine worship, and being proper acts thereof: ergo,
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It must needs follow that the particulars stand by virtue of the command of Divine worship, and are proper acts thereof: we see by this tyme whither the Dr. Divinity hath brought him.

Againe, if they be so commanded, and be such proper acts of worship: of such acts the Rej. confesseth the Negative arg. from Scripture conclude well. Such acts of proper worship cannot be imposed by man or the Church, significant ceremonies, which carry such acts of worship, are unlawfull, and thus by one graunt, he hath yielded there of the arguments, which he strives after to answere and to overthrowe.

CHAP. V.

Of the sorts and differences of Ceremonies.

The first partition of Ceremo. into private or publike, close or open, may passe for the evidence of it, but yet it may be questioned, being institution is essential to a Ceremomy, as before we have beene taught, to whom the institution of private Ceremonies do belonge? whether the convocation house may appoint men, when they eat and drink, goe to bedd and rise up, to signe themselves with the signe of the Crosse?

The second partition into Ceremom. civill, sacred or mixt: Civill, when their immediate object and end is civill; Sacred, when the immediate object and end is matter pertaining to religion, requires more attension. And it is to be noted, that by this division, all naturall Ceremo. are abrogated.
A fresh suite against Ceremonies.

or excluded, for else the first distribution should have beene; Ceremo. are either naturall or instituted: Now Bellarmine himselfe more considerately makest some ceremony naturall. Ceretaine Cerem. receive institution, and were from nature it self, which may be called naturall Cerem. as to looke up to heaven, to lift up our hands, and to bow our knees, when we pray unto God. Note also the varying of the phrase: In civill cērem. he requireth an immediate civill object & end, but in sacred he will have it enough, that the immediate object and end, be matter pertaining to religion. There may be some purpose in this, to exclude all civill Cerem. and civility out of matters pertaining to religion, that all things being counted religious, humaine mistcall Ceremo. in religion, may not be discerned from common observations, which are equally and often used to the same immediate end both in civill, and in religious matters. These things reserved, the substance of this partition may passe, together with the illustrations of it: Only one illustration I would have remembred for future use. An action ( faith the Rej. ) imperated of religion, or bringing our of the fear of God, may be civill, and belong to the second table. This is that which some of our Divines meane, when they speak of mediate worship, that is, there be duties belonging to the second table, imperated or governed by religion but not immediately flowing from it. This the Rej. keth shoulde of in many places, and maketh thus action religious, which here he calleth civill. The conclusion drawn out of this partition is, that they have the spirit contradiction, which say that the church may not ordaine C
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Surely ecclesiastical, but only common, because all Cerimonies are mere ecclesiastical and beside the cross have their civil use, as a cross for a shop signe, &c. But if one spirit cross another, those spirits must be yed (after the Apostle) and where ther is want of reason and ground, ther is that spirit which the Rej. blasth, and objecteth to others. Now upon a short trial, may appear, where it waketh: The Rej. could us bere, that some ceremonies are mixt, partly civil, and partly sacred; now he telleth us with the same breath, that any ceremony in religious affairs is merely sacred and ecclesiastical: And by proportion any Ceremonies must needs be merely civil, what then become of the mixt or common sort: here sure is a contradiction from what spirit soever it come. 2. What appearance is this, any ceremony used in religious affayres is merely sacred? If men and women come purposely in their best apparell to church, if they compose themselves to a grave posture, give the upper place to their best persons, and take such to themselves as they hear the preacher in, and yet have no exception ten against them for it, if all the places and seats be ade cleanly and fit for a meeting, to be held in a mely fashion, all these are ceremo, according to the ej. his definition, yet no man but out of contention ill affirmeth they are merely religious, or ecclesiastical: all these in the same manner and to the same imme-
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Many Ceremonies are of common use in things civil and ecclesiastic.

affaires. And surely that which remaining the same be civil, is not merely and properly ecclesiasticall, common to both uses, and rather merely civil, because civility is supposed included in ecclesiasticall affaires, but ecclesiasticall proceedings are supposed and included in civil. Dr. Lack in his original of unbelief, pag. 337, doth well obser.

That decent behaviour doth change the subject only, not its own nature and forme, whilst its used in matters sac.

Nob is the habit of civil complements, or good manners, an unallowed weed, as must be layd aside, when we come to the sanctuary. And indeed there is no more reason shunt civility out of the church, or become business, to shunt religion out of the towne-house or civil faires. 3. That which is added of a civil use of the remon. in question doeth nothing agree. If a porter, baker wear a linnen garment in the Church, upon occasion, as at other times, no man will except against or account it a ceremony, ecclesiasticall, or religious.

A crosse that is used for a shopp signe, hath no ecclesiasticall or civil use in religion, except ther be so many temples in one place, that they must be distinguish'd signes, as shoppes are: As for the examples mention'd before, of the Bishops in their formalities, and the Clerks in their surplices, at a funerall for civil use: I answer immediat end of such formalities is religious, even that, they are characters of ecclesiasticall persons, their religious office: Are not Rochetts and such formalities ecclesiasticall ceremonies, being signes of ecclesiasticall officers as such? The funerall
of which they are present, doth no more make them civil, then among the Papists it maketh all their superstition to become a civil order: Nay by this it appeareth that both civil ceremonies may be used in ecclesiastical affairs, and ecclesiastical ceremonies, in civil affairs, because both may be used in the same affairs. To traverse these notions more fully, I add these considerations:

These words, master pertaining to religion added in the explanation of sacred ceremonies, may carry a double sense. 1. That it is enough to make ceremonies sacred, if this be their end to be serviceable to some thing, which is an ordinance, or to some person, in a holy function, or performance of an ordinance, and this seems to be the Rejo.

meaning for his examples carry this meaning, when wearing of blackes, rendering of garments, in days of humiliation are made by him sacred cer. as also by those words, wherein he is so peremptory, and expresseth his lordly censoring, even of mens hearts, in lusting after contradiction, if they deny ceremonies used in religious affairs to be merely ecclesiastical, but this we conceive to be false, & hope it hath in part, and shall appear to be more plainly in the following discourse.

Secondly it may carry this sense: that is truely sacred, when the object is God, and his honour aimed at immediately, as when we kneele to God in prayer, we do not kneele to the scripture, or man praying but God directly: or when the next object is a holy thing, but so esteemed as by that, or in the use of that, we tender up honor to God and attaine that end. As the minister preacheth the word to the people, and they heare it preached, but by both and in the virtue of both,
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According to God's appointment, the heart is carried in holy affections, and apprehensions to him, and so both hould out God's honor: So Sacraments given and receive, excommunicatio dispensed, they hould out the spirituall government of God and his honor unto us, & bring our hearts under his hand to give that honor which is due to his power, soveraignty, and holiness, appearing therein unto us: This only makes a thing properly sacred, but if things of any nature, only so far attend a religious, either person, thing, or performance, as that they help not in carying out the act to God, and so tendering honor to him, but stand only in a distance, and subordination as things of necessity, or in some convenience presupposed to goe before a religious work, in a common way to that, as to other things, in the like proportion, and have the self same work in that sacred as in civill affaires, this is not sacred at all: So place and tyme, a font, will doe as much to any civill action, as to a sacred: So that only religion applieth, and takes to itself, that civill circumstance, that it might put forth his owne act, as upon a stage, makes such things doas much for him, as for any politike and naturall work. Religion serve its turne upon these occasions. In a word the ground lyes here: The latter art, ever useth the work of the former, sometimes for necessity, sometimes for convenience, and adjoining himself to it, doth of itself, do its owne work: So that the thing, is either a subject unto which the act of religion or policy is applied, or else, that finces which such things have in subordination, to have other things to be annexed to them, is that common end,
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end, which such things hould out indifferently, by the
same rule, to civill and sacred actions, and ergo are com-
mon to them both, but are neither properly: Instance
thus: A magistrate of the common wealth: A Gene-
ral in the field: A minister of a congregation, they may
successively stand upon the same hill: the magistrate to-
deliver the law, and judgment, to the subject: The Ge-
nerall to give his charge to the soldiery: The Minister
to preach unto a congregation. Is any man such a wise-
ker, as to say, this hill is a civill, or politike hill, a warlike
hill, a sacred hill, because it serves all these actions of po-
lity, warr, and religion: so that to make the point plaine,
because we are forced to shew forth the seeblenes of the
Rej. dispute, we will now from these grounds (Reader)
reason, and exemplifye, that the meanest may under-
stand.

If to be applied to a religious affaire, make a thing sac-
cred, then all things almost and all arts may be sacred,
because they may be applied to a matter, thing, or per-
son religious, as the next object and end. If the pulpit
be a sacred thing, because it is applied to support the
minister preaching: then is the ayre sacred, its applied to
his speech in speaking: then is the light sacred, its ap-
plied to his eye in reading, then are his spectacles sac-
cred, for they are used by him, reading his text, then the
two pottle potts, which hould the wyne consecrated,
should be sacred potts, Nay the ministers doublet, that
covers him, yea if he was hoarse, and tooke some oyle
to help his voice, they should now become sacred dou-
blets, and sacred oyle. The paper book which the prea-
cher
cher looked on, when he is out in his sermon, should be a sacred paper book, and to follow the Rej. if putting on of ashes upon the head, be sacred in the day of humiliation, then by like proportion, when God enjoineth people in a fast, to put on their poorest and meanest attire, those ragged bands, and ould Capps, and Quoifes were sacred bands, and Quoifes and Capps: But do you laugh at these things matters? when the Rej. is so violent in this cause, that he breakes the bridle, and flies out against all, that will not yeeld to him in this: And I would wise the reader to consider how righteous it is, with God, to suffer men to fall foully whe they will follow their owne imaginations: Ere why the Rej. made all things Cerem. by the loosenes of his definition, and now to help the Ceremo. he would make all things sacred by the large compass he gives to religious Cer. The vanity of which expression, I hope appears sufficiently, by that, which hath beene sayd, but yet that the meanest may feele with his finger, the grossnes of this mistake, I shall add one more instance. The height of the sunne, or the sound of a clock one & the same, may at the same tyme, in the same city, be a directio for Protestants, Papists, Jews, Anabaptists, & all sects to assemble for religious service: It may at the same tyme by the same sound be a direction, for magistrates to meet for judicature, for drunkards to meet to riot, for garmisters to meet to play, for travelers to meet to sett upon their journey: so that it hath relation to all these religious politike, prophane practices at once, I would sayne have the Rej. tell me, what a kynd of Ceremony this is? If he say religious
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Religious, I then demand, is it Anabaptistical, Papistical, Judical, Lutheran, Protestant, Arminian, superstitious, or truly religious ceremony. Is it any one of these, or all of these, for to them all it serves in their intentions, and purposed observation, and by the institution of him that set it up happily. Nay it hath relation to many other affairs, and so it shall be a politike, civill ceremony. It serves to that end, it may be called, a riding, a playing, a drunken ceremony. For it serves at once to all these purposes, and in all their intentions and purposed observations hath equal relations unto all: Again those things whose end is immediately God's honour, they must be able to cause that honour, for each thing can reach his own and immediate end, in the course of nature, or rational institution, one time or other: But all things which only attend upon religious affairs, can never attain this end, or cause the worship of God in lifting up his honour: of this kind are time and place, being bare circumstances: the like may be said of the font, which is no more sacred, then the mud and banks were that contained the water of Iordā when baptism was celebrated. Thus of the definition in the general, some other especials be, in the explication whereof, I shall desire the Rej. judgment, and help a little, that I may understand his meaning, at his next returne. When he sayeth, pag. 36. If the next immediate use belong to religion, as Ieroobams setting up of his calves, that the people might worship there, the action shall be construed religious whether true or falsely called.

Come to this the words of the eight corantary which goe thus:

H 3
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It is not the same end, and use, which maketh a cerem
part of divine worship, I desire a reconcileation of the se
For:

That which makes actions, such species of religion
worship as Ieroboams bowing to the Calves, th
makes them parts of divine worship, though fall
But the use and end here make actions such true ar
reall species of false worship religious, as Ierob
aoms bowing to the calves was: ergo, the use a
end makes Cerem. parts of divine worship.

Againe he saith: it is not so much the terme from wh.
that shall denominate the action, as the terme to wh.
Pag. 36.

If he meane by not so much, that is never a whitt; a
conceave he doth or must, I define he would inform
us, by his next answ: of this case: Conceave a man
ming to do homage according to custome to the Ki
shall by reason of an errorous conceit, bow out of
 sacred opinion and affection, though the object be
 vili, and the act terminated in the person of the Ki
whether is this action sacred or no?

Againe I enquire what those words meane: The same Ce
mony, which is in present use sacred, may by forfith with by
change of the object become cruel: The people bowing do
worshipp God and the King, the Ceremomy was matur.
the same, but objectully different. These expressions
a comment: If by materally the same, he meane the
trall action is the same, its true, but that is nothing
this purpose. Let him tell us, whether there is a pec
specification of those actions in themselves, before 
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Since the object supposeth the being of the thing in its kynd, before it can be an adjunct to it: If there be the same specificall and formall nature of the action, then that bowing being civil when it is performed to a man, why might not I hon have tendered the like to an Angell, and the angell received it, in that he might have done it, as to a fellow servant of higher honour and account, and the angell needed to have feared religious worship, for he being knowne once to be a creature, the change of the object would have altered the worship: But the angell it seemes was of another opinion, then the Rej. and conceaved that it was religious worship before it came to him, and would not have beene civil worship if the object had beene changed.

The third partition (of sacred Ceremo. into propri. sacred, as those of divine institution, which are simply necessary, re-constitute præcepti, or reducibly so called, as such which in their particular have no divine institution, but are applied to things divine, and these are arbitrary and ambulatory cerem. This partition is somthing obscure and therfore should not have beene sett downe in bare words, but had some sufficient warrant and explication: For 1. if these be true members they must have the true nature of things sacred agreeing to them both equally and essentically: but things which are applied to Divine actions, have not the nature or definition of things sacred, because they be applied as adjuncts to the subjects in a separable manner. Is all one as if a man should divide, a living creature, either that which is so properly, as a man, or that which
which is so reductively, as a garment, because it is applied to a man. 2. Proper is usually opposed either to tropical, or to common, or to alien, or else to unfin, unto none of these senses can it be referred in this place where it is opposed to reductive. 3. Sacred arbitrary ceremonies are in truth arbitrary worship, and arbitrary worship is will worship. 4. I would know to whom our Ceremonies are arbitrary? Surely to the imposers only, and to all instituted Ceremonies are arbitrary, though to others, they be made never so necessary, they are not (it will be said) made necessary to salvation. No more say I are all popish Ceremonies, nor all Divine, absolutely necessary to salvation, nor so made or esteemed: Ours are made, as necessary to salvation, as man can make them, when the ordinary means of salvation, are absolutely denied to all those that refuse them.

The fourth partition is of reductive sacred ceremonies rightly so called, and abusively: which is indeed an explanation of the former division, of sacred Ceremonies of Divine institution, are rightly so called and the other abusively: But the Rej. syndeth both these under the head of reductively sacred (Rightly reductively sacred strange amazing terms) are they whose object and end is good, and no things not unapt, &c. where I cannot but admire, that no place is given, to a good efficient or institutor, with any authority in matters of institution: we cannot understand by this description, but a Ceremonies is as sacred and religious, when it is appointed by a Vestry of Layicks as when the convocation imposeth it. 2. The papish have as good ends, and objects, and also as much aptment in mo
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In most of their Cerem. as we have in ours, and yet they are taxed by our divines, as not rightly sacred, and they themselves are ashamed to defend sacred ceremonies, merely humane, or without speciall authority of the institutors, how good soever they esteeme them for object and end: So the Rhem. on Math. 15. 9. Cerem. are made by the H. Ghost, joyning with our Pastors, in the Regiment of our Church. So also Bristow against Dr. Fulke in his Rejoy. to Bristow, pag. 104. Nay there is no order of Friars that will admitt of new Ceremon to be rightly reduced upon them, what ever their object, end, and aptnesse be, except they come from the institutor of the order: All Casuists do hold it for a wrong unto them, if their Priors, Abbats Generalls, should impose upon them the observance of any thing, by syde the vowe which they have made, to observe the rites instituted by their founder: And are not we Christians, as much tyed by our vow unto Christ, as they are to Dominicus, Franciscus. &c. Or are we more subject to our Prelats, then they are to their superiors, by vow of obedience? Luther also hath given us a good item in Gen.

22. In religion nothing is to be attempted or rashly adventured upon, but in things belonging thereunto, we must always enquire, who, how good, and great the person is who commands: But the Divill changeth these things, in to what, of what quality, and how great the thing is. Is it not strange then, that from an auncient reverend minister of the Gospell, a hundred yeares after, there should come a doctrine, of right instituted reductive sacred Ceremon. without any respect of the authority, which is in the institutor?

The first Part.

And
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And yet even if these conditions made necessary by the Rej. a question may be made concerning the cross, whether two crosses motions of a finger and a thumb, be things apt to putt Christians in mynd of Christ's passion for us, and our passion and profession for him?

Abusively reductive sacred Cerem. sayth the Rej. are Idolatrous, Superstitions: Idolatrous, repsecting a wrong object. Superstitious made divine in terms or in effect: Impious, cutting off God's Cerem. or obscuring the Gospel, by representing the History and mystery thereof by dumber shooes, as in the Pageants of the Masse. Here again the same fault is committed, that opposite members of a distribution, are made subordinate one to another, and may be predicated or affirmed, as Genus and Species, which is an infinite seeblenees, in a judicious disputer: for are not idolatrous, impious: are not superstitious impious Ceremo, as those which professedly crosse the first and second command, wherein pyety is most properly placed, and thus divisions fill up places and breed confusion.

CHAP. VI.

Concerning the difference between pope's Ceremonies and ours, in regard of necessity, holines and efficicy, wherein how far we joyn with the Papists, is fully discussed by the confession of papists themselves.

To lett passe the first abuse of Idolatry: Superstition is confessed to be present, where the proper service of God or meris, necessity, holines, and efficacy, by the churches in-
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Institution or the doers merit, or when omission of them is counted a synne without consempse or scandal, as it is amongst the Papists, sayth the Rej.

We are now come by this distinction, to discern the differences betwixt the popish Cerem. and ours, theirs being condemned and abominated, and that justly for these evills which are found in them: but ours are wholly acquitted, as though they shared not in the same guilt: Let us therefore enquire into this busines, with that received caution, heare the other side.

First as touching merit, which is attributed to the doing of Ceremonies by Papists: the difference here, lieth not firstly in Cerem. in particular, but about good works in generall, the Papists making all good works of believers to be meritorious, and we denying that presumption. But see that controversye as ydce, our Prelates profess, the observation of our Cerem. to be good works of the same kynd, that many of the learned Papists doe many of theirs. The maine enquiry lies about, propriety of worship, necessity, holines, efficacy: And (merit being excluded) if these be found in ours, as well as in those of the papists, they will prove guilty as thers, and with thers to be condemned.

Enquire we then, of the severalls: 1. In the doctrine of worship I see not how, or wherein the Iesuites doe differ from the Def. and Rej. about such Ceremonies as ours. Balthasar Chavasius the Iesuite, in his notes of true religion sayth thus: Ceremonies are called lesser, in respect of those

How wejoyne with Papists in giving propriety of worship to Cerem. Balthasar Chavasius Iesuita de notis vero religionis ubi cap. 2, &c. dicit: Minores Ceremoniae de
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Those which are feared greater, because these are led greatest consequence, and so appertain to divine worship of themselves, and directly: but those to wise such are cerem, of lesser note, they so far cross to the worshipping of God, as they serve for the ornament & signification of such worship, the special parts thereof: which is so pat the Rej. & Def. doctrine, that they may seeme to have translated his words.

For necessity to salvation, no learned Papist ever writ or taught any such thing of all their Cerem. Darby, thyre Bonners Chaplyne, and Kynsman, professd to Mr. Thomas Haukes Martyr, that no Ceremon. (besyde those which Christ himself instituted) are necessary to salvation, but only for instruction: whereupon Mr. Haukes answered, God send me the salvation, and take you the instruction. If necessity of observance be respected (which the Def. ca. sect. 3. calleth obedientiall,) that is not only as great in our Cerem as in any of the Papists, and more also, but advanced by Dr. Covell to equipage with the Decalogue, and Dr. B. by his silence ye普京nt unto him, and imitating of him, doth seeme to subscribe to his sentence, and certaine it is, that he writ with Acheypis. allowance. Ecclesiastical constitution, sayth he, doth change the nature of in different things, & by vertue of the commandement they become necessary, mens lawes while they are in force, commanding or forbidding, bynde the conscience. as the Decalogue doth, in his preface to the confusion of Dr. B. his Apologye: The Rej. comes not far short of this plea, pag. 42. where he sayth: They are ordeyned to be used necessi-
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In respect of order and peace, though in respect of judgment, and immediate conscience to God freely: The former part of these words, layeth more necessity upon our Cerem. then the learned Papists do upon all theirs: The latter doth take away no more, then the like words of theirs do, as by and by shall appeare. In the means tyme let him that can unriddle me this: They are ordained to be used necessarily in respect of order and peace, though in respect of judgment, and immediate conscience to God freely: Is there one conscience mediate, and another immediate? Is necessity of order and peace free in judgment and immediate Conscience? Can any creature, or is any so foolish as to say, they can lay a bond upon conscience immediate to God? Is it not a contradiction, for men by their authority, to bynd immediately to Gods authority? The truth is our convocation doth make our Ceremonies, as necessary as they can, either by eclesiastical, Civill, or Divine authority, whereas the Papists say, they can make many of theirs more necessary, then they doe, if they would: And yet in all, their highest pitch is, they call them necessary: Not out of any necessity to salvation, but out of the churches institution: and enioyed the Sacramentalia, not by any necessity of a sacrament, but of a commandement of the church, and we do no lesse.

For making it synne to omit these cere. even without the case of scandall & contempt. 1. This no learned papist doth say of all their cere. as you shall hear stright. 2. Our practice doth say so much in that, bare omission I 3
where none are scandalized or contemned, is made fault punishable, nay more then that, when by the practive of them, many are scandalized, and great contempt doth follow to some users of them, yet is it, a capital fault for them to omit them so longe, untill they use them without scandal, and contempt: And what hath beene sayd of worship, necessity, and synne as that we concurred with papists cerem. pressing our Cerem. upon the same conditions, as they in the former considerations, the like is true also touching holines.

Now because some of these things, which I have affirmed, concerning the doctrine of the Papists about Cerem. may seeme strange to those, that take the measure of their opinion, not from them, but from the occasionall and imperfect sayings of their adversary partyes: It shall be necessary, to heare themselves speake. First let us heare Cassander with his allegations, who in much consenteth with D. Burges, that his Rej. might better have beene called, and intituled Cassander Anglicanus, then M. Sprights book was, save only, that there is more passion shewed in it, then Cassanders temper, and protesting moderation could be brought unto. Cassander, in his consult. article 7. I conceive that to be false, that any of ours should have taught, those external rites and Ceremo, to be worships necessary to procure justification before God: Neither is any other thing attributed to those rites, but that their external observation may admonish us of the true and internal worship, and might by the hand lead us thence: And if they be done out of true faith in Christ and obedience unto the Church of Christ, to which Christ hath commanded.
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...to the subject, they receive that acceptance from God, which other works of pietie do: But that all ingeniously confess, our hope of happiness is not to be placed in them: Againe, the same Cassander pag. 869. The false opinion of worship, merit, necessity, the Pontificans themselves (upon whom that conceit is fixed) do not acknowledge; but affirm, that it is falsely attributed unto them. Of this judgment Thomas Aquinas, and Byell are sayd to be by the same Author pag. 870, 871. And in 1575, if the explication of those positive precepts be considered, they will be found, not to differ much for an advice or exhortation, &c. If the sentence of some may appear more rigid: I believe, that no man is forbid to follow the more moderate opinion, which is explained by Gerson, and followed by many worthy men, who in the transgression of such kind of precepts, place the mortall synne only in candal, and contempt. The same author in the same places.

Alphonse Verbeisius thus: Our traditions bring no deadly danger unto the transgressors therof, unesse the heart be smitten, and, condemning. Periionius (out of the sentence of the Rabone Schoole as I suppose) writes thus: Thery be many Cere.

In the church, which fall under the nature of a counsel, but those which come under the nature of a precept, the violators in not of them, all ours would make guilty of synne, unless peradventure they shall be found consenters.

This which Cassander sayth is sayre, yet to make it more-
more full, I will add some other testimonies, and those of note. Gregorius de Valentia a Iesuice, Tom. 4. disput. question 1. part 4. It is a notorious ye, that we attribute much to these rites as we do to the Sacraments, and that we have them in the same account, as though a true Sacrament could not be instituted without them: If any of the vulgar err in that behalf and so conceive, assuredly, neither the church nor divines so teach: If they be omitted without scandal and contempt, and the matter be small and that a forme will and full deliberation be wanting, it will be only a small synne. So Cajetan a Cardinal: The rule is universal, that in those things which stand by a positive law, if the transgression be made without contempt, and crossing the end of the law, from some excuse appearing to the party, if it procures from him, who hath a mynd no wayes syding against the command which bynds to a mortall synne, a mortall synne is it by that breach committed, because it is not the intention of holy and just mother the church, to ensare such good souls with so dangerous a bond.

Bellarmin also thus: Certaine Cerem. are immediate wor. ship, some dispose unto worship, some are instruments of worship: The same author in the same place, cap. 31. Calvyn say he judged it a fault, if Cerem. be omitted out of contempt of great negligence, and our church teacheth no other thing teach her Ceremonies. The same author againe: Other Ceremonies are not laws, but admonitions, and bosome instru.
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It was but a poore proof therfore of the Rej. to allege, that which Bell. saith of some Ceremonies, as if it did agree to all popish Cerem. and that in the common judgment of Papists. Calvin speaking in the person of Sorbonicall Drs, declareth their opinion to be; That Ceremonies bynd consciences by accident, to witt, because of their ratification, in that the church intend this, and the people consent. Lastly the judgment of Papists is cleare, that they putt no holiness in the Cerem. instituted, you must place no holines in images, Concil. Trid. Sess. 25.

By this which hath beene saide, it is (as I think sufficiently manifested, that the differences betwixt all popish Cerem. and ours, of worship, necessity, holines, and synfull omission, are vainely and without ground allledged by the Rej.

1. Doe the Defend. and Rej. affirm, that our Cerem. are not properly worship, but only to admonish us thereof: The Papists say the same.

2. Doe the Defen. and Rej. affirm, that the omission of them without scandall and contempt, is not a synne: The Papists say the same.

3. Doe the Def. and Rej. affirm, ours are not necessary to salvation, but necessary by the command.
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maund of the Church to be practised: The Papists say the same, nay of some of theirs, they say less, for they say, that many of theirs, are only appointed by way of counsel, not of command.

There is one other difference, which is added to the former, that Sacramentall operation and efficacy is insinuated upon Popish Cerem. as he mentioneth pag. 43, out of Bellar. I add concerning this: 1. That Bell, doth not affirm this of all Cerem. 2. That he doth not acribe this virtue to the crosse, as a humaine Ceremo, but as an imagined institution of God: especially from the institution of God: The cheif Jesuites do disclaime this operative virtue of many Cerem. Sacramentalls do not work reparation of veniall sines, neither are they appointed to signifie that, but to stirre up their mynd to detestation of them: So li Jesuite Yasquez. Balchazar Chiracius another Jesuite:...

Without question, that we put so much difference between Cerem. and the Sacraments, to which they are appliued, as betwene the bark, and the wood, the body, and the soule, the leaves and the tree, whence it is we grant, that they may be omitted in any weighty necessity. Castander alio Confitt art. 9. well observeth, that the best Papists doe make th Cerem. of Bapt. only, certaine visible words: from whence it followeth, that they give no other operation to their then to words, which all favourers of fig. ceremo. must needs give: And our prelats do give in all their proceedings, and expressious: as by the following arg. sha appeare.

*gem = arma, solis & arborem, unde concordiam illas omittit, post in gravis necessitate.

That our Prelats give a morall operation to their sites and Cerem. and the Papists do no more. Art.
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1. What ever is a meane any manner of way ordained, to bring in divine worship, and to carry the mynd and heart to God in that: is so morally efficacious, as the Papists require, and so as our Divines condemne it. Nay if it be by teaching, & stirring towards these supernaturall works, as Gods spirituall worship: its that which the Lord condemnes in images, which tell lies, its that which the Lord threatens (Isay. 29. 13.) that his feare is taught, according to mens commaunds. And this kynd of efficacy our Cerem. have by their institution as they are appointed, and enjoined to be used. The preface to the book of common Prayer, discovering the intende-ment of the imposters, hath these words: Such are retai ned, which are apt to stirr up the dull mynd of man to the remembrance of his duty to God, by some notable and speciall significacion, whereby he might edifyed.

2. These Ceremo. which are of the same kynd, and homogencal with the significative part of the actions in the Sacrament, they may be said, to have a recalll and true efficacy of teaching, and so be a work of proper worship: because that part of the Sacrament, which is placed in significacion, is so: but these ceremonies are homogeneall, & of like nature, with that part of the Sacrament, doth baptisme consecrate the child to God: and so doth the crosse: doth baptisme signifiye the covenant, betwene Christ & the child? so doth the crosse: its openly layd, to betoken the engagement, that is betwixt Christ and the child, that he shall be Christis servante, and woulde to followe his colours, and to fight under his banner unto his dying day: though this image have no
tongue of it owne, yet its speaks by the mouth of the Prelats appointing, and their substitutes the ministers acting this image.

3. Consider that which is made end of our Cerem, that our Cerem are able, or at least are conceaved to be able to attaine, for every rationall means can reach the end, now this is the end of the crosse his institution, the white at which it floos, and the minister makes it spill this lesson, even our dedication unto Christ and our continuall perseverance in his service, so that as the end is, so the means are, the end is properly holy and religious, ergo, the means appointed therunto (such this is) must be holy religious and efficacious therunto, in the intendment of the institutor.

4. Thole which are of the same ranke, and set in the same roome, with Gods owne Cerem. they must be conceaved to have holines, and efficacy in them, for so Gods ordinances have. But these significant Cerem. thus instituted, are of the like nature with some of Gods owne spiritual rites, As the Phylacteries Nub. 15. 39. were appointed by God, for this end, to be remembrances, and admonishers of the law to thole that used them; the same place our Cerem, supply, and are ordained for the same purpose.

It it be here sayd, that God himself appointed his and therefore they are holy and religious, but ours being instituted by man have no more then man can give them, I answ: God appoints his, and therefore they are truly holy, and religious, and ought to be embraced. Mens inventions being set in the same ranke, are holy an
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CHAP. VII.

Touching other partitions of Ceremonies, Pag.

A first partition is, that of sacred Cerem. some are perpetual, as divine, some temporary, moveable, alterable, ambulatory as humane, and of ambulatory some are free, and some are fixed.

Of the perpetuity of Divine Ceremon. there is no question, of the alterablenes of humane, 1. That is a corrupt rule which the Rej. addeth viz. that they are alterable, when in the judgment and consciences of those to whom it belongs to discern thereof (that is with us to the convocation house) they become not unprofitable alone, but dangerous and hurtfull. For not to repeat here, that all humane Ceremonies are unprofitable, dangerous, hurtfull, 1. unprofitableness alone is sufficient to cathyre a Ceremony of mans making: consider well of these reasons.

1. If Gods owne Ceremonies were therefore to be removed because unprofitable, then much more ours, Heb. 7. 18.
2. If we must answere for idle words, then much more for idle ceremonies.
3. That wherein neither the governour, attaines his end in commaundning, nor the governed his in obaying, to
command that is unlawful: but he that com-
mmands unprofitable Ceremo. he attaines not his end in commanding, nor the governed his end in obeying: Ergo.

4. 2. Coll. 18. Those things which perish in the using, with those we must not be burdened: but unprofitable Ceremo. perish in the using: ergo, with those we must not be burdened.

5. Things indifferent, when they are used not in sub-
ordination to help forward morall duties, then their use is unlawful, but when they are unpro-
table, then they are not in subordination to help forward the morall. Ergo.

6. That which crosseth the place and office of the governour, that he must not doe or maintaine: but to enioje a thing unprofitable is against his office and place: for his office is to rule for our good, Rom. 13. 4. but unprofitable things are not so. Ergo.

7. That which the magistrate can command or maintaine in the Church, he must doe by virtue of some precept: That which is done by virtue of a precept, will be avayable to bring about the end, whereof there is a precept, but unprofitable things cannot attaine that end: Ergo cannot be done by virtue of a precept: ergo, are not under the command of a magistrate.

Againe when its here referred by the Rej. to the judgments and consciences of governors to dicerne the dangerousnes of Ceremo. and I would sayne know whether the consciences of all the Christians in England be
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be so subjected, and tyed, to the knee of the convocations of the conscience, that without it they may not judge, nor frame of the unprofitableness, danger, and hurt of the Ceremo, which they are to practise, surely this is more wise, blynd obedience, then the wiser sort of papists will admit of. The Inquisitor Silvester, in the word impulus, faith that: To interpret discreetly, humane precepts in the court of conscience, belongs to every one, as touching his own practise. This was one ground that Paulus Venetus igenius, and the other Venetian divines stood upon, but every man whom it did concern, might and ought to discern of any superiors precept, even the popes, whether it were lawfull and convenient or no: But herein the Rej. had consented (as it seemeth with D. Lovell pag. 19. that in such things as these are, the precept of the superior doth bynd more then the conscience of the inferior can: And that the subject having the command of King, or Bishop, for his warrant, ought to examine, but only to performe what he seeth commanded, A very good stirrup if it be well held, for help men up by, that they may ride upon mens consciences, at their pleasure. Dr. Davenant taught us other doctrine at Cambridge: when upon Coloss. 2. 13. In opposition to Jesuiticall blynd obedience, he shewed in out of Thomas Aquinas, that subjects may and ought judge with the judgment of discretion the decrees of their superiors, so farre as it concernes their particular: and against the Rej. his contrary doctrine let these reasons be weighed.

If the judgment of the governour be not the rule of impo-
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imposing, then is it not the rule of removing Ceremo
but the first is denied by all, even the Rej. and therefore
the second part cannot be granted. 2. If Cerem. must
not be removed before they be discerned dangerous by
the consciences of the Governors, then Governors do
not synn, if they retaine Cerem. never so bad, provided
that in their judgments and consciences they seeme no
dangerous, that being by the former graunt the rule of
their removeall, but this is absurd: ergo. 3. If Gover-
nours have authority to keepe any Ceremonies impos-
sed, untill they seeme dangerous & hurtfull unto them,
then all other are bound to obey in the pratise, of such
Ceremo, though in their consciences they ought to be
removed,because the judgment of the governour, is the
rule of maintaining, or removing: and thus they shoul
de be brought into a snare and a necessity of synning,eithe
to goe against their consciences rightly informed, and so
synne: Rom.14. last: or to goe against the judgment of
the governour, and so against the rule (that being the
rule of retaining by the new doctrine of the Rej.) and
so also synne: Againe of ambulatory free Cerem, the
Rej. giveth only an example out of auncient times, but
we could wish some examples in England. It seemeth
we are more fettered and lesse free in all the Ceremo.
we have, then any approved course doth warrant: The
explication of ambulatory fixd Ceremo, is as uncoth, as the
title: Their observation, must ever be free in respect of th
judgment, to be bad of them, but the pratise only is required.
For if all judgment, to be bad of them, be free, then it
free to account them unlawfull, hurtfull or unprofit
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Ought the practice to be required either against the judgment or without it? A brutish practice is not required, neither is there properly any good practice, but filling out of judgment. Those therefore that so require and fix our practice, must needs as much as in them lies, require and fixe our judgment in some manner: But in very deed no man or convocation of men (either de jure, or de facto) can fixe another's judgment, concerning lawful or unlawful. They may arrogate so much to themselves, & command men to captivate their wills unto them, & by their wills so far as they can their judgments, yet the judgment they cannot fixe, but only the outward practice: Neither is it any thing to me, what authority others do arrogate to themselves, concerning my practice, but what they require me to practice: I should account him as good a master or Lord, that should say, do this upon judgment, that thou shouldest do it, because I command it, as him, that saith, thou shalt do this, judge what thou wilt judge: The Rej. it may be will say, that he meaneth a freedome of judgment, in not accounting of them necessary to salvation: But no learned Papist should their Ceremonias minores necessary to salvation, if he speake of necessity of synning upon omission without scandal or contempt, that hath beene handled before. Zech. 8:19. Is this to be practised? If these Cer. be proposed to Christians they must be propos'd, either as indifferent or necessary: If this, we do impioysly, to make those things necessary, which God hath left indifferent: If that, they are then to be left free, unto the church, but by commanding & constraining we make the necessity.

The first Part.
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The will except, that they be things of a middle nature, the use whereof is indifferent to Christians, why therefore doth forbid any thing to be omitted?

A first partition is of simple and double cerem. double as described to be such, as beside their use, for order and decency, serve also to edification, by some profitable signification which either of themselves they have some aptness unto, or receive by appointment, as is where by common agreement. Wherein, the Rej. seemeth to double with us, when he maketh simple ceremonies to serve only for order and decency, without signification, when as before and after he telleth us, that no cerem. may be dumbe, but all must have their signification. 2. Order and decency seeme to be separated from edification in some sacred ceremonies, which he knew not of that willed all things to be done unto edification. 3. All significant cerem. are supposed first to be in order and decency, and yet after so long a tyme, we are to learne what use our crosse hath for order, more then a circle would have. 4. By the distinction or distribution here made, aptness of things for signification, either is in them of themselves or not, yet in the fourth partition our necessary rule was, that the things be not unapt unto their ends. 5. A strange power is here given unto the convocation, to make things apt for signification and edification, by their appointment, which before were not apt to any such thing. This was wont to be the peculiar of God, to call things that are not as if they were, and so make them this or that,
A fresh suite against Ceremonies.

In the next place we are tould of significant Cerimoniats, or those are so called either reductively, such as fix'd to the use of the Sacramet, whether they beare no signification, or bear some signification, either of their virtue, or duties, unto which we are obliged by the Sacramet: Or be analogically so called, if they be instituted to work usual effects, the former are lawful, but not the latter.

Enunciation of these confused distinctions is this:

Properly, Sacramentall

Improperly, redactive which are not significative.

and analogically, or significative.

All which members, I could have seriously wished would have added accurate definitions or descriptions, and then he would either have beene hyndered, the confused setting of them downe, or else he have discovered, his infinite mistaking, and made to the world, how he had bewildered himself, he mudds the water, and so would mislead the reader.

But we will follow his footsteps, only let us see some conclusions out of the frame in general is this: That some non significative Cerem. are significative: or which is all one, significative Ceremonies.

Rej. concurrence in a grands manner.

A desperate absurdity lyes open to the eye of any, if their eyes annointed with the eye salve of Lo and judicious discourse, for let but a fresh man, 
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runn
runn up the speciall to his highest, and he shall perceive some no significative to be the speciall to the Genus, a significative cere. 2. Cer. reductively sacramental & reductively significative, do properly appertaine to sacred Cer. reductively, & by right so called, & have beene had before, & are here wholly heterogencal. 3. Its well to be note that humaine Cer. appertaine to the Sacram. & bearing signification of the Sacram. vertue, & obligations, are such the Rej. lighteth for: But these are analogically sacramental, for analogie, similitude, or proportion, cannot be denied to be between two signes, which signifye the same virtues, the same duties, & the same obligation to these duties, And though the Rej. say againe & againe, they were never held unlawfull: Yet learned Chamier in the name of our Divines & reformed churches hath these words: We observe some circumstances in the celebration of the Sacramet, but we justly censurte those, who have added superfluous, unto which they have phased mysteries, & proper significations, & that of those effects which appertaine unto the word of Baptisme. As though the work should be twice or thrice done, and that either nothing, or that was not sufficient which was done by divine appointment, unless humaine rascines should have added supply. And the Waldenses who first reformed their churches, & purged out all their popish leve, renounced all such humaine Cer. or Traditions as unlawfull as manifestly appeareth by all Papists and Protestants, that have sett downe their confession & practice. 4. If Analogically sacramental Cer. be impious emulators of Gods holy Sacraments, as the Rej. confesseth, what can be sayd, why humaine significative Cer. analogicall to divine significative should not by parity of reason, be esteemed impious.
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Pious emulators of God's holy signs, Is it forbidden to emulate God's Sacraments only, and not all his holy ordinances? After all these come into moral significa-

Cer. Which are only to express some benefit, which God gives us, or to notify, pro-

test, or express some duty, which we owe to him, or one to an-

other. But I do not see wherein these differ, from reductive Sacraments. Cer. Except it be in this, that it may so fall out, that these sometimes are not affixed to Sacraments. This head therefore seems to be added, only because D. Morton had used it before, and for his sake let us a little further weigh it, when thereby the Reformed ones might argue, that morally significant are ordained to express some benefit on God's part, some duty on ours. By some benefit or duty, he must mean any spiritual benefit, or duty, besides the covenant, which he professedly mentioneth & excepteth, for if one benefit may be signified, why not any one, & this morally significant, are religious or sacred significant in the general, the Species as large as the Genus: Hence again morally significant, will be a genus to sacramentall reductively significant; for that is but a particular signification of some benefits, & duties in the Sacrament, which are included under this General, & so one species of the distributio shall become a Genus to the opposite member, & contradicting species. If it be here replied that reductive significative sacramentall is annexed to the Sacrament: I answer, that is nothing to the nature of the significance, for take & use a cross out of baptism, in the same manner & to the same end, as in it, & it will be the same in the specificall nature of significance, only so much the worse, because it is left check by note with baptism. 2. I ask what he means by those words, express.
express protest: is it barely to declare? if so, then let him show who is his adversary, unless he will fall out with his shadow, for do not all his opposites grant, that signa indicantia, or showing sygnes are lawfull, but not symbolica.

Lastly, when he affirms, that these Cerem. morally significant are not to signifye the covenant of grace. I reply, if they may signifye any other spirituall duty or benefitt, if they may signifye the severall essentiaall duties of the covenant of each syde, why may they not signifye the whole covenant? 2. If the crosse signifyeth the consecration of the child to God, and so entrance into the covenant, the relation of a soouldier to a Commaunder, a servant to a master, and so is continuance and faithfull perseverance in that profession to Christ, and his respect and regard of us according to those relations, then doth it signify the covenant? By this which hath beene sayd, it appeares, that the question is falsely stated: for these Ceremo. are more then holy by application in his sense formerly opened, they are pressed as necessary, and are used as analogically sacramentall, as well as properly morall, and in signification, do pertake somthing of the proper nature of Sacraments, as also in the significative reaching, and stirring up the heart: when its said, they are used in worship, they are external acts of Gods worship falsely appointed by man, and serve not for order, nor decency, nor edification.
Of the faithfull congregations, wherein we were borne, baptized, and nourished up in faith, there is no question made, but they are our loving and beloved mothers: Yet much question ariseth concerning that which the Rey. teacheth viz. That all these churches together, have one mother, and so we have a grandmother, that is the Church of England, considered as one church: and that by way of representation, as the convocation house, 2. by way of association and combination into one profession, worship, and discipline, which includeth the orders and offices, that is, the Hierarchy, pertaining thereunto, but not by another collective consideration.

1. I never read either in Scripture, or in any orthodox writer, of a visible particular Church, either grandmother of Christians, or mother of other Churches, if the Rey. hath, he should do well to informe us, where we may fynd this doctrine explained. 2. I would willingly know, whether Christians & Christian churches also, were not in England, before this great grandmother? I think, the Rey. will not denye it, nor yet ayse for affoord to his phisitians, who have found out an herb, which is called of them, Sonne before the Father, to justify his intention of Daughter before the Mother: He must onsefle, that this Grand-mother, is onely a mother in law,
law, and that law also to be mans, not Gods. 3. All the churches of England, may as well be considered as one in unity of profession, without any new motherhood, as all the Latine Scholes of England one, in the unity of the same Grammar, or all Gallenicall, or Platonicaall Scholes, one in their kynd. 4. A Representative mother is the image of a mother, and an image, with commanding authority in religion, without Gods command, is an Idoll: it was well therefore, to this purpose, sayd of Zwinglius Explan. art. 8. That you be a representative church, we willingly believe, for you are not the common church: but show I beseech you, whence you had this name who styled you with this title? who gave you power of meeting, and combing together? who granted you authority of coining decrees and Canons, differing from the word of God? who sufferd you to impose these upon men? who substended you thus to burden Consciencs? who enjoyned to call evil good, and good evill? You are therefore an hypocritical church, which hath nothing sound in it, and substantiall, but all things sayned and payned; but you are not the church, that bride beseeming our Savoyr, who layd himself upon the truth alone, and the spirit of God. He spake these things of the ie, which under the name of Representative churches, imposed their inventions, upon true churches, without Scripture, which is a true representation of our representative convocation. 5. The Reconfesseth, that this Hierarchicall convocation is humane and not divine, and he will not denye, but Chri-
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... doth he make (as it were in a Chymæricall dreame) of Divine Children, proceeding from humane mothers and grandmothers: Our Saviour was of another mynd; when he made these two opposite, from earth, and from heaven: The Rej. hath found out so great consent betwene these two, that earth may be the mother, and grandmother of heaven: Besyde the humane mother of Divine children, is not of their heavenly fathers chiose, nor by him appointed, to beare the person of their true mother: But she was first putt into this office, by the presumption of men, and afterward authorised, by the Archmother of Rome, continuing her profession, by sleight & might, to represent those, from whom she can shew no other letters of credence, for the power she usurpeth, then she maketh her self, or hath gotten by stealth from civill power.

6. This representative mother, is very seldom exstant viz, when ther is a Parliament, which now we have not had these diverse yeares: And when she appereareth, she can give no milk to her children, further then she hath commissiion from man: None of her children can have access unto her, only she appointed many yeares since, certaine servants of hers, with restraint of their fathers allowance, to dyet them, with drye ceremonies, and scourge them, with silencing, deprivation, excommunication, if they fynd fault with that provision, which is very pap, with a hatchet; Is not such a mother worthy grand titles and honor?

7. The examples of such motherhood, which the Rej. fetcheth, from the assemblyes of Israel, Scotland, and...
our Parliament, have no agreement. For we read of no assemblyes of Elders (by office in Israel) from whence all other were excluded, stiled either Mothers of Israel, or all Israel: Neither was there in any such assemblyes, this motherly authority exercised, of appointing humaine sacred Ceremo. unto Israel. 2. The assembly of Scotland, before Perth, had no such state, as our convocation, nor power of commandung, but only advise of, and directed those things which God had appointed, and the churches were known to desire, yet might their judgment be well called, the judgment of the church of Scotland, because they pronounced nothing, but that which all the churches of Scotland, did publiquely profess, even in their solemn confession. 3. Our Parliament is not stiled, the Mother common wealth of England, yet in civill affaires, more liberty is left for stile, and power, unto publique assemblies, then in religious: But if the lower house of Parliament, were not more freely chosen, and of greater power, then the poore lower house of Convocation, a quære might be made, whether the state or common wealth of England were there or no.

Now for the second way of one church, by association, and combination of all particular churches into one profession, worship, and discipline: This is good, thus far, and the very same with that collective consideracion, which the Repl. mentioned, and the Rej. termed a new mystic inexplicable nothing, except combination doth mistily cover under it, the swallowing up of particular congregations, by Nationall, Provinciarly, Diocesan churches. But as for
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A for that clause, that this must needs include such orders and offices as our Hyerarchye: this is either a begging, or a stealing of the mayne question: For this Hierarchye consisteth of officers and orders, by the Rej. owne confession) humaine, not divine: now association of profession, worship and discipline, may certainly be had by officers and orders divine. 2. The reformed churches of France, have their association, and combination, without any Hierarchye. 3. The Hierarchye doth not associate churches, under it, but subdue all to it self, so that, as the Pope, is sometyme esteemed the Church of Rome, and sometyme, he with his assistants, so is our Hierarchye in England. Beza in his notes of the church not far from the end, giveth warning of this: I most willingly leave the whole frame of Episcopall authority to the Papists: of which (I openly profess) the Holy Spirit of God, was never the author, but humaine policy, which if we do not observe, to be accursed by God, we certainly as yet see nothing at all: and worship we do a viper in our bosomes which will kill the mother. This prophecy is too true of the Hierarchye, as in other respects, so in this, that it seemeth to devour our mother churches title, liberty, right and power, and in a great part hath prevailed.

9. It was added by the Replyer, that the Hyerarchye, is a creature of mans making, and may more lawfully be removed, when it pleaseth man, then ever she was by him erected. To this the Rej. answereth, confessing, that sundry offices and orders in our church are humaine, and not divine: adding, that accidental forms of discipline, are not determined in the word of God, but left in the churches liberty.
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herty, so devise, as all but Anabaptists, and such as edge meare upon them consent.

Which words are worthy of a note or two: For he acknowledgeth our Hierarchye of Archbishops, Deanes, Archdeacons, &c. to be creatures of mans making, not divine: Now of these principally consist, our convocated mother church, as its well known, a few ministers being added to her, for fashion sake, so that this church is a church of man, not of God, by his owne confession, and this church is sayd to be devised by the church, now it foundeth strangely, a church of the church devising: Nor know I well, what the devising church of England can be. The Rej. telleth us, that there be, but two wayes of considering, the Church of England, as one, either in the convocation house, or in that combination, which must needs (sayth he) include the orders and officers, pertaining therunto: Now in both of these wayes Hierarchicall orders and officers are supposed and included, so that the Church of England, neither of these wayes could possibly devise these orders and officers. 3. The distinction used betwixt the essentiall of discipline, and the accidentall forms thereof, is scarce: And if these termes, may be interpreted, that sense, which is given by the Rej. of Doctrinall and Rituall, substantiall, circumstantiall worship, that must essentiaall, which is commaundd in the word, that is accidentall, which is not commaundd, but permitted. Then the Rej. in affirming essentiaalls to be determined, and accidentals not, sayth nothing else, but that which is determined, is determined, and that which is not determi
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3. It is not determined. 4. If he meane by accidentall formes, circumstances of ryme, number, place and occasionall course of proceeding, then he accuseth unjustly, not only us, but the Anabaptists themselves of opposing to manifest a truth, by all men confessed. 5. It would be worth a little paines of his to declare, how, and in what sense our Hierarchye is accidentall, to the church, and discipline of England? The Bishops are efficient causes, even in a high ranke, of our Discipline, they are principal members, of our Diocesan churches, they have an Ecclesiastical rule, and command over the particular congregations within their Dominion, by them and in their name, the essentiaalls of ordination, institution, introduction, suspension, deprivation, excommunication, &c. are dispensed and disposed of: who will say, that these things, can agree to accidentall formes.

6. Concerning edging upon Anabaptists, in this point it may with better reason be objected, to those that maintaine Diocesan Bishops, then to those that oppose them, for it is well known, that the Anabaptists, in Holland, Zealand, and Friesland, have their Bishops, which have care of many congregations, within a certaine circuit, & in all of them (though ther be others that teach) they only, at their visitations, performe some mayne things belonging to the pastorall office. 7. The position (that our Bishops are humaine creatures of mams making) is not only to us, but to many of themselves, sufficient to condemn their office, some of them having publikely protested, that if it were so, they would not keepe their places one day.
Concerning Superstition: answers to 64, 65, 66, 67, 68 of the Preface.

Behold a new crime (O ye Judges!) and unheard of before this day: Those who should the reliques of Popish confessed superstition, unlawful, are (in that very name) indited of superstition. Nay they must be content to have it for their solemn style, in public writings, for so Dr. Morton hath dubbed them (To his superstitious brethren the non-conformists) and Dr. Burges will maintain it. If any man take it ill, and say, that such a title doth rather becometh those, which allow of religious holy water, images, circumcision &c. by side crosses and surplices (as these two Drs. do,) here is straight way scurrilous: But let us inquire into the Inditement.

1. It was noted by the Replier as a ridiculous pece of Rhetorick, and a trick of prevention, usual with crafty men. The Rej. answereth these two titles suite not well, and the charge is weightye: which is very true, they suite not well, neither to them they were intended unto, nor yet, betwixt themselves, and the charge of superstition, if it be in good earnest and upon ground, is weightye: But not well fusing, do meet often times in affected accutations, and so doe here ridiculous Rhetorick, and craftyresse: Such that hatted, to call her party whore, in the beginning of their scoulding fray, for feare she should be prevented, with that salutation, as more deterving it,
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was therin crafty, and yet if she called her "whorish sister",
it was ridiculous: Ridiculous I account, a new unexpected toy, which bringeth some admiration with it,
Now this accusation is such, for until now, it hath scarce been heard of. The Jesuites want neither invention, nor good will, in accusing such, as reject their ceremonies with all kind of reproaches, and yet they could never yet, hint upon this imputation, to charge them with superstition for that cause: Nay Balthasar Chavasius (a Jesuit) lib. 2. cap. 7. s. 54. though he would sayne have lightened some such thing upon us, yet seeing it would not take, but be accounted ridiculous, even by his owne friends, he doth so much as say, he durst not do it for shame: We must not expect says he, many superstitious expressions of undue worship, from those who are falsely called, Evangelical professors, considering these superstitions are certain to be certain, vain, and superfluous observations; but they (meaning the reformed churches) do bitterly inveigh most against all Ceremonies. So our Rhemists on Acts 17. Sect. 4. discharge us of superstition: whereupon Dr.

Fulk faith: we accept of your testimonie as the witnesses of our adversaries: And is it not admirable then? that our Def. and Rej. should goe beyond the Jesuites in their owne element, and teach them how, and in what sense, they may after better accuse Calvin, and those that agree with him of superstition, then of rash irreligious, or profane innovation, for rejecting so many ceremonies of theirs: which not only they, but also our Divines (if we may believe the Def. and Rej.) esteem easily reformable to good use, & not simply unlawful:

And
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And by the same reason, Non-residents, Pluralists, To Quots, common swearers of diminutive oaths, & dices, standing upon the lawfulness of their practice, may upon that supposition, call those, that gayncsay them superstitious brethren.

2. For the expounding rather then answering or confuting of the foresaid ridiculous accusation it was allledged: Thus superstition is a kynd of excess of religious worship, and this an excess, or error in a negation, was never called by any author superstition, when he meant to speake properly, except the every negation be hold as a speciall worship. Thus we do not abstaine from these Ceremo. but as from other unlawfull corruptions (even out of the compasse of worship: That erroneous deniall of things lawfull is not superstition, and that all sorts of definitions which are given of superstition, do touch upon our Cerem. rather then on the deniall or condemning of them. All this could not stay the Rej. but he must maintaine, and renue this weighty charge, as he calleth it, and pronounce, that if we can avoyd it, it is our will, (as if he would say) our book hath saved us: Let us therefore consider, what the accuser can say, to bring us to this extreme passe.

3. There can be noe plainer reason of this accusation (said the Rej. then that out of Coll. 2.23. where Will worship is insisted in negative observances, touch not, tast not, handle not &c. But we teach no negative observances so called, for observances are ceremoniall: Tho. 1.2. q.101. art.4. we make no ceremonies of our negations, but make them morall duties: The Prelates on the other lyde, appointing positive observances, do seeme to in-
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de the negations of them, as of the same kynd: Baptize not without crossing, doe not divine service without surplice, communicate not without kneeling, so that by this meanes they are made guilty of double superstition.

2. The practise of superstitious persons in those dayes, condemned here by the verdit of this place, caries no proportion or resemblance, with our cessation, or negative abstaining from cerem, because ther be such not, sit not, 

When hart cessation of evil come to be worship.

abstraining, and for the more speciall worship of God, in a more peculiar manner, but we cease from ours, by virtue of another rule, with no such intent, as to present any peculiar kynd of honor to God therby: And thus abstaining from our Ceremon, as unlawfull, upon conscience (though they were lawfull,) cannot be superstition, except first it be an elicited act of religion, or worship: Such worship it cannot be, except either in the intention of the abstainer, or in the nature of the forbearance, it be used as a means, to give unto God speciall honor, that is, other and more immediate honor, then we do, by acts of obedience, common to the second table, with the first: But this is neither in our intention, nor doth the nature of such forbearance as we use, implye it: For that common charge which usuall occurs in scripture, cease to do evil, Isay. 1. Abstaine from all appearance of evil, 1 Thess. 5. is a duty of obedience in generall common to both tables: Now, if it be onely materially determined, upon a work of the second table, not formally elicited, from love or justice to our brother,
brother, it is no act of love or justice. As if a man hat-
ing his neighbour, should yet for fear of God's judg-
ment, abstain from killing of him, this was no act of
love, or justice, toward him; Even so, abstaining from
our Cerem. as evil for fear of offending God, though
it may materially be referred to the first table, yet can-
not it be an elicited act of worship, except it floweth
from religion, or a desire to do speciall honor to God
therby.

3. These negative prohibitions, were so plainly the
Commaundements of men, ver. 22. that from henceon
divines do commonly argue against such popish Cerem,
as ours are: And therefore Papists in their commenta-
ries, as Estius ad Corn. de lapide &c. upon that place,
do strive to putt-off that blow from their Cerem. but
yet are constrained to confess, unprofitable and super-
fluous Ceremo. or instituted by a mere human spirit,
(such as ours are) to be in those words condemned; If
therefore this place, be the plainest reason, which the
Def. and Rej. have, of charging us with superstition, it
is plaine enough, there was more affection and affilia-
tion, then reason in this weighty charge.

4. Whether any definition of superstition will bear
up this weighty charge, forced upon those, that reject
humaine Cerem. the Rej. will not try by the Schoole-
men, because he loveth them not so well, but only by
Definition which is found in D. Ames his Medulla: but
passing by the Schoolemen, he might have found in our
Divines, Definitions, very fit for this triall, as that o
Vrsyne Tom. 1. in precept 2. Superstition is that which
add
adds humane inventions to divine precept: That of D. Fulk in Act. 17. Sect. 4. A will worship is, more then appointed by the law of God: That of Mr. Perkyns on the second command. Superstition is worship of God, without his commandment &c. For ther is not one of our writers, who treateth of superstition, and doth not give such descriptions of it, as from them it may be concluded, that the rejecting of such Ceremonies, as ours are, is so far from superstition, that it is the opposing of superstition: Yet let him choose by what Definitions, the cause shall be tried.

3. The Definition which he maketh choice of is: Superstition is that whereby undue worship is exhibited to God: from hence the Rej. collecteth, and assumeth 1. That superstition properly is in the opinion and mynd of the worshipper: 2. That a man may imagine himself to honor God in the use of such things, as God hath not forbidden or condemned, and thereupon forbear, even for conscience to God, things lawful: 3. That the very not doing of things prohibited in the first table (if it be for conscience to God,) is worship. Now the full of these, is to fetch quidlibets ex quolibets, any thing out of every thing: For ther is nothing in the Definition allledged, from whence (by any logick) it can be concluded, that superstition is properly in opinion and mynd: 2. The assertion is as false, as untowardly collected, for though inward superstition, be in the mynd or soul, and springeth from an erroneous opinion, yet neither it, nor any moral vice or virtue, doth properly consist in opinion, but rather in affection, and disposition of the heart and will, as all that consider of the matter,
matter, will easily perceive and confess: And as for outward superstition, that consists in outward observances. 3. The second collection serveth nothing to the purpose: Neither yet the conclusion drawn from it, that there may be a negative superstition: Yet is it so intricately sett downe, that it conteyneth a kynd of contradiction, for the forbearing of things lawfull, is termed the forbearance of such things, in what sense I cannot conjecture: The last would prove something, if it were generally true as it is not: The avoyding of synne or things forbidden by God, is an act of common obedience, belonging as well to things forbidden, in the second table, as to those, that are forbidden in the first: And the termination of this act, upon matters of the first table, doth no more make it properly worship toward God, than the like termination of it, upon the matters of the second table, doth make the same act properly justice or charity towards men: It may, in this or that particular, be imperated or commanded by religion to God, and in others by charity to men, but it is not, in that particular elicited, or naturally flowing from either, as worship doth from religion and bounty from charity.

The Def. and Rej. absteine every day upon conscience from innumerable things forbidden concerning God worship, as from Popish Idolatries, Mahometicall impostures, & all the rabble of those divillish divises, which are among the Heathen. Yet I do not thinke, that the themselves conceive, their acts of dayly worship to ali in account, unto such a number, as is there to be found of such things forbidden. The plaine truth is, that an al
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If one this or that instituted, or chosen to be observed, in the worship of God, & for the honouring of God therby, is a kind of Ceremonial worship: But the mere abstaining from this or that unlawful action upon conscience of God's command is no special worship, nor was ever so esteemed. 6. But out of D. A. who saith, That Religion is an observance whereby we perform such things which directly belong to the giving of honour to God, so much may be wrong the Rej. meaneth, viz. that if any observance be made of anything, which God hath not forbidden, of purpose & directly to give honour to God in the not doing thereof, it is must needs be an excess of religion, a negative superstition. Not so as not observing, is observance; not doing a thing, is performance of it, as the purpose of abstaining from that which appeareth a dishonouring of God is a direct giving of honour unto him. 7. Neither is the other allegation out of D. A to any better purpose than the former: There is a superstition sometimes in abstaining from certain lawful things, viz. when some singular service, & honour is by that absence intended. Did the Rej. ever deny this? Nay, doeth he not expressly confess as much in these words: The superstition of religion, doth sometimes seem to consist in a negation, viz. when that very negation, abstaining, or forbearing is held for a special worship? The Rej. indeed, seemeth to finde a difference in that term of singular: But that is to finde a knott in a rush; For by singular Dr. A. meant the same thing which the Replyer meant by special, according as these terms are oft promiscuously used. The descent therefore which the Rej. maketh upon this occasion, that we fancy our non-conformity so singular a piece of service.
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vice, a singular point of piety, and of true sincerity, this is but a declamatory venting of bitter, but ungrounded, surmises. We account our abstinence from these Ceremonies, no special or particular worship, much less singular in degree of excellency; nor doe we esteem it a point of piety, more singular, than to abstain from swearing at the Masse. Some point of sincerity there is, in refusing these mixtures, but not worship, or so singular in our opinion, as the Rej. would persuade his readers to our singular prejudice, & wrög. Many things are singular faults, if they be admitted, the leaving of which is no singular commendation. What if some had rather never preach the Gospel, or receive the Supper than tell a lie to those ends? Will the Rej. thence conclude that he make the abstaining from a lie a more singular piece of worship, and piety, than either Word, or Sacraments: would be loath to undertake the proving of such wilde consequence. Divine, and blessed Bradford refused to be admitted unto the Ministry by B. Ridley, except he might be excused from the abusive formallice then and now, in use: yet Gardiner, nor Buner, neither did, nor being asked, would therefore (as is probable, have accused him of Superstition, as esteeming the abstaining from those abuses more singular service to God, or piety, than all he might doe, and did afterwa:

in the ministry.

8. The examples brought by the Rej. are like unto his Reasons: 1. The Pharisees did superstitiously restrain labour on the Sabbath, beyond that which God imposed; it was a negative superstition. True; it was an humaine
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1. Ceremony something like unto Popish holy days: But the Pharisees abstaining from the feasts of Bacchus, Venus, &c. was no speciall worship. 2. The worship not reading on Dagon's threshold was negative superition: True, as the former, it was an observation instituted to honour Dagon by: But their not-admitting of Circumcision was no superstition. When therefore upon such wretched examples, and reasons as these, the Ref. is so confident in laying his weighty charge of Superstition upon us, as that he pronounceth all the users of Nile not to be sufficient to wash us from grosse superstition, the understanding reader hath no cause to think otherwise but that even the Ref. may have a confident full persuasion such as that he buildeth much on, and yet but hollow empty supporters for the upholding of it.

9. Such also are his distinctions, whereby (as with a wet finger) he dischargeth the Convocation of all superstition, because they impose the Ceremonies, not as things directly, properly, immediately, but only consequently, and mediately, belonging to the giving of honour to God. For 1. If they be consequently directed to God in teaching of men Gods will, as the word doeth, they are direct worship unless preaching be no worship. 2. If they be worship proper to this office, they are proper worship. 3. If they be worship belonging to the first table, then they are immediately worship: But all the former are true, as was before shewed, yet one thing more would be known, what reason the Ref. hath to place the observance of our Cerem. for the kynde of it, in one
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in one degree of distance, and latitude: and the rejecting of them, in another? It seemeth to be as if the Englisht day, and night should be so disjouyned that our night should be in England, and our day in China. When he further expounds himselfe we shall be more able to discern his meaning.

10. Last of all, For ending of this question about superstition, I require a resolution of this not-unlike Quære, which with change of persons containeth the same case. Seeing there be different opinions concerning our Diocesan Bishops places, and functions, even among them that make benefit of them, some holding them to be of divine institution, or else not lawfull, that (as they say) without this persuasion they would give over their Bishopricks, to day before to morrow. Others holding them onely of humaine Institution, and yet lawfull: Let him, I say, tell us plainly, whether the Prelates of this later opinion may call the other Prelates, superstitious brethren or fathers, for holding Ecclesiastical Bishops of Mans institution unlawfull? If not, let not the Rej. nor his Diocesan be so liberall of this title to others that dissent from them about humaine Ceremonies as unlawfull, except they either thinke Bishops cannot be superstitious, or that we cannot be wronged with any odious imputation.

CHAP.
Concerning Parliaments, and Convocations: answer to 70, 71, 72, 73, of the Preface.

Because the Dei. objected the authority of Parliaments, and Convocations for establishing of their Rites; it was opposed by the Rep. 1. that Prelates in those matters have no respect unto the authority of Parliaments, as appeareth by the testimony of the Parliament itself An. 1610, in the Records thereof. 2. That no Parliament doth allow subscription, and Conformity to be urged as now it is by the Prelates. Which also was shewed out of the same Parliament records. 3. That the Prelates proceedings are so agt. Parliament Lawes, as by them they are subject to a Præmunire. Now see that is rejoyned.

1. The first fillip is, that though the Prelates regard not the authority of Parliaments, yet that is no answer to their objection; their Ceremonies are established by sundry acts of Parliaments. Where the Rej. forgetteth that some arguments, and answers are ad hominem, that is, they respect the thing in question, not simply, but as it cometh from such a man. Now this was the meaning of the Repl. that objecting of Parliaments by a Prelate, in science of Prelates who regard not the authority of Parliaments, is a ridiculous plea.

2. In the second place, it is denied that the Prelates object not the authority of Parliaments, because, for...
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Sooth, they have the kings commission, and broad, they are by Parliament confined. That is; they neglected Parliamentary Statutes in all things. For so far as they can turne any Statute Law to serve their turne, at those circumstances which they dare not, for heads, omitte, they follow that which Parliament scribe.

13. To that first Evidencce which was allledged out of Records of the worthy Parliament, An 1610, it is said that it doth only prove that the Prelates mistake (it is a mistake) in one point, their owne authority greater than Parliament. Now if by mistake he meaneth bad, or lawfull taking, this which he sayth may be grant. But if he meaneth an error of ignorance, surely he taketh the matter one way or other. For 1. Ignorance of the Law doth not excuse any violaters of the Law. Scribes, and Doctors, Prelates, which be among Law-makers, and in Commission for the execution of Lawes. 2. Those that erre of ignorance, correct their fault upon information, and knowledge: But our Prelates being diverse times warned by the Parliament, have not mended, but more vio- than before, persisted in, and pursued this mistake. 3. Mistaking in matters of such weight, as are to good mens livings, and fre-holds, is a broad fault, in the nature (in all Law) with id (crafty) meaning. Prelates should take upon them to take away the some non-conformists, directly, and by tender they have, in effect, done by long imprisonment should be called in question therefore, it woul
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It is added here by the Rej. that the making of Ecclesiastical Canons do properly belong to the Prelates. But 1. except there be some mysterial distinction understood with Canons, and Lawes, this is to robbe both Parliament, and King also of their just authority, that Prelates may usurpe it. 2. Say it be so, that it belongeth properly to Prelates; for to make Ecclesiastical Canons, whether they therefore belong to them to make such Canons, suppose the Ceremonies to be lawful, have the Prelates proper power to appoint any lawful Ceremonies? then they may institute, and appoint, in the Def. and Rej. his judgment, not only holy-water and Images, throughout all England, but also command that all the Parliament, with the rest of English men, shall be circumcised; for the Def. Pag 285. being asked, whether he deems Circumcision as it is used under Priest John, lawfull? the Rej. answereth for, and with him, it doeth so, and you nothing to disprove it; Insinuating that if any thing sayd to disprove it, he is ready to maintaine it. Now appeale to the first Parliament that shall hereafter be holden, and in the mean time, to any English man (beside those that are resolved to say what Defendants, and Rejoyners will have them) if they believe that the Prelates have power, and that from the Parliament, or with the consent of Parliament, to appoint the people of England, even those of the Parliament it selfe, to be circumcised? Have the innocent Ceremonies brought us, and the Parliament into such bondage, that at the Prelates pleasure, we must all be circumcised? It seemeth
then they are bloody innocents.

5. The second instance out of the same Parliament Recit (sayth the Rej.) laymeth this in the Convocation, that it hath made the refusal of Subscription painfull, with deprivation of mens free-hold. Which is very true, and due: but not that only; For the Parliament condemneth expressly all urging of Subscription above that appointed; the statute of 13th. Eliz. which only concerneth confessing the true Christian faith, and doctrine of the Sacraments. Neither is their mentioning of free-hold so to be taken as if they allowed the men should for refusal of other Subscription, be deprived of their Copy-holds; but only as an exaggeration of the Prelates presumption, who do not feare, nor spare to violate the fundamental Lawes, and Liberties of England, such as that is for no man to be deprived of free-hold, without the Law of Parliament, and a Jury of 12. legall men.

6. The Parliament addeth, that silenceing and depriving of Ministers for non-conformity, and non-subscription (without, and against Law) hath beene the great griefe of sundry well affected subjects. To this the Rej. sayth, that it hath beene the griefe of those which deprived thee, who yet deprivd thee because they were commaunded, lest their error should be still maintained, ad the Ministry of conformists continued. This profession of griefe in depriving Prelates, may be likened unto that of Queene Maries Prelates, who when they condemned the Martyrs, sayd they did it with griefe. So Gardiner in his sentence of condemnation upon Mr. Rogers, the first that suffered and Queene Mary. We therefore, sayd the Bp. aforesaid, we
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The griefes of the Prelates in mind, and bitterness of heart, doe condemn thee said Io. Rogers, &c. Unto which may be added M. Fox his Marginall note. These murderers pretend a sorrow of heart, and they will not cease from murdering. But to follow only the Rej. his so grieved. It is very goddly so. The well affected subjects were, and are grieved, in that life that scandalizing is called grieving. This scandal was at the Prelates proceedings: The Prelates are grieved for their owne fact, but not to repentance, at least such, as they doe not repent of. The griefe of those well affected subjects stirred up in them, and in the Parliament a serious petition, and indeavour to stay the Prelates violence, and remove the scandal: but the Prelates, though they challenge the power, and care of Ecclesiasticall affaires as properly belonging to them, could never be moved, either by others, or their owne pretended griefe, so much as to petition unto his Majesty, for the removing of the grievance, but were and are as ready as their Paratours, & Pursuivants to doe that which belongs to them about this that grieveth the Parliament, and sundry other well affected subjects. The Parliament grieving with those that grieved, made a good Law to make void the Prelates Canons, as the cause of unsufferable griefe: The Prelates, first makers of the Canons, and since urge rs of their execution, in which also they often goe beyond their owne rules (as passionate executioners use to doe) and many of them applaud themselves, glory, and triumph in their imagined victory. But it may be those are here meant, who, as D. B. in D. Covel p. 44., urging subscription, and conformity,
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They stick not to say the Authority sinneth in not removing some of these things. Now if they grieve for sinning against their conscience, God give it may be to repentance: not to be repented of: but yet this not so as the well affected (of whom the Parliament speaketh) are grieved, by other mens unconscionable dealing. They are commanded, forsooth: But who procured that command? who should procure the ceasing of that same? And is it sufficient for Fathers in God to say they are commanded by man to vndoe the ministers, and vex the people of God? Bishop Grindal was commanded to suppress the exercise which was called prophecy: yet he constantly refused to execute such a command. Tempora mutantur, & nos mutamur in illis. But the Prelates, (sayth the Rej.) proceeded not against them, because they were painfull, and fruitfull ministers. As if the Parliament were to be so interpreted, or rather derided, or any but the Devil of Hell would professe such a cause of such proceeding? Wherefore then? Least their error should be still suffered, and the ministry of others contemned. It seemeth then that in the Rej: his opinion the Parliament in condemning these proceedings, went about to maintaine dangerous errour, and to bring conforming Ministers into contempt. But not to speake of his taking the question for granted, viz: which the Ministers held a dangerous errour: the Parliamentary way of making voyd the Canons might have freed the pretended errour from all danger, and left no ministers in contemptible conformity, vnlesse some would contemn Christian liberty as having by custome their cares may
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Concerning the Pramunire answer is given, that if the Prelates be subject unto it, that is more than the Rej: knoweth; that they might incurre that perill upon ignorance, and that by Statute Law the Ceremonies are established, with the penalty of refusing them, as all men know, and some have set at Assises, and Westminster Hall. But for the first of these suits, D: B: knowes ful well (whatsoever the Rej: will know) that Prelates cannot take from any Englishman his freehold, without Parliament Authority, and yet be free from the Statute of Pramunire: Now that they doe so, the Rej: himselfe even now confessed. Moreover, who knoweth not that the Prelates doe keepe their Courts, silence, deprive &c, in their owne names? which doeth evidently intrench upon the Prærogative Royal of the Crowne, and so fall into the penalty of Pramunire by the Statute of Henr. 8. 25. except they can shew some speciall warrant by Statute for so doing; which that they cannot doe is evident; because in King Edwards dayes they were enjoined to keepe their Courts in the Kings name; and since that time, have no speciall warrant, by any Statute, for any such Courts in one or others name. Ignorance is here againe vainely pretended, as before was declared. Are the Prelates onely ignorant of that which they have so often beene warned, and convinced of in many Parliaments? Now for the establishing of these Ceremonies, with the penalty of refusing them by Statute, the Rej: should have done well, if he had named that, or those Statutes where we may finde this done. As for the penalty
penalty of deprivation for refusing these Ceremonies, the Rej: confessed before, that the Parliament anno 1610. pronounced against it, as contrary to Law. If the Ceremonies themselves stand established by any Statute, it must be that of Eliz: 1. But that concerned the booke of King Edward in which this Rej: pag. 54. 55. confesseth some vaine Ceremonies, now removed, to have beene prescribed. Now either those tolerable solemnities were established by Statute of Eliz: 1. or not theis: For no difference is found in the Statute; if those, why doe our Opposites refuse them, and yet urge their upon that Law which no more established theis than them? The truth is, though the booke for substance was in some sort confirmed, yet every rubrick, and ceremony which was therein contained, though it was for a time tolerated, was not established. Why else was subscription, by that Statute, restored only to doctrine of Faith, and Sacraments? If any therefore have beene deprived, either at Assises, or other Civill Courts, for mere refusal all of these Ceremonies, (which I much doubt of) that, (without question) hath beene by the Prelates procuring, not by such evidence of Law as just Judges require in such wretche accidents. It would also be knowne what kinde of Judges those were which are sayd to have beene so Ceremonious. Sometime it falleth out, that a Nale is put out of Comission by a Gardiner, and another, a friend of Gardiner being put in his place, strange sentences follow thereon. At the least, it behooveth the Rej: who alledgeareth, and alloweth those Judges facts, to shew vs upon what grounds they proceeded?
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8. Against the Convocation-house (as reasons for which the authority thereof is little, or none in mensa), some knowen things were briefly mentioned by the Replier, to which how the Rej. answereth, it is of unworthy consideration. 1. Convocations consist of a faction. No (sayth the Rej.) but of men which submit themselves to the Lawes of the Land, and Constitutions of the Church. As for the Constitutions of the Church, they are the Constitutions of the Convocation; so that the answer in that part is, they submit themselves to their own constitutions: To the Lawes of the Land that they do not duly submit themselves, it appeareth out of which the Parliament, before alleged, sayth; diverse, painful, and learned Pastors ready to performe the legall subscription, have beene deprived for refusing monastic subscription: which could not be, if Canons were legall, and their makers obedient to Law. They have also the bodies, lands, and goods of subjects further than is lawfull, sayth the same Parliament. So that it is by this plain how the Convocations may be said to take a faction even against Parliaments. Yet if they were obedient to Lawes, they may (by conspiring for their private ends against the common good) be esteemed a Faction, as those that bare the greatest sway in the Counsell of Trent, were, and are of indifferent understanding men esteemed. So in Queene Maries dayes, the persecuting Prelates, though they submitted themselves to Law, and cried out of others that did not so, yet they were a pernicious faction. And so (it seemeth) was the meaning of the Repl. in this charge, because he addeth for
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for a reason thereof, that they never conclude any thing
for the common good of the Church. 2. They are servile
those on whom they depend, and tyrannicall over the par-
th. e are subject to them. This the Rej. doeth not deny, but
sayth; It may be an error of their persons, not of their Con-
stitution. But what doeth this helpe us? If we must be
subject to servile, and tyrannicall Canons, which come
from the error of their persons, their Constitution
will no way relieve us. Their Constitution is for sub-
stance the same now that was in Queene Mary's days,
and yet we know what they did, and thereby may con-
ceive what they may doe againe. 3. They are grosser
laters of most antient Canons, being non-residents, Plut-
liffs &c. Neither is this denied by the Rej. So mani-
is the truth of it. Onely, that he may not be altogether
silent, he alledgedeth that this being true, yet the Def.
s speech standeth unshaken, viz. Theis Ceremonies are es-
blished by Canons. But I thinke if the Convocations be
such as have beene shewed, the credit, and authority
both of them, and their Canons is so shaken, that they
can afford little establishment to the Ceremonies in
any free judgment.

CHAP.
Concerning the good and evil, which our Convocations have done.

Among the Objections mentioned against our Convocations, one appendix was, that in memory of man they never concluded anything for the common good of the Church, more than by others was better done in their hands: but much evil hath come from them, and more would, if their commission had served thereto. Now because this is a weighty charge, and enough to weigh all their authority, if it be true, 'tis worthy to be severally, and diligently considered, what their Advocate can allege to the contrary. If in this point he be brought to a nihilo dictus, then let him for ever holde his peace about such Convocations.

1. The first answer is, that the accusation is not true, an effe the Agreement of the Articles of Faith, and Religion were not good. But if this being granted to be good, yet the accusation may be true, because this Act of An. 1571, can hardly be said to have been concluded within the memory of man. 2. It may well be questioned whether in this, our Convocation hath done that which was not better done to their hands. To which purpose it shall not be extravagant, nor unprofitable, to compare a little the Articles as they were set forth in King Edwards days, Anno 1552, with the edition which the Convocation of Anno 1571, hath left us. In the former we find
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this Article De Gratia. The Grace of Christ, or the Holy Spirit, which is given by him, takes away the heart of stone, and gives an heart of flesh; such as were unwilling to things lawful, he makes willing; and such as willed things unlawful, he makes unwilling. Which Article is, I know not wherefore, let out in the later edition. This I am sure of, that if the said Article had beene renued in the same manner as it was first set downe, it had beene one barre more than now is found against those amongus which follow Arminius, and his Remonstrants, & one warrant for publique preaching against them. Secondly, in the Article of Justification, it was before sayd, that the doctrine by sole faith in that sense in which it is explained in the family of Justification, is most certaine; now in the later edition this most certaine is left out, and for so sense is put in an ambiguous terme ut. Whatsoever was the occasion or meaning of this change, the former words were more full against those that broach new doctrines about Justification, such as Dr. Jackson doeth in his booke of Justifying Faith. Thirdly, in the Article of Sacraments, the former edition had, that the efficacy of the is not from the work done, which expression (in their Latine) as it is strange, and not knowne in holy Writ, so it carrieth with it a sense favouring little of piety, but much of superstition. Which words, if they had beene still retained, (as they are not) some superstitious conceits about the Sacraments might by them have beene suppressed. Fourthly, in the Article De Cana Dimini, the olde edition had these words: Seeing it is required to the true being of humane nature, that the body of one, and the same man cannot be in many places at once,
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A fresh suit against Ceremonies. It must be in some one definite place, therefore the body of Christ cannot be present in many, and diverse places at the same time. And because (as holy Scriptures deliver to us) Christ was taken up into heaven, and is there to remaine unto the end of the world, none of the faithful ought to believe, or profess any reall, and (as they speake) corporall presence of his blood and blood in the Sacrament. In the new edition all this is blotted out: which yet had good use against the Lutheran error of Conf participation. Firstly, In the Article of Traditions, these words (not found in the former edition) are conveyed into the later. Every particular, or national church hath authority of instituting, changing, or abroging Cerem or Ecclesiasticall rites instituted only by humaine authority, so that all be done to edification. This addition seems to be added for the better advancing of humaine Ceremonies. Sixthly; The Article about the books of usage, is very much transformed to the wronging of subscribers. For formerly it affirmed only that the book of service, and that of Ordination of Ministers, swar as concerned truth of doctrine are good &c. but now in the later, this limitation (qu. ad doctrine veritatem) is left out, and in stead thereof is added, that the book of Consecration, and Ordination containeth all things necessary thereunto, and that it hath nothing in it or it setteth either superstitious or impious, and all that be consecrated, and ordained according to it, are orderly, and lawfully consecrated, and ordained.
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These changes well considered, I thinke D. B. himselfe will confess that there was no great good done in the second edition of the Articles concerning Faith, and Religion: Yet be it so, that this was a good work of our Convocation, what a poore commendation is our good worke, of a Mother-Church in a whole generation or age of her children? Tis for the poore to tell their sorr. But for a shepheard, in numbring of his flock to let them brought to one head, what should he say but bewemoane himselfe with Alas! and Weel a day?

2. The second answer is, that Convocations doe sometimes, in confirming what was decreed before. Which is sometime true, viz. If the things decreed before, were of themselves good, and had need of the Convocations confirmation. But sometime such confirmations are onely for fashion-like; As when the Councell of Trent confirmed the Holy Scripture, the Apostolicall Creed &c. and then there is very little, or no good done, more than was formerly done to their hands. Any other confirmation of good, I doe not know our Convocations to be guilty of, nor can I understand when, whence, and how the Convocation had Commission to confirm any thing, without making of new Canons. A Law of Confirmation is necessary to Canons: but Canons of confirmation are not necessary to Lawes establisht. Neither can it be shewed that so much hath beene given or committed to the Convocation. Nor if it were, could that be done without Canons (in some respec new. And so much (it seemeth) Dr. B. knew, from whence it is that he addeth; or if they have done nothing being
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because they have had no commission, to which they are limited by all of Parliament, where is the blame? If they have done nothing! What a miserable supposition is this! To do nothing in so long a time, is to be no Synode, no Mother-Church, nor good Milk-nurse, but a dead Carthage, bearing an empty name of both. If they had no commission to do good, they had no commission to be a Mother-Church. If the Parliament hath limited them to a commission, it was because they durst not trust them without. Yet the blame of not doing good cannot be upon the Parliament, because they never sought to it, or by it, for a commission of doing any good; Nor yet of the Kings Majesty, (where the Rej. seemeth to leave it) except they have declared what necessity there was they should doe some good, and to that intent made petition for a commission; Let it ly therefore upon the convocation itselfe, which representeth, as an Image, or maketh shew of some good but doth none at all.

3. The third answer is; That in the booke of Canons were many good provisions for more plentiful preaching, and redressing the abuses of Ecclesiastical Courts, which would have done much good, if they had beene as carefully executed as they were made. But 1. so there was also in the Council of Trent, many Canons of Reformation, at most of their sessions, nay such, as (without any straining) goe farre beyond those that are found in our Canons. As for example, in the fift Session, under Paulus 3. it was decreed that expounding of the Scripture should be diligently observed in all Cathedrall Churches, and also in other places where any stipend was, or may be had, and that
that Præbends, for that cause absent from their Chapter, should enjoy their dividends, as if they were present. And that all Parish Priests should be compelled to teach their people, at the least on the Lords day, and solemn feasts. In the sixth session, the Ancient Canons are revived which were made against Bishops that build themselves in Princes Courts, or other where with secular affairs, and so are either non residents, or non predicants. In the seventh, it is ordered that all collections of benefices be upon able men, and such as will be resident upon the same, under great penalties. Pluralties also are abolished, or made nullities. In the fifth session under Pius 4. all taking of money for Orders, for letters testimoniall, for fees by Bishops, is condemned as simony: Nay, the Notaries, or Secretaries are forbidden to take anything except they have no wages (or then also, not above the tenth part of one Crown, under great penalties. It is also under like penalties decreed, that none be ordained (except upon necessity) and then with patrimony, or pension sufficient to live on) which have not an Ecclesiastical Benefice, or special charge. Moreover, it is decreed, that honest unlearned Parish-Priests should have learned Coadjutors adjoyning to them upon their charges, and that scandalous Priests should be either reformed, or removed. In the seventh Session, non-residency both of Bishops, and Curates againe condemned, as a mortall sinne. And which Bancroft would have called English Scotizing, or Scott Genevating; if it had bene but mentioned in his Con- cation, it was appointed, that the names of those whic
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desire to be ordained, should be the month before, publicly proclaimed in the Church, and diligent inquisition made concerning their life, and manners. It also confirmed that none should be ordained, that is not designed to a certain place of ministry. In the right Session it is injoyed to Bishops as their principal office, to preach diligently in their Churches, and that in all Parishes at least thrice a week, there should be preaching. And that one man should have but one Benefice requiring residence &c. With what sincerity theis, and such Canons of Reformation were propounded, is to be seen in the History of that Council. But in verball provisions it is evident that that Convocation was not behinde our Convocation, but rather ledde her the way, and taught her how to dissemble as if shee had set downe among other Canons, who knows not how to signe, he knows not how to reign.

Secondly: That provision which is here added (if those Canons had beene carefully executed) is as bald as any of the Canons. For 1. the question being of doing good, we are tolde they proceeded so farre that they had done some good, if they had come to execution, that is, to doing of good, and not pretending it onely.
2. To whom did it belong to see good Canons executed, but to Archbishops, Bishops, Deanes, Arch-deacons, which were the makers of them? Had they commission both to make badde Canons, and execute them; but to make onely good, and so leave them without execution? 3. This whole Plea is, as if for the cursed figtree.
which brought forth no fruit, one should have alleged that it brought forth leaves, and so made good provision for fruit, if fruit had followed answerable to the leaves. 4. What provision was made for preaching, if it were fully executed, D. B. in his Apology, in the 67. page of D. Covel, sheweth thus. By the Canons, no part of the service must give way to a Sermon, or any other recess, which competes with the accessory occasions of Christenings, Burials, Marriages, and Communion, which fall out all at some times, some at all times in many Congregations, that necessarily pretend, if not a purpose, yet a consequence of devouring of preaching, and so not widow's houses, but God's house, under pretense of long prayers, while neither the time, nor the ministers stringency, nor people's patience can bear the task of reading and preaching too. Of which intention I am afraid, who can marvel, that either shall observe the Lord of London's motion, for a praying ministry as more needful in a Church planted, than preaching, as his specific success have professed; or that shall make how some Canons are planted against Lectures in Market-townes, whereby the light hath spread to many dark places, and without how skillful all his Majesties godly purposes against the ignorant, negligent, and scandalous Ministers, have beene not so much delayed, as deformed, and the offenders covered &c. 5. If some little good had come from the Convocation about their Courts, yet that being covered, and overwhelm with so great evil which came from thence, as the removing, or excluding of a thousand good preachers, the vexing, and disturbing of ten thousand good Christians, (I speake within compasse of trueth) should be a
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The no more doing of good, than the leaving or sticking lowne of a feather was by him that stole the goose.

All these things being well considered, he that should reach to the Convocation, may well take up, and receive Mr. Latimers words uttered before the same Assembly in the 28. yeare of Henry 8. The fruit of your consultation shall shew what generation yee be of. What have yee done hitherto, I pray you? What one thing that the people of England hath beene better for of an haire? or you your selves, rather more accepted before God, or better discharged toward the people committed unto your cure? For, that the people is better learned, and taught now than they were in time past, to whether of their ought we to attribute it, to your industry, or to the providence of God, and the foreseeing of the Kings grace? What did yee, so great Fathers, so many, so long a season, so oft assembled together, wherby Christ is more glorified, or his people made more holy? I appeal to your owne consciences. Mr. Latimer in this charge, excepteth two exploits of that Convocation; One that they burned a dead man, who had with blood their profit; the other, that they went stout to take another in the coales, because he would not subscribe to certaine of their Articles. Such like exceptions may be made for our convocation, and those multiplied to a great number. But he that should make them must looke for no other see, or thanks, for such allegations, than Latimer was rewarded with, who (not long after this Sermon preached) was driven not only to cease from preaching, but also to take up his lodging in the Tower.

CHAP.
Concerning worship answer, to the Rej. premonition,
Pag. 123. 124. 125. 126. 127.

We here have the Rej. againe entrenching himself, and raising up many distinctions and definitions, as so many blinds, as it were, that the ignorant sort, and such as are more weak in judgment, might not perceave, how the evidence, and strenght of the arguments, which are leveled directly against the Ceremonies, come in upon them, and prevail against them: As also, that in the tumult, and lumbur of these distinctions, being thus hurried, and hurled together, those answers which are lame and wounded, may crepe away, and escape in the crowd, unseen and unsuspected by the most, who either have not skill, or will and care, to examine things, before they passe, but are content, rather to take these conceits (which are accompanied with ease and quiet) upon trust, then to put them to the trial, or themselves to trouble & vexation, if they prove not true. And because this head is of wayght, & worthy the skanning, we shall therefore take into further trial, and examination, what ever principles or authorities the Rej. hath sett downe, either in the premonition to the second argument, or in the beginning of his treatise, touching kneeling at the Sacrament. That we may thereby dicerne, what succour the Rej. his cause is like to fynd, when he thinks to shelter it under
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Under these outworks, which he hath reared up on purpose to be his sense.

Worship generally taken, is thus by him defined.

Worship is the performance of respect, unto anything or person, according to the estimation and dignity thereof.

The terms of which description, are so loose and wide, and so far from laying out the bounds, of the thing described, that like a ship-mans hose, you may apply them to what you will, rather than to the purpose intended. A man hath estimation, of his life, his goods, his good name, answerable to the worth & dignity of the, and doth accordingly performe, that respect, that is fitt in caring for them: doth he therefore worship his house, his goods, his lands? Nay any Christian heart, esteemes and performes respect to the worship of God: doth he therefore give worship unto worship: The Rej. therefore doth be desired, to make accurate descriptions, if he desires to give satisfaction to a judicious reader. Lastly we have here things & persons made the object of worship, and yet in the division immediatly following, we are taught, that worship distinguished according to the object, and that truly: is either of our fellow Citizens, and so civill, of our God, and so divine: In the definition things and persons are the object: And now in the division only persons are the object, and things not mentioned: how this quicksilver will be sodered together, I see not.
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Worship according to the degrees, is divided into reverence which is a due respect of God's ordinances or appurtenances to his service or adoration which is due to God alone.

Its a receaved rule, that degrees vary not the kynd of any thing, but the quantity of it: As the diverse degrees of heat, or cold, in severall things, degrees of whityness in severall walls, none of these degrees declare diverse qualities for kynd, but diverse quantities and measures of the same kynd of quality: as one thing is more or lesse hotte, but both have the like heat, for kynd of it whence it followes from the Rej. his ground, that reverence and adoration differing only as degrees of worship, they are both of the same kynd, and then veneration being due to the ordinances, and appurtenance thereof, the essence or kynd of true divine worship, is due to some creature beside God, which not only religion & reason, but all the world of Orthodoxe Divine deny, and the Rej. I presume alto in cold blood will do the same.

3. Third division is: Divine worship is either principall or sub ordinate: Principall is that holy reverence and respect of the Divine Majesty, which is inwardly performed for his honor: either by the understanding, or wil: and affections: And this may falsely be pretended, but cannot be falsely performed.

I will not here be curious to pursue all the open weaknesses of these expressions: Only let the Reader take notice, that the Rej. makes those members of a distinction, & so, such as should be opposite one unto another which
which are yet in subordination, and that by his owne
remes: for he makes one part principall, and the other
inordinate to it, and so in agreement with it, which
reason will allowe: As though one should divide a
living creature into that which is principally so, as a
man, or that which is subordinate, as the faculty of
laughing, which is a token of a man: And that which
breath him to these inconveniences, is the feare, lest
he should make externall worship, true worship, in its
owne nature, as conceaving, a back blow is coming to
its cause by that means.

2. I will not here ask, by what rule he makes revere-
ence the Genus to principall worship, when the verdit
of all writers, and text, calls religious reverence, as a
proper duty in the third command, whereas principall
worship is made general to all the first table, and so the
more particular is made a Genus to that which is more
general then it self: I suppose this is the Rej. phra-
siologie, fitter for a declamer, and one that should descant
end fine: 3. let it here be remembred, that the in-
ward acting of understanding, will, and affections to-
wards God, is made the proper forme, and that which
properly being to principall worship, because we
call have use of this hereafter.

Only that which is most remarkeable, and exceeding
subfull ( & therefore desired proof and confirmation)
that which is added, in the following words, viz. In-
ternal worship cannot be performed falsely: which is a cœcit
beyond my shallow apprehension, & therefore, at his next
voyning I desire to be satisfied in some particulars.

1. He
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1. He that acknowledgeth one God, Eternall, Almighty, &c. and two persons: but conceives the Holy Ghost, not to be a distinct person beside them, but work proceeding from them both, and so also depend upon the Godhead thus apprehended: whether doth such a man falsely conceive of God, and falsely worship him: making no expression of this his conceaving or dependance.

2. If there be the same ground and reason, to make false internal, as external worship, then the one may be as falsely performed as the other: but that there is the same ground for both, let any man compare them together, and it will appear at the first view: For the heart, can, and doth goe aside as many ways from the rule, as the outward man doth, or can do: A man may feare God, upon a false ground, after a false manner to a wrong end: as well as preach, or pray, upon a false ground, after a false manner, to a false end: So that I see no colour, nor can conceive, how those words can be excused: Internal worship is true or not at all: Imaginary internal worship is no worship. For there is nothing, that can be called true, being ordered a right, according to rule, but there is a falsity, which will arise by the wrong ordering, and ill disposing of the same thing: At a word, as every proper axiom admits of a contradiction, and so of a falsity necessarily: so likewise every individual action, which can admit of alteration, must needs admit of a wrong, as well as of a right disposition, and by consequent of a falsity, which may befall it in that kynd.
All lifting up the honour of another, to whom, in way of homage we present our services, that is, worshipping of such a party in our intent, and according to the nature of the action: but false conceiving of the true God, and fearing of him, upon false grounds is the lifting up of the honor of God, in the intention of the person, and nature of the word: and therefore it must needs be worship of God, for of no other, it can be, as being tendered to him, but its not true internall worship, and therefore it must be false.

Lastly, if this be not at all false worship, then at all, it is no sinne, and so must never be answered for, because unto any other head beside that of false worship, it cannot be referred.

Subordinate worship is that which is done in token, and testimony of the sovereignty, we acknowledge in God, and of our dependance upon him.

Here againe, we have the like phrasiologie, words without waught of reason, in describing or defining the thing intended: For token and testimony are too large and loose expressions to lay out the nature of this worship: Because 1. a man may severall wayes give a token, or testimony of his acknowledgment, and dependance, and yet in none of those wayes be truely said to worship i.e. as by some pledge, by his hand writing, and seal annexed testify, that he doth thus acknowledge and depend, and yet none of these wayes he worships: 2. Take actions in this reference onely, as they looke to our
true externall worship is said to be made up of 4. things.
A person holy, 2. action and manner warranted; 3. end right, 4. the present intention of the worshipper beflowed, and employed upon the service.

Where let it be considered, how he broyles things of all kynds together, contrary even to their nature, and right reason: In that he requires the inward holiness of the person, and his gratious acceptation with God: and secondly the present and religious intention of mynd, as necessary to make up externall true worship, which mixture and constitution, even the names of the things gaynesay, and their natures will not indure.

For 1. that which was the forme, and made up the proper nature of internall worship before, that cannot constitute external worship, as common sense teacheth: but the inward performing of reverence, (and consequently present religious intention, which is of that kynd) was made the proper forme of internall worship, by the Rej. his graunt.

2. All outward actions, in the frame and constitution are liable to censure of the church, either for approbation or reprehension, but the sincerity of heart, and intention of mynd, the church cannot take notice of, nor
A fresh suite against Ceremonies.

of, nor passe a censure upon, provided the outward expressions do not sayle or be a wanting.

1. A man may be bonus ethicus, and yet not bonus theologus, i.e. a well cariaged man outwardly, expressing both the sense and practise of religion in his outward demeanor: And yet not be a a sincere hearted Christian: So a man may be a member of a congregation, and behave himself outwardly beyond exception, and yet want, both an upright mynd, and intention sincere: So that though they be rejected of God without those, yet the fault lies not in the outward action, but in the inward & spiritual work, which God approves, and takes his complacency in, yet he looks upon these, and loves them so far as they be suitable to their rule, as he did in the young man, Mark 10.21.

At a word: an action may be done by the rule of Ethics, or the rule of outward ecclesiastical policy and church discipline appointed by Christ: Or lastly by an inward spiritual principle of grace: The two former, may be true without the last, though a man's sinnes in seperating the last from the first, because though the first be good in their kynd, yet they are not sufficient: the former therefore are to be continued, and the sinne in the last to be reformed: Hence the Prophet Isaiah 1.16. Put away the evil of your doings, the Lord enjoyneth the not to take away their works, but the evil of them: as though he should have said; sacrifice still according to rule prescribed; choose a sacrifice without blemish &c. for the matter; offer it according to rites appointed, for the manner, as before, but being also a heart hum-
humbled, a life reformed, wherein you have hitherto fayled, keepe that which is good, and add that which is awanting.

4. Lastly, when an unregenerate minister (gifted sufficiently for outward expressions, and called by the church) shall preach, administer the sacraments, beyond all exception to the eye of man, and to the approbation of the church; I ask: whether the true matter and forms of right administration, may not undoubtedly be concluded to be there, so far as those services are external.

I presume the Rej. will dislaft the contrary conceit, and scorn to entertaine so silly an imagination, as to affirme, that a wicked man, cannot be a true minister, or his actions performed unreproveably in that kynd, by what man can see, to be true ministeriall actions.

If this he graunt, which cannot be denied with any colour, (and if it be, I shall be ready to make it good;) I then reason.

Where the true matter and forme is of external worship, ther is the true compleat nature of external worship.

But in the administration of the Sacrament, &c. by an unregenerate minister, ther is the true matter and forme of true worship.

Therefore in the administration of these by an unregenerate minister, ther is the true compleat nature of externall worship.

To this place appertaineth that expression in his premonition to the receaving of the Lords Supper,
Concerning which passage, I desire one case may seriously be considered, and it is this: Whether is it not possible, that a man (either out of ignorance as not knowing, or out of false fear dissembling) may kneel downe before an Idol, as Idolaters do, performe and express according to their manner all outward actions of reverence, and yet keepe his heart, mynd, & affections, inwardly acknowledging and loving of God.

That this practise is possible, nay too ordinary, that the heart may be caried one way, and the action another way in appearances, needs no proof, since each mans reasonable experience gives undeniable evidence thereof: hence then I reason.

If an action may have the reall subsistence of superstition, without the intention of the mynd, the work of heart and affection: then without these hath it the subsistence of externall worship.

But without internall worship: to witt without, nay against the intention of mynd, the work of my heart & affection, the action formerly mentioned hath the subsistence of reall superstition.

Therefore without the internall worship, the externall hath subsistence.
The fourth division:

Externall worship is either mediate, or immediate. Mediate, when any duty of the second table is performed immediately to man, but out of conscience, and in obedience to God, to his honour.

In this division of mediate, and immediate worship, used by some Divines: The name worship, must needs be taken (by a synecdoche the part put for the whole) for obedience in general, and so they are to be understood and not in propriety of speech: For that which comprehends both the tables of the Decalogue in it (as in this division worship doth) cannot properly be referred either to any one command, or any one table: And in this construction, it serves nothing to the Rej. his purpose, but only to fill up place, & make up the number of Divisions, which is the ready way to confound the reader: And that the Rej. cast lots almost what to say, it may appeare, in that, he who makes external worship the Genus to mediate and immediate here: Elsewhere in his premonition to the receaving of the Lord's Supper, he makes immediate the Genus to external and internal, so curious is he in his distributious, that in his sense, you may make the whole the part, the part the whole: And if in such Divisions ther be like to be mistake, let the judicious reader determine.

But let us come more neare his particular explication, which is this: That mediate worship by the Rej. is definition when any duty is done to our brother, but in some sense to God.
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Where I desire to be informed at his next rejoicing, whether he make his worship to consist, in the discharge to our brother or in the conscience to God, used in the discharge thereof: The former (I suppose he neither will, nor can say, though he can say strange things, for then worship should first be tendered man, and to the Lord at the second hand.

I conceive then he must affirm the second, and use the worship, in the act of conscience, carried by virtue of a command: but then let him tell us how it can be called external worship, or can possibly cord with the words of his definition going before: external worship is, the performance of an outward action, he defines, but I assume, the inward work of conscience, is not the performance of any outward action, where external worship cannot consist in that.

And yet if this was granted, which sense gaynsfayes, how unhappy he is in his expression, for neither in this would any worship properly appear. That which pertains to the right doing of every act of obedience as such, that cannot make up the proper nature of worship: but to be done in virtue, and so in conscience, God's command, belongs to every action of the catalogue: what ever is not done of faith is sin Rom. 

The fifth Division.

Immediate worship, is either properly so called, or else reductively.

Proper immediate worship, is any action done to the honouring
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nouring of God immediately, and in that act it self, are all such ordinances, which God has appointed.

Improper worship is any act done, to the honouring of God by the orderly, and comely usage of his own ordinances, which because they poynt as Gods honour in their remote end, as they determine their first end, and use of men, as tending to order, decency, and edification, therefore but improperly acts of worship.

It is the nature of errour, ever to be unlike it self, and he that goes out of the right way, will cross himself commonly in his going, and this is the reason, the Rom doth so often interrise in his discourse, and which is his exceeding ill hap, though no occasion require it, cannot conceale these crafty, and ill joyned expressions we shall thersore againe, lay open the whole frame, that the description may be half a confusion:

Divine worship proper to God pa.
124. sect.5. mark those words (proper to God) is

principa

mediate, done to man immediate, but in conuissance to God, in a honour,

subordinate & external, and that

immediate, improper done, their use end immediate proper

improper does:

Where some things in the generall are very obvicable.

1. That improper immediate external worship, is &

vce
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First, worship proper to God: this conclusion will appear, to any, that will but wisely apply the speciall and generall together, according as they be ranked in the foregoing delineation.

2. That improper immediate worship, is mediate worship; for thus I reason: That worship which is immediately done to man, but in conscience to God, that is mediate worship, so the Rej. description teacheth: but improper immediate worship, is first done to man, so the very expresse words of the Rej. declare evidently: the acts of improper worship determine, in their end, and use upon men.

Therefore immediate improper worship, is mediate by the Dn dispute.

If it be here replied, that the actions which make up mediate worship, must be actions of the second table, not of the first, as these be: I answer; It is the verdit of the word, and the common consent of all Divines, that all the actions and duties, which concern our brother as the next object and end, and so determine upon him are required, and regulated by the second table: since therefore these things of commones and order, are of this nature, by the Rej. his graunt, I do not see, how it can be avoyded with any colour of reason, but they must be commanded in the second table, and so come under the definition of mediate worship, directly contradictory to the Rej. his determination.

I might also put the reader in mynd, of these twice-sod colceworps, that are sett agayne before us: viz. this misty distinction of properly, & reductively, which like
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A vagrant wanders up and downe in every coast, and therefore should be whipped home to his owne place: For it is propounded & applyed upon the like mistak, that formerly it was pag. 37. in the division of Cerem. And is here, as it was there, voyd of all art and truth.

1. Voyd of Art: For what reason, or rule, doth allow, any reasonable disputers, to make a distribution and to an opposition of parts, that are in consent, and agreement one with another, such is this here propounded. Worship is either proper; as Gods ordinances, or improper; as the adjuncts to these ordinances, which appertain therunto: As if a man should say: There be two kynd of byrds, either an (eagle, or her feathers.

2. Its voyd of truth: For who ever accounted all the civil circumstances, and attendants of decency in the discharge of Gods worship to be worship. The band the preacher useth, the doublet he weares are decent attendants unto him, in preaching & praying, and it would be exceeding unseemely, to see him naked in those parts, rudely presenting himself amiddst the congregation, in the work of the Lord, yet did ever any, before D. Burges say, that the band and doublet of the minister, were improper immediate worship.

Amidst these many mistakes, we have a ground of graunt from the Rej. his owne words: That kneeling in the act of receaving, cannot be improper, but proper worship: For we kneele not either, to man or to the bread, but to God directly, and it is to lift up his hon-
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nour immediately in the use and end of that action, and therefore it cannot be improper, but proper worship.

Anne her example of serving God with fasting, and prayer, comes after to be scanned in the next section, only before we end, lett us consider in a word of that passage which the Reij. hath pag. 126. To the proper, circumstantial or accessory worship: the permission of God, and right intention, and use, sufficeth to legitimize them. loyne we unto these words, the definition of immediate worship, under which all these improper circumstantial worship are ranged: viz. Immediate worship is, when any act of obedience to the first table, is performed to honour God: out of which I thus reason:

Every act of obedience to the first table, is not only permitted, but required in the first table.

But the acts of improper immediate worship are acts of obedience to the first table: therefore they are not only permitted but required.

To this place belongs the considering and discussing of the variation of that phrase used in the premonition, touching kneeling at the sacrament, cap. 3. p. 3.

False worship, is sayd to be of the will of man merely, True, is sayd to be according to the will of God wholly.

The mistery is, that no worship is false, which hath any thing in it of the will of God, And ther is some worship true and good, which is not of the will of God as a cause, but only according to it, as not hindering or forbidding: This is the Papists plea just against our Doctrines for their traditions. Gregor. de Valent.  

S 2  Tom.
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Tom. 4 DIsp. 6. Q. 11. P. 1. Christ doth not forbid that we make such addition of worship, which doth not repugne to the law, but consents to right reason, and so to the will of God.

So Estius in Tit. 1. 14. The Scripture so far as it shall in the worst sense, touching the precepts and traditions of men, it always understands such, which are so appoint and commanded by men, as that they nothing at all conform unto piety, or plainly oppose both is and the law of God, such which proceed from a humaine spirit or appetite, to wish so far as a man is acted of himself, and not of God. So the Rhemists on Math. 15. 9.

The contrary assertion is the received doctrine of our Divines for, and out of the word of God against the Papists, and one fundamental principle of reformation.

So Luther Gen. 21. This is one mayne principle of the doctrine we profess (against the forged superstitions of the Papists) that we undertake no work in the things which appertain unto worship, concerning which we have not an express command of God: No man can boast of the performance of any worship, unless he be wholly as it were clothed, and confined within the compass of the word.

Hitherto also, is to be added, that distinction which is last mentioned by the Rej. in the forenamed place in his premonition for kneeling at the Sacram. Chap. 3. Pag. 3. 4.
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Immediate true external worship, is so called in respect, that of the means, or manner of worship, and that which is said to be grounded either on special command, which is properly in and of itself worship, or upon allowance only, as touching the particular, which is worship per alium, by virtue of some thing else.

1. But first, there is internal means, and manner as well as external. 2. The manner and means do depend on God's command and allowance in that also. Immediate worship in regard of the means of worship, is just as much, as immediate mediate worship: And suiteth well with that distribution, which we met with in the former section of significant Ceremonies, to significant and non-significant: 4. When as the Reformed much to this distinction of general and particular command, he should have told us, whether he meaneth by the general, the Genus or the kynd immediate, and next, or any other how remote soever; the former sense will not help our Ceremonies, the other will serve at a lift, for many popish Ceremonies as all as ours, since God's command doth not make any tag immediate worship, in, and of itself, for then the king of a murthecer should be worship, in, and of itself: 3. What reason or sense is there, that God's command should make a thing worship of itself, and God's allowance should make it worship by virtue of something else, when as the commandement, doth no more beit itself or other thing, then the allowance. 6. Allowance of this or that in general without allowance to be worship, maketh nothing at all to be worship.
7. It may justly be questioned, whether the Reformed reverend usage of prescribed worship, according to order and decency. Where observe that worship being formerly defined by an action here specified by a manner, whereas the manner of an action, is not an action, at least every manner is not. That in the manner here specified (reverend), the usage of an action differeth not from the action only in reverence, which is a common adjunct worship, and therefore maketh not a distinct worship. That civility, order and decency is required, usage of prescribed worship, and so worship in regard the manner though it be religious, may be call vil: yet let the Reader be admonished, that under
The words of worship, much sacramental worship is maintained by the
reverend manner, order, decency of worship, nature, therefore of the things themselves, should be
considered, and we should not suffer ourselves to be
suffocated by words. That which is quoted here out of D.
imes, will occasion the reader to look upon the place,
ecul. lib. 2. c. 14. th. 25. the words of that position
thyself: Although these circumstances of time, place and
like, are wont by some to be called rites or religious ec-
stitual ceremonies, yet in their nature they have nothing:
propriety of religion, and therefore religious worship doth
propriety consist in them, however by neglect, and contempt
sual circumstances, the sanctity of such religious worship is
some sort violated, because the common respect of order
decency, which do equally agree to religious and civill
ions cannot be severed, from religious worship, without di-
ishing of the sanctity and dignity of it. What can the
r. gather from hence, but that these circumstances
not worship, being only so required to religious
ions as they are to civill: If his argument be this: they
not properly worship, therefore worship, it is ridici-
ous: If it be thus framed; they are commanded in gen-
ally, therefore in their generally nature, & in respect of
heir utmost end, they must be vouchsafed, the title of
divine worship: He may as well conclude, that the office
and act of a justice of peace, or Constable, nay a Hangman,
nt be vouchsafed the same title of divine worship, for
ere are commanded in generally, and their utmost
ought to be the honouring of God, and sometime
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they may have reference to some thing done in the worship of God: In the last place ther is a memorandim added, that the same humaine Ceremonie, which is a worshipp in regard of manner, may also be worship in respect a meane, but not of, and by it selfe. This is as much to say, That the last distinction between means and manner is not distinct, and that a humaine Ceremonie cannot be grounded on Gods speciall command, the whereof no man ever doubt of, and the former, I fear, falsely assent unto.

**S E C T. 2.**

*Concerning the exemplifying of the former distinction of worship by instances, and confirming of it by testimonies in the same treat: Cap. 4.*

Anna served God in fasting and prayer, Luke xxiv.
Fasting here was worship, saith Dr. B. in some sense, or else S. Luke was deceived. Whate
ever becommeth of this consequence, the example fitteth not our Ceremonies, for though D. B. hath often counselled his Auditors to worship God in fasting & praying, in the same phrase, yet (I dare say) he never exhorted them, or any ministers to whom he hath preached amongst others, to serve God in Surplice and Prayer, crossing and baptizing, how much soever he favoured these Ceremonies: The strange beating such a phrase carieth with it, would have amazed his people, and affrighted the ministers, and discredited his ministry:
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this alone it appeareth, that the example of fasting is abused, when it is paraleled, with crosse and surplice: 2. The consequence is all too peremptorily followed, or else St. Luke was deceived: I should rather think, that D.B. may be deceived in his interpretation of St. Luke: The phrase which St. Luke useth, doeth no more urge us, to make fasting worship in any sense, than St. Paul his phrase Eph. 6. Watching unto all supplication with perseverance, doth constrayne us to make perseverance, or watching a worship, distinct from supplication: Or then, the same Paul's phrase Acts 20.19. serving the Lord with many tears and temptations, doe make temptations a special kynd of worship. 3. Fasting may be called worship by a trope, as being a speciall adjunct of some extraordinary worship, and yet not be a special kynd of immediate reductive worship, or any other kynd. 4. The truth is that fasting, is such a help to extraordinary humiliation, as moderate fasting, is to extraordinary thanksgiving, and therfore is no more worship, then Christian fasting: And to this purpose do our divines answer, concerning this place, which is ordinarily objected by every Papist, as here by the Re. See Chemnitus upon these words: See Polanus, Synag. lib.9. cap 8. Fasting is a help to prayer, a signe of humility and repentance, but is not a worship of God. 5. Fasting such as Annas was, is not a humaine institution, as our ceremonies are, but partly naturall, when the whole man is taken up with greater, and more instant imployement, exclusive of all ordinary refreshments: and partly of Divine application, in extraordinary humiliation, so that
that it hath ground and example both in the O. & N.T.,
which our Ceremonies are destitute of.

2. Mr. Cartwright (many degrees and ages distant
from S. Luke) is brought in next, acknowledging cir-
cumstantiall worship, only allowed in the particular,
though commanded in his kynd in the second com-
maund: Now I have at hand, only that edition of Mr.
C. his Catechisme, which was printed Anno 1611,
and therin I fynd no such thing, upon occasion I will
seek for the other edition: In the meane tyme I fynd
there, that all will worship, how great a show soever it
makes, is condemned and images (in speciall in Gods
service even as lay-mens books) which the defendant
defende, thand the Rej. rejoyneth for. 2. Suppose he
graunt a circumstantiall worship, what is that to wor-
ship invented by man: There is no doubt, but some
parts of Gods worship, by himself instituted are com-
paratively circumstantiall, but what is that to mans in-
vention. 3. There is a mighty distance, betwixt the ge-
erall of kneeling at prayer, & such like gestures, inten-
ded by Mr. C. (if he name circumstantiall worship,) and the generall of Croffe and Surplice, as there is be-
twixt the generall of this and that father, and the ge-
nerall of all entia and things, that have being: This
testimony therefore maketh nothing to the purpose.

The third wittesse is, Chamyer, Tom. s. l. 20. 4. 5 affir-
mimg that arbitrary voewes are worship of God not per se,
of themselves, but by accident, and for some other thing,
wher
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where to omiss the translation of per se, of themselves, which should have beene by themselves betwixt which there is a great difference, (as betwixt a body living of the soule, and by it self.) Chamyer in that very place, if his whole sentence be expressed (which neglect, if it had beene the Replyers, we should have heard ouercryes, proclamations and invective accusations enough) I say his whole sentence is contrary to the Rej. : His words in summe are these: To vow, and to performe are elicited acts of religion, because by themselves and properly they appertain to religion, but the actions that are vowed, are impertained by religion, and belong unto worship, not properly, but by accident, those formally, these materially. He doth not speake of vowes, in that part which the Rej. quoteth, but of things vowed, nor doth he acknowledge these worship, otherwise then the matter of an action, is an action: It were not farr from his meaning, if one should say, this bakers bread, and that vynters wyne, is a Sacrament materialiter and per accidens. Lastly he doth not speake of any worship elicitus per accidens, such as immediate Ceremoniall worship is, but only imperatus ordered and directed, such as service to ones father or freind may be, and is not this then a worshipsfull testimony for Ceremonies, invented by man and made formall, immediate reductive worship.

Junius in the fourth place is brought in, testifying, that the humaine feasts of the Nativity, and Easter, are not worship properly, but it may be figuratively: And what is that, I wonder, to immediate reductive worship of humaine invention: Worship figuratively so called, is any matter,
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instrument, subject, adjunct, effect or even similitude of worship: Are all such things immediate reductive worship? Iust as bread, porrage, wyne, oyle, or meat, having touched the skirt of a holy garment are holy, Hag. 2. 11. Thus the words and wildenesse where Christian meet, may be called worship figuratively or by a figure, the place being putt for the thing done in the place: thus the ringing of the Bell, before the Sermon, may be called worship figuratively, because it is a signe civil to give notice that such a service will be: And hence it is that Tunnius doth in the same place affirme, that such observations are only contingent accidents, or adjuncts to worship. The same Tunnius doth expayne his owne meaning controv. 3. lib. 2. c. 16. n. 18. warning us to distinguish betwixt actions of worship, and such which are done in order unto worship, adding moreover this: Actions of worship, what ever are not commended of God are forbidden, for as touching such, nothing can be detracted, added, altered, and in Levit. 9. No right way of disposing Gods servants in his worship, can be invented by man, but that, which God himself hath prescribed.

Polanus is next, who (saith the Rej.) in his syntagma defineth true worship of God to be the performance of what he hath commanded in obedience to him, to his honour, yet in his partitions pag. 128. he saith, that an ecclesiastical rite or Cerem. is outward worship of God, not forgetting or casting himself, but taking the name of worship in one place properly, and in the other improperly, or reductively. Where it is to be noted, that Polanus sayth nothing of improper, reductive worship, but those termes are putt into his mouth,
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A mouth, or thrust into his speech by the Rejoyner. 2. Petrusus writ his partitions, when he was a young man, and divine, but his Sytagme was his last work: If therefor any crossing was found in these two writings, his Sytagme was to be taken, as his more mature judgment, and preferred as his last will and testament.

3. In this his Sytagme lib. 3.c. 1. he hath not only the definition of worship, contrary to the Rej. his tenets, but many other items: It belongs to the substance of a good work, that it be commanded of God, and therefore is requisite, that the worship of God, and every thing appertaining therunto be commanded: Actions indifferent, are not the worship of God &c.

4. In the place quoted out of his partitions: That an ecclesiasticall rite is outward worship, he doth not crople himself, for what he there meaneth by an ecclesiasticall rite, he sheweth in the specialls, which he after setteth downe, as sacrifices &c. though he mingleth some humaine feasts, with the ordinances of God for his method sake, never intending to make such ceremony, as ours lawfull worship, and therefore opposeth his ecclesiasticall rites to those duties, that are performed only by speech: as Invocation, confession, thanksgiving.

6. Fenner (faith the Rej.) maketh bowing the knee or head, lifting up the hands, or eyes, to the parts of external worship: But what consequence is there from natural gestures to ceremony, instituted by man? From actions particularly commended unto us in Gods word, as outward worship, to such as their patrons can fynd no allowance for, but in a remote transcendental racket Genius?
Tylenus (a man, that Dr. B. should rather have written against, for his errors, then alleged against others for his authority) is in the seventh place brought in saying; that a vow of a thing not commanded, is not only by accident, Syntag. par. 1. dif. 42. th. 17. Yet it doth not say, it is worship, but that it cannot be called worship, but by accident. 2. He giveth this limitation, so far as may, some way be referred to worship, as an arbitrary, contingent, indifferent mean. Such as in prayer the choise of the word, forgiveness, rather then pardon, is in the petition of remission of sines. 3. The worship he speaketh of, is not immediate in his opinion, as appeareth disp. 40. th. 16. as it is in the Rej. his divisions: N. Tylenus is so wise, as to say, that the most proper immediate acts of religion, do not respect God per se, and of themselves, Ibid. th. 18. is it any wonder then, granteth a worship, not in, and of it self, but by accident only.

Bucanov is the eight witness, and yet nothing out of him is brought, but that ecclesiastical rites, are not worship themselves, and as a work done. Did any of us ever affirm, they were such worship? May be the Rej. would gather from thence, that ther is a worship, which is not of self, and as a work done such, which (though it cannot be gathered from that phrase, with better reason, the if from this, that sayth (doeth not justifye of it self, as a work done, he should conclude, that some greater is, which justifyeth of it self, and as a work done yet we may well grant of false worship: But see how unhappy the Rej. is in his wrested allegations. Bucanov...
the place quoted Loc. 41. q. 20. giveth this caveat: 'The place appointed for order, and cominices sake only, are of divine worship: 2. It should be provided, that in use of a grave, seemly, and profitable order, these things be unaffected, which are unprofitable, foolish, ridiculous, stageable. And of this sort are those, which the Lapis com-
mand, concerning the difference of days, and garments:
and the same Bucan us Loc. 39. q. 15. In things appertaining to worship, we must attend for direction only unto the will of God, and not to humaine traditions: No observance 
due rites, where of some are popish, wayne, and light, in either in regard of themselves or some other thing su-
pitious, amongst which he reckons, the making of the sign of the cross, the burying of the dead, the consecration of altars, and magistrall terminations. And that lawfull rites of order, are to be preserved, not in regard of themselves, but by the law of cha-
: where he plainly sheweth, that per se is not always to be held to relation ad alud, as the Rej. understands. The same Buc. also, Loc. 47. qu. 65. giveth this rule: 'The humane ceremonies ought to be used, but those which are 
pointed, and commanded by the authority of the house of

The last witness is Melancthon, who saith in one place: 'A man may not institute any worship of God, i.e. Works of God so allweth, that he himself to be honored of themselves; or whose immediate end is, that God be honored by them: As if we did hold the contrary, it is not this testimony wisely allledged, that all men in his opposites may graunt, and the graunt of it, neither hurts them, or helps him: Nay take away that clausu,
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clause. Gods allowance and holding himself honored, which no humane institution can infer) we say that our Ceremonies are such, for it is as an immediate end, of all moral call teaching rites, to honor God, by them and in them, as of the word, so far as it preacheth the same vehicle that Ceremonies do teach: And so much is taught by the Rej. in these very dictums, when he reduceth these reductive ceremonies, under the head of immediate worship, for nothing can be immediate worship, whose immediate end is not, that God may be honored by the performance of it. The same appeareth out of the which the Rej. pag. 313. affirmeth, viz. that the proper end of preaching is adification of men, if that be joined, which he everywhere teacheth, that the proper end of significant Ceremonies is adification: Of such Ceremonies therefore may well understand. Melanchton, not only this place alluded, but also Tom. 2. p. 142. The word understands not, how great a name it is to forge worship without Gods command: And P. 107. Idolatrous worship all they, which are appointed without the command of God. Here is no distinction between worship of itself, or itself and by accident reductively &c. The Rej. his ceremonies being such as have beene declared, there cannot be much force in his examples, if they be agreeable to his rules, whether he hath brought such crosse witness. The first example is, of free will offerings, when a man was left at liberty to offer a bullock, a goat, or sheepe at his pleasure: where the particular was not commanded, but only allowed though the manner was prescribed: Concerning which answer t. that there were no obligations left wholly.
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The pleasure of men, for though the particulars were not, nor could not be determined by a distinct rule in general, yet they were determined by the circumstances, as our Divines are wont to answer the Papists, about their vows, counsels, superarrogations, not by a general law, but by concurrence of circumstances. So Deut. 16.10. Moses sheweth that the freest offerings were to be according as God had blessed them, from whence it followeth, it had beene synne for any Israelite, whom God had plentifully blessed, to offer a payre of pigeons in stead of a bullock, or two, upon his owne meere pleasure: 2. where that proportion was observed the choice of a goat, before a sheep, or a sheepe before a goat, was no formall worship: 3. That it had beene unlawfull for the Priests out of their pleasure, to institute any such determinate free offering, either ordinarily to be observed, or upon occasion of a mans forwardnesse to such a duty, i.e. that every free offering should be a goat, or at the least, that a goat should be one part of it, which is the presumption of our Prelats, about the reduc'tive worship of the crosse. 4. It was not left to any mans pleasure, for to appoint an offering not appointed of God, in the speciall or least kynd, but onely to choose among those, which God had instituted, that which did best agree, with his condition and occasion, as it is also now of psalmes, prayers, doctrines, interpretations, exhortations, let every man offer, according as God hath furnished him: But from hence to inferre the free choice of offering now to God, a crosse, surplice, holy water, images, this is, as if one should then have concluded from...
from that freedome, the free offering of certaine buters,
flyes, or such like pretty, odd, vermy not prescribed in
the law, nor by name forbidden.

The second example is taken from Salomons worship, in
the dedication of the temple, 1. Kings 8. 2. Chron. 6. and 7
which he thus conformeth to his notions: The number of Bul-
locks and Sheepe, were worshop in respect of the end and al-
lowance only, the Cere. of prayer, kneeling upon a Scaffold, &
stretching out of hands, were worshop reducitive ad modum
in genere suo, having respect to the manner in the general
kynd thereof: The burning of Sacrifices in the floore of the
Court, was only lawfull before the brasen altar was construc-
ted, and upon the present necessity: But 1. in the number
of Bullocks and Sheepe, ther was not a different wor-
ship, but a different degree of the same worship, as a lon-
ger prayer or seramon is not another worship then a
shorter, but another degree of extension in the same
worship, Surely to pray and prayse God twice, thrice or
seven tymes in a day, are no different worships, one for
another, but onely more or lesse exercise of the same
worship. 2. Kneeling & stretching out the hands, were
not worship in respect to a generall manner, but speciall
externall worship, as being naturall, immediate expres-
sions of the inward: As for the scaffold that Salomon
kneeled on, that was no more worship, then the ass was
upon which our Saviour did ride. Lastly, being none of
these things carying the nature of worship, were insti-
tuted ordinary observances, neither might the Preists in
any convocation, have made such, these examples are
nothing like ours in question.

The
The other examples of Joshua's monitory stone, Jos. 24. 20.
Jnom. 14. days solemnity, 1. Kings 8. Ezekiel's design
in. days, 2. Cron. 30. Mardicay, Purim, Hest. 9. have little

2. Joshua's stone was, as Dr. Jackson, Bid. pag. 329. judged, but
solemnly attestation, though somthing extraordinary,
indeed was no more worship, then the heavens and
which Moses & Isaiah did call to witness. 3. Asa
ah, & Nehemiah's subscription, were no more distinct
ship from the covenant, then the words of a simple
rifle are a distinct promise from the meaning of
subscription and swearing of Canonical obedience in England, were never (that I hear of) excep-
against as Ceremonies of worship, by those which
andme them in the substance of them. 4. The
slinging of worship by Salomon and Ezekiel's was
with a distinct worship, as Paul's continuing his exercise
religion to myndight, Acts 20. Mordecai his Purim
are their proper place in the dispute: Out of all these
tales, testimonies, examples, nothing followeth in fa-
our of our Ceremon. because no sound rule, just testi-
mony
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mony, or allowed example, is brought for any Ceremonies of Mystical signification by man instituted, and brought into the solemne ordinary worship of God, for the same teaching: which maketh the Rej. his full persuasion, which he protesteth, suspected, and his triumphing ridiculous to those that well attend to these his grounds.

Yet the Rej. hath a double conclusion looking the way, 1. That this will shew in what sense we may value our Ceremonies worship, and yet deny them to worship, that is in such a non-sense as is usually found in contradicting shifts: The 2. to shew the difference betwixt us and the Papists, which is here showed very briefly, but hath beene handled, and answered at large before, and thither therefore we refer the Reader.
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THE DISPUTE
about
HUMANE
CEREMONIES.

CHAP. 1.
Of the negative argument from Scripture,

SECT. 2.

My purpose is not, to insist upon words, & circumstantiall exceptions, as being of little moment, but onely to discusse the materiall poynts that I meet with, in their order. Yet because the Reij. commeth on in the beginning, with suche a heat, the Repl. had marvelously offended, almost in y word; I will take his first accusations (though not the materiall) into due consideration.

The Repl. made onely mention of the all-sufficiencie, or perfect fulnesse of the Scriptures. Heret the Reij. sently complaineth of abuse, misreporting, and made a false show: as if (sayth hee) wee denied the perfect effe of the Scripture etc. Now the Repl. sayd no
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suche thing, but the contrarie rather, when he saith that the same was granted by the Deity as it was said by those the writ against.  

2. If he had said, the Deity and Religion also doe deny the perfect fulness of nature, in regard of Ceremoniall worship, he had more then truth, for they teach, that some worship is lawfull and good, which is not taught by Scripture, that many teaching Ceremonies, which never instituted, may by man be instituted and be into worship, images themselves not excepted, traditions to Gods word (so they be not contrarie and ought to be made.) The summe of their doctrine in this point, is that which Mr. Hooker testeth in p. 125. Much the Church of God shall always need, which Scripture teacheth not.

Nyet, doeth it help, which the Reformed Scripture is as perfect in giving general rules, as it is in setting downe of all particular instances. For it is not generally true, because generall rules make on proposition tending to particulars, and the assumpstions being undetermined, they therefore do not so full perfectly inferre the particulars, as if they were downe.

Generall rules are given in the new Testament civill policie or government of Common wealth. no man (I think) will say that civill policie is so and perfectly taught in the new Testament as it is the olde, or as religious worship is now in the new.

The rule for cleane beasts (sayth the Reformed) that they be as chowe the cudde, and divide the hoof, was as perfect
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suche beasts had been named. True, but here no

domination of the assumption was necessary, but suche

the beasts themselves did make to every man that was

blinde, without any institution of man. It was as

with in bread & wine for the Lords Supper, which

appointed in generall, without naming of wheat,

millet bread, or Frenche, Spanish, Rhenish, Italian,

Greek wine: but coste and surplice (I hope) are

to in generall appointed. The generall rules which

Rej. groundeth our Ceremonies upon, are: let all

be done to edification, with order, and decorum. Now

these rules are such (sayth Mr. Hooker p. 95.) as stand

right of reason, and nature to be observed, though the Scrip-

that never mentioned them. So that in them there is no

perfection of Scripture, for particulars, as if the

ticulars had been named. 2. betwixt these generalls

suche particulars in question, there must come a

mane institution, suche as (to make the example

e) if it had been prescribed in the olde Test. only

beane beasts should be used in sacrifice, and left to

Priestes for to determine, what kinde of beasts should

or holde to be clean.

2. An untruth is charged upon the Replier, in that

sayd, nothing was denied by the Def. in the 2. section.

Now let any man read, over the section, and he shall

be nothing denied. His answers ar these: we doe ac-

t of your distinction; oneiy the second member must be ex-

ed to generall rules, permissions, commo aqutie, you must

nd unto this distinction, which when you doe not, you cou-

se your selves. Is here any thing denied. Yes (sayth

Aa 2
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the Rej. the Major is denied: because it is shewed that something is warranted which is not prescribed. The major is: Scripture condemneth) that which is done either against, or without warrant of the word of God, especially in matters of God's service. Let any man of common reason and indifference, judge, whether this be contradicted by that, something is warranted which is not prescribed.

3. The Replier is taunted with I know not what fault, for saying here, that, distinction to be granted, which after he denieth to be the non-Conformists. As if in dispute, it were not usual for one partie to observe what the adversarie doeth grant himself, though hee himself doeth not owne it. The Rej. might have spared all these words of this section, but that he affected to say muuche upon little or no occasion, that his ansver might seem abundantly complete.

SECT. 3. 4. 5.

Concerning the faithfulnesse of Christ and Moses. Heb. 3. 2.

1. The Repl. once for all noteeth, that the Def. his distributing of our confirmations, from Scriptures, fathers, and Protestant Divines, as if they were like in the intended confirmations, whereas the later are onely used by occasio of perverse prejudice in our adversaries who require suche things, and also in constant stiling the fathers testimonies, judgements, and others confessions, the Repli
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Repl. I say noteth onely that this is some wronge, except it be onely idle Rhetorick. For this, the Rej. lieth in his face, saying he noteth himself an egregious wrangler, his notes are notorius cavils, and wrangles, and shews what spirit he is of. I will not say this sheweth what spirit D. B. is of: for I doubt not but his spirit is better then here is shewed. Yet this sheweth what spirit he took upon him with the person of a Rejoiner.

Is it so great a fault to suspect the Def. of some wrong-doing, or of using Rhetorick, without any moment, in variation of phrases? To doe some wrong unto an adversary in propounding his allegations after another manner than he meant, is so ordinarie, that the suspicion of it, and that with exception, cannot be accounted so heynons a crime as those toothed termes import. Prajudice is as common fault, and all prauidice is some way perverse. The Rej. after p.461, acceulth all those of aversefesse, by distraction, stupiditie or prauidice, which doe not feel that organiall musicke worke muche upon their affections (in and to Gods worship) though he knoweth as good mee as our adversaries denye it.Yet he would not have us, nor will wee, from thence gather, what spirit he is of. Rhetorick is no more an ill word, then Grammar, or Logick. Idle is nothing but without use: and so the Rej. himselfe confesseth the Def. his variations to be, in making judgements and confessions all one. Neyther could he finde what to say against the former suspicion, without sayning a new objection, which the Repl. maketh not, of aqualling Divine and humane authortie. The onely fault was, that such
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things which might be well spoken to another, were spoken to a Bishop.

2. Concerning Heb. 3. 2. (to omitte altercation about what was sayd or not sayd by the Deft. and take what the Rej. will have sayd, or sayth himself.)

The Rej. sayth that a distinction is made, of Ceremonies whereof some are substantiall Divine, and Doctrinalls, and have particular determination in Scripture, some are not substantiall, called, Rituals, and mere Ceremonies: the former have particular determination in Scripture, but not the latter. Now (to let passe, that this distinction concerneth not the proposition which formerly was sayd to be denied because there is no mention in it of any term here distinguished) let any man of reason consider the sense of this distinction: Ceremonies are eyther substantiall, Divine, Doctrinall, that is, suche as have particular determination in the worde, or else not substantiall, that is, suche as have no particular determination in the word; the former have particular determination in the word, but the latter have not. Which is as much as to say, those Ceremonies which have no particular determination in the worde, have no particular determination in the word. This explication cannot be excepted against, except Divine and Doctrinall Ceremonies be not all one, with Ceremonies determined by doctrine Divine, which neither the Deft. or Rejoynder or any considerate man for them, will deny. The Rejoynder himselfe for instance of substantiall, Divine, Doctrinall Cerem: putteth at those of Moses, lawe,
A fresh suite against Ceremonies.

3. The Hierarchie (being questioned to whiche of these heads it belongeth) is referred by the Rejoynder to both in several respects. So then, the distinction is not real, but rational only, in respects.

I see not why all lawfull rites ordeyned by men, may not as well be referred to both. Nayther doe I thinke our Hierarchie would take it well if they should be called Ceremoniall Prelares: and Doctrinall for the greatest part they are not found to be actively, nor can so be proved passively, so farre, as they differ from those ministers many of whom they will not suffer to be Doctrinall, because they cannot be at their pleasure Ceremoniall.

6. Concerning the rest of the third section, all that is rejoyned, dependeth onely upon the terme mere Ceremoniall Ceremonies. This terme the Replier did not understand (as it seemeth) according to the Authors meaning; neyther can the Rejoynder interpret it, but with suche sense as was formerly declared. Mere Ceremonies are not onely suche as the Rejoynder p.33. calleth single Ceremonies, for in the same place, he makest significant rites, having relation to a further worship, suche as ours are, double, or triple Ceremonies. So that this mere Ceremonie can be nothing else, but a Cereemonie which God hath not instituted for his worship: and so the Def. and Rejoynder mainteyne here onely this assertion: those Ceremonies which God hath not instituted, are not instituted by God. Whiche is so evidently true, that it cannot escape the imputation of idlenesse, eyther to dispute for, or against it. Onely this I note,

The second part.
that by this distinction, God cannot appoint a mere Ceremonie in his worship, though man can: for if God appoint any Ceremonie, it is (eos ipsum nomine) doctrinall, substantiall, morall. No merveyl therfor if God have not appointed mere Ceremonies, seing he cannot appoynt any suche, but man onely can doe that.

7. Concerning Heb. 3. 2. it is further answered sect. 4. that the faithfulnessse of Christ, and Moses was aequal, and alike in reall faithfulnessse, because they both did that which was commanded them of God. But howsoever this be true, yet if it were Gods revealed will, that more immediate meanes of worship should be instituted in the Christian Church, then Christ hath instituted, who was ordeyned to institute the meanes of worship, and Moses (as is here supposed) instituted all such meanes of worship in the old Testament, as God would have instituted, it followeth, that the faithfulnessse of Christ, was not so extended to all the necessities of the Church, as Moses his faithfulnessse was.

8. Concerning faithfulnessse in Rituall ordinances, the Def. mentioned the ordeyning of two essentiall and necessarie Sacraments. Which allegation the Replier esteemed nothing to the purpose. Yes verely (saieth the Rejoynder) it is some thing. It is in deed something, but this something is nothing at all pertying to mere Rituals. For so the Defend, and Rejoynder both confesse expressly, that these two Sacraments are not mere Rituals.

9. The Def. addeth, that as Moses appointed Ceremonies,
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Ceremonies, so Christ removed them. Whiche explication of Scripture being blamed by the Replier, the Rejoynnder answereth. That it is not an interpretation of the text, but an answer to an objection from the text. And yet the same Rejoynnder in his Summe of the Def. his answer that it is a comparison of the falsitie of Christ and Moses. And all the text, and objection, from the text, consisteth in this comparison. 2. It is a proper answer saith the Rejoynnder, for if Christ was faithfull in removing Ceremonies, before necessary, then be neede not prescribe other Ceremonies then simplistic necessary, and so not all mere Ceremonies. Is not this a proper consequence? ther is no connexion at all betwixt the first and second part, the appointed Ceremonies are therefore onely called simplistic necessary, becaus they were appointed by Divine authority: and yet of suche it is sayd, that Christ neede not appoynt other, wheras in deed he could not appoynt other, and that he neede not appoynt mere Ceremonies, that is Humane, which if he should have doen, it had implied a contradiction, mere Ceremonies (in the Def. and Rejoynnder opinion being suche as are not appointed by authoritie divine. 3. It is added by the Rejoynnder that the falsitie of Christ appeare in removing those Ceremonis of Moses, nd she thing compared is falsitie. Both whiche are true, but not to the purpose: because the comparison is not in falsitie abstracktly considered, but in falsitie about the building and furnishing all the howse of God, of whiche, the abolishing of Mosiacall Ceremonies, is no substantiall part.

10. About the Repl: his answer to a place cited
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out of Calvin the Rejoynder observeth much irreligious waywardnesse, with falshood, and three grosse untruthes, in one short sentence. Whiche it pleased him to note also in the Table of his principall or most observabile Contents: the Replier found guiltie of three grosse untruthes together. p.15. This peal of terrible words make suche a noise in the readers ears, that he eares hear, what may be spoken for the partie accuted. But if he will hearken a little, it shall be made plaine unto him that hastie passion onely (in reasons absence) made all this ratling sound.

The first wayward, false, irreligious, and grosse untruth is, that the Def. should have dealt more plainly. if he had cited Bellarmine, and why (trow ye) is it so great a crime, for to say the Def. might have dealt more plainly? because (forlooth) no dealing could be more plaine, then to set downe the very words of Calvin, with the place, where they are to be found. Now be it so, yet it is not so heyrous an offence to say some dealing, might be playner then that which is most playne, but as the Secretaries and Proctors of our Prelats courts doe in imitation of Criminal indictments (wherin always fland felonious etc. aggravate every trifling accusation, and citation especially those which concerne a Bishop, as ungodly, irreligious, false etc. so must he that writeth, against any thing prejudiciall to Prelats, secondum stylum Curie. But the truth is that any other mans words set down according to his meaning, is more plaine dealing, then to set down Calvins, beside his intention.

The second wayward, false, irreligious, and grosse untruth is,
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is, that the same words, which the Def. citeeth out Calvin, are found in Bellarmine, de Pontif. l. 4. c. 17. the contrary whereof, the Rejoynder doeth averre upon his credit. Now here is to be marked, that the Repl. spake nor of every word the same, nor understood individual sameness, but "ike onely, and so did the Rejoynder understand him, when he sayth upon my credite their be no suche words any where in Bellarmin, of suche words is the credit pawned.

This being præmised, let these words of Bellarmin in that very place existant, be well considered.

For as muchas the law of the OLD TESTAMENT was given to one people and for a certaine time only, as till the coming of Christ, that law might easily determine all things in special, as in deed it aid, for in special it prescribed all things &c. But the law of the gospel was given to all the world i.e. to the peoples of Sundrie nations, and was moreover to endure to the end of the world, and therefore this law of the Gospel could not so easly determin all things in particular as did the other, that no other lawes might be supposed necessary then what are found in the new Test. Nor is it possible for diverse nation to agree together in the same lawes and rites, and therefore God judged it far better if he delivered in the Gospel the most general and commune lawes, leaving the more speciall things concerning the Sacraments and articles of faith to be ordered by the Apostles and their Successours according as circumstances of time and place should require.

Quia lex Test. sanctorum veter. ritis debetur unum etiam populo. & ad certainum tempus hanc promittere in Christi adventu. Esum autem faciliter determinare subscribitur speciali, ut eam esse. Nam in speciali prescribitur omnia, ut Evangelica daret suis mundo. I.e. diversitatem ramum populi, et duritate off. utique ad fines mundi, eò licet non omni tempore facile determinare omnia in speci.
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Let there also a comparison be made betwixt this, and that translation which the Rejoynder maketh of Calvin's words.

Calvin says', that the Lord hath both faithfully comprised, and perspicuously declared necessaries. Bellarmine saith, that God in the Gospel hath delivered unto us the most common laws, concerning the Sacraments, and Articles of faith. Calvin saith, that Christ would not prescribe singularly, and specially concerning external discipline, and Ceremonies, for that he foresaw these things to depend on the occasions and opportunities of times, nor did he think one form to accord with all ages. Bellarminius saith, that all special things could not so easily be determined in the Gospel, so as more laws should not be necessary; because they must be diversifie of laws and rituals, according to the diversification of Nations and Peoples, places and times. I doubt not but the Rejoynder upon consideration of this collation, will repent him of pawning his credit for no such words in all Bel, but I esteem D. B. his credit better, then I will hold it from his person, let onely his Rejoyning credit be hence esteemed.

The third wayward, false, irreligious, and grosse untruth is, that in that place of Calvin, there is nothing at all, which without grosse equivocation, will serve the Def. his purpose. If this were not true, yet I see no wool answereable to so great a crie.

But let us see what the Rejoynder can finde in Calvin's words, for the Def. his purpose. First (sayth the Rejoynder) Calvin differenceth matters meerly ritual, from matters reall, as the Def. doeth. Whiche as the Def. doeth, is
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is not true. For the Def. differenceth Ceremonies into substantiall and meerly Rituall, p.7. whereas Calvin doeth not difference Ceremonies, nor maketh any mention of mere Ritualls.

Take away that as the Def. doeth, and then the Repl. doeth so also.

Secondly Calvin (sayth the Def.) sheweth that Christ bish left mere Rituall at the Churches choyse under generall rules only. Now heare that equivocation which the Repl.spake of, for by Ceremonies, Calvin understandeth no suche thinge, as the Def. and Rejoynder doeth by mere Ritualls. The Def. and Rej. (as Bellarmin doeth) comprehend under that name Mysticall Ceremonies, which the Rejoynder calleth double or treble Ceremonies: but Calvin meaneth onely single matter of order and Decencie. For this cause it was, that the Repl. sayd, the Def. should have dealt more plainly in citing of Bellarmin, then of Calvin.

11. About Calvins meaning the Rejoynder striveth muche, but cannot draw it to his purpose. 1. He granteth, that Calvin meant not to teache, that men may prescribe at their discretion mystical signs in the Church, which is all that we desire. 2. His meaning is (sayth the Rej.) that what Ceremonies the necessitie and utilitie of the Church doe require, may be ordeyned by the Church. This is expounded in Calvins own words, translated thus by the Rejoynder what soever the necessitie of the Church shall require for order and decencie; which is the same that the Repl. sayd. 3. Some toleration of some Ceremonies like unto the Jewish, Calvin is sayd to give, sect. 14. But that which he speaketh
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Speaketh there obscurely, he doeth in this 36. sect interpret plainly:

I witnessse that I do onely approve such humane constitutiones which are founded by the authority of God, and taken out of the Scriptures and so altogether divine; let kneeling in Solemn prayer be an Example. 4. Because Calvin was interpreted out of himself, to speak of things necessarie in their kinde, the Rejoynder opposeth, that absteyning from bloud Act. 15, and suche like things are not necessarie in their kinde. I answere yes: because the kinde under which they were found, was absteyning from scandum. So Calvin, sect. 22. (which place is allledged also by the Rejoynder for the institution of Ceremonies not necessary in their kinde, because it is there taught, that weak brethen first comming from Popery, and not yet seing their freedom in some indifferent things, are not rashly to be offended, by publicke practice of suche things) Calvin (I say) answereth in the same place: Who but a calumniator, can say that, So a new law was made by them, who onely as appeareth, went about to prevent scandals, expressly enough forbidden of the Lord? Nor can ought more be said of the Apostles Act. 15, who intended nothing els by taking away matter of offense then to urge the Divine law for avoiding offense. But Calvin sayth the Def. epift. 379, teacheth that some scandalous thinges must be borne with. And what is this to the allowing men to institute Ceremonies unnecesarie in their kinde, which is the question in hand?

5. The Rejoynder objecteth further, that the particulars, and not generalls are appointed as necessarie. Which
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Which is the very same that the Rep. said, the kindle is allways necessary and the particular doe so vary by circumstances that some time they may be necessary, and so appointed, some time not necessary, and so not to be appointed. 6. When the Rejoynder perceived that this testimonie of Calvins maketh nothing for significant Ceremonies, he at last denieth the question here to be of significant Ceremonies, but of Ceremonies. He might as well deny the question to be of sacred Ceremonies, or as he calleth them of double Ceremonies, but onely of Ceremonies. And thus is that very ambiguous equivocation wherewith the Def. was charged, by his Rejoynder, confess'd. For what else but to equivocate, when all men know the question to be of one kinde of rites onely, to bring an argument which concerneth rites in deed, but not of that kinde?

12. After some pretty phrase of the Repl. his running away, looking backe, showing his teeth angrily, the Rejoynder in answer to a sad argument, that Humane Ceremonies properly of religious nature use and signification, suche as Cross and Surplice, are not necessary in any Church, nor any ways more necessary for England, then for any other nation; or then holy water and suche other Ceremonies would, in answer (I say) to all this, the Rejoynder repeate the againe his confuse equivocal terme of Ceremonie, denying the question to be here of Ceremonies properly religious in theire nature, use, and signification. i.e. suche as Cross and Surplice are, as if we, disputed here of an inde.
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termined idea. And upon this miserable shift, not knowing what to answer unto the demands propounded, (without speaking directly against his conscience and known profession) he telleth the reader (both in text, and table) that the Repl. hath plainly abandoned Heb. 3. 2. and so retireth again to his fort, of phrases, of demolishing his Castle, firing his Trenches, running away, &c. of his chaffe and stubble, carried away before the Deity's windie words. After all which, as a good Canonier, he dischargeth (as he calleth it) one piece of ordinance after his flying enemies, which is this Basilisk: You (run away) teache some Ceremonies to be unlawful, though not forbidden, because they are not commanded. Ergo. But alas! this shot hath no mettall of truth or sense in it, and thersfor will never hurt us.

Is any man so voyd of reason, as to teache any thing to be unlawful, & yet confess it is no way against law, or forbidden? Those that say, the Ceremonies are unlawful, because they are not commanded, though they be not forbiddë, doe evidently mean, that though they be not specially and by name forbidden, yet they are generally forbidden, by that rule which forbiddeth man to adde any thing in Gods worship, unto that which God hath commanded, for suche a shot ther is no need of ordinance: as good may be made out of any bell that hath a clapper in it.
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Sect. 6. & 7. Of.

David's purpose, to build a Temple.

2 Sam. 7.1. Chron. 17.

His passage will soon be dispatched, if the question may be cleared. The purpose of David was either conditionally onely, if God should allow and second the business, or else absolute, without the suspending condition, as supposing that God did allow, and would prosperously assist him, for the accomplishment of it. If it was of the former sort, and so far as it was considerable within those limits, ther is no question, but it was godly, and worthy of all honour. But if it was absolute, it cannot be excused from some mixture of presumption. For whatsoever a man may absolutely intend to doe, that he may doe, but for the doing of such a thing, as building of a Temple then unto God, the Rejoynnder himself confesseth it to have been unlawful, for David, without further warrant: and so confesseth also, that the absolute intention could not be lawfull. Hence are these speeches of the Rej. That which may be lawfully purposed, with submission to God's pleasure, might not be done without his pleasure known, and leave given. Wee grant, that David could not build the House, nor so muche as set out the place for it, without leave and direction from God.

All the question therfor is, whether David had an absolute purpose or no? If he had not, wee have no ground
ground from this place, against absolute instituting of religious Ceremonies by me. If he had such a purpose, then the Rejoynder doth not gain by, but our argument is good. Now that David's purpose was absolute, it is more then probable, by that which the Rejoynder confesseth, viz. that Nathan was undeceived in saying to David, 'Ie doe all that is in thine heart, the Lord is with thee, before he had consulted with the mouth of the Lord, to whom the designation of place, manner, and Man, did belonge. Heering with the Rejoynder Nathan failed. For 1. Nathan so far as appeareth doth answer onely to the question of David, allowing his purpose, if therefore Nathans allowance was a failing in being too absolute, David's purpose was of like nature. 2. If David's purpose had not been absolute before, yet upon Nathans counsel, from which no dissaent of his is any ways insinuated, it became absolute. 3. If David had dissentend from Nathan in that poynt, he ought to have admonished Nathan of his sayling, and would also no doubt have done so or at the least, it would have been concluded between them two, that counsel must be sought, and expected of God; but Nathan not being corrected, but rather confirmed by David, as David was by him, they both were (without seeking) better informed by extraordinary revelation. 4. The Def. saith, and the Rejoynder mainteyneth it, that God did interpret David's action for a deed. But no imperfect velletities of God, are so interpreted. The will which is accepted for a deed, must be absolute, and hindered only by defect of power. Howsoever, out of the Rejoynder his giantes, we are furnish
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And with this argument:

It was not lawfull for David to purpose absolutely the building any religious house for God's sake, without God's special command or warrant. Therefore it is not lawfull for man to institute and build Ceremonies double and triple religious (as the Rejoynder calleth ours) without God's special command or warrant.

The grant of the Rejoynder is the common sentence of our Divines well expressed, among other, by Mr. W. Auestol, upon Num. 3:4. I ait it was decreed, that he went beyond the commandment of God. To seek to prevent God was to be reproved. It might have been said to him: "Who required these things at thy hands?"

However his purpose (or simple affections) may be commanded yet the same purpose resolved upon the self. That is, the absolute purpose resolving upon the self, is reproved, he ought not the have entertained that, which was not commanded either to any other, or to himself. He did not obey God, but follow his own minde and device. He did runne too fast, travelling (as it were) without his guide, and sailing without his compass.

These things being considered, it were but vaine labour to prosecute the Rejoynder in particular litigations about this matter, which would be little else then repetition of the same things. I will only therefore consider of the Def. his retorsion, and the Rejoynder his bus out of this place: which also should have passed, but for the boasting wherewith they are (with provocation) advanced above their measure.

The Def. his retorsion is thus. This Act of David's
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Without special warrant were recommended by God. Ergo, all institutions of Ceremonies by man, belonging to God's service, are not thence to be condemned, because they want express warrant. This Act. (sayth the Def. that is (sayth the Rejoynder) this conditionall affection not lawfull to be brought into act. From suche a conditionall affection, he argueth, to absolute and actuall institutions, by what rule of consequence I know not. The Rejoynder teacheth us the clean contrary argument, as before was declared.

The Rejoynder his shot is thus in short: David (as Mr. Cartwright confesseth) had generall warrant from the word of God, for building the Temple, and had no word to forbid him to doe it (till that by Nathan) thersfor for David to purpose to build (till that forbidding by Nathan, was lawfull. I answer the conclusion (being understood of a conditionall purpose (as the Rejoynder expounded it) we willingly grat, as neyther making, nor ever having made any question about it. 2. David had no generall warrant, for his building of the temple, neyther doeth Mr. Cartwright say any suche thing, but onely that it was revealed there should be s suche a Temple. Which was no more warrant for David to purpose the building of it, then other Prophecies were warrant for somme (upon supposition) to purpose the destroying of it. 3. Though ther was no word of God which particularly or absolutely forbid David to build the Temple, yet ther was word enough in generall forbidding him to attempt any suche thinge, untill he should receyve further Commission. So the Rejoynder before confessed: the designation
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designation of place, manner, man, and time, did belong to
God: and was therefore forbidden to David, and so the
building forbidden, untill that designation should
come from God.

Now adde unto this shot of the Rejoynder thus repelled
but a little altering the charge and turning the pieces
mouths, viz. That our questioned Ceremonies have
not so muche generall warrant, as that it is any where
in Scripture revealed, she should be a Crosse, and Sirplice,
and that the places of Scripture which seem to forbid
them, could never yet be otherwise cleared; and then
see how it maketh for the Rejoynder his cause.

---

SECT. 12.

Concerning that phrase, Jer.7.31.etc. You doe that
which I commanded not.

That which the Rejoynder (out of his abundant
leisure) would needs inlarge most vainly
about sect. 8.9.10. & 11. I passe over with silence:
because the Repl. refused to mainteyne that which
is there objected, out of unprinted and uncertayn
papers.

1. In the twelfth section, we are to inquire, whether
and how that consequence in Gods worship, be good:
I have not commanded this: therefore, you may not doe it.

The Def. and Rejoynder say it is not good, except
by
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b; not commanding, be undue, flood, forbidding as Lev. 10.1. Deut. 17.3. Which is thus furth true, that except some forbidding be included, or (as the Rejoynder speaketh) imported in that not commanding, not commanding cannot make a thing unlawful. But that is the very question whether in things proper to religion, not commanding, doth not include some kinde of forbidding.

2. The place mentioned by the Rejoynder: out of Lev. 10.1. doth most strongly make against him. For the soanes of Aron are there condemned, for bringing strange, or ordinary fire to Gods worship, as doing that which God had not commanded, and yet had not otherwise forbidden, then by providing fire proper to his worship, and not appointing any other to be used in the tabernacle, and this is the very plea which we make against Ceremonies of humane institution, in Gods worship. The scope of that text we are taught, by an English Bishop, Babington, in his notes upon that place: We may hence learn and settle in our hearts, with what severity the Lord hallowed, and defended his authority, in laying down the way and manner of his worship, not leaving it to any creature, to meddle with, but according to prescription and appointment from him. Cont. he is, that men shall make lavers for him: ne matters etc. But for his Divine worship, hee one, will prescribe it himself, and what he appointed, that must be done, and that only, or else Nad. and Abime their punishment expected, that is, Gods wrath expected, in such manner as he shall please.

Hee was taught this by Calvin, who upon the place sayth
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Mr. Attersoll also in his learned and grave Commentaries upon Numb. 3. 4. doeth largely declare out of this example, how God dislikeneth, and disclaimeth mens devises in his service, as trash, trumperie, and mere dotage; instancing (among other devises) in Ceremonies added unto Baptism.

3. Our reason was propounded in the words of Calvin upon Ier. 7. 31. Seeing God under this title only condemneth that which the Jews did, because he had not commanded it them, therefore no other reason need to be sought for the consutation of superstitions, then that they are not by commandement from God. To which the Rejoynder answereth, that Mr. Calvins conceit holdeth true in proper points of religious worship, which are all prescribed of God himself, but not in matter of rites, not prescribed of God. Now if this be not a miserable conceit, that Gods not commanding doeth forbid that which he hath prescribed or commanded, but not that which he hath not prescribed, or commanded, let any man of sense judge.

Other meaning I cannot gather eyther out of these words, or out of the Rejoynder his doctrine of worship, which was before distinctly weighed, in the head of Worship. Mr. Cartwrittes conjecture (as the Rejoynder calleth it) is the very same with that which he calleth The second part.
Calvin's conceit. The Rejoynder his answer also is the same for substance, that it is true in matters particularly determined by God, but not in matter of order and ceremonies, of which God hath not determined particularly. The sense of which is, that we must depend upon God, so far as he hath determined particularly, but in other things, we must depend upon men, and in England, upon the Convocation house. But to depend upon God, and his mouth, being to follow only his determination and what sense then is this, you shall only follow God's determination, in those things which he hath particularly determined, but if you please to doe any thing in his worship, which he hath not determined particularly, you may therin depende upon whom you please? For matter of Ceremonies, enough hath bee spoke before: and of order, wee shall after dispute.

4. The rest of this 12. section is spent about the Def, his wondrful wonderings, at our symbolizing with Bellarmine and other Papists, because that as they distinguish sinnes into mortal and veniall, so wee (sayth he) make a distinciton of against, and beside the word. About which, the Rejoynder granteth that Chrysostom did well use this distinction, in matters of stryne, yet he sayth it is not to be extended unto matters of Ceremonies. But (the question being only about the distinction) it is in the Def. and Rejoynder their opinion far more appliable to ceremonies, then to doctrines: because they holde many Ceremonies lawfull beside the word, which are not against it, though they holde no suche difference of doctrines. Now this distinction was
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was used by us, according to their conceit, more then our owne. The like is acknowledgeth will betwixt beside and against the Word, in the question of traditions devised for divine worship, i.e. essential worship, particularly determined by God. Which is not so, for in that place, Cont. 3. l. 4. c. 17. an 10, Iunius hath no question eyther about essential, or worship, or traditions, but onely about Ecclesiastical laws, binding the conscience. And if he had, yet that clause particularly determined by God, would spoile all: because in suche things ther can be nothing eyther against, or beside the Word. But if it were true, what is the difference, betwixt Iunius and us? The Rejoynder sayth that wee confounde rites with worship, and yet confess rites not to be particularly described as the other. Which is neyther so, nor so, except he meaneth those rites, which he calleth double or treble ceremonies; and therin we have Iunius so for us, that not onely in other places, but also in the words next goinge before this in question, he sayth generally, in divine things to cygne new laws is nothing but to decline. Yet the Rej. will have it, that Iunius in that place Cont. 3. l. 4. c. 17. Sect. 10. doe: h refuse this distinction, as used by Bell. Marke therfor what are Bell. words, which Iunius confutable) viz. Onely a prohibition of addition contrarie laws es understood.

Which are the words also of our Defender and Rejoynder, cap. 2. sect. 3 4 5. So that by this interpretation, the distinction is theris, and Iunius confuteth them all, so well as Bellarmine.

The persuaders to Subscription, are also confes-
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sed to use the same distinction, but in another meaning. Let the distinction therefore passe (for shame) and dispute of the meaning. But the meaning expressed by the Rejoynder is the very same with ours, save that they differ in the conclusions deduced from it. The altercation therefore which the Rejoynder addeth about some speeches of Mr. Carter, is not worth the answering.

The plain truth is, that this distinction is ordinarily used by our Divines, against the Papists, even in case of Ceremonies. D. Fulke against the Rhemists, on Mat. 15.9. Of Papish traditions, some be repugnant to the laws of God, and some are beside them, as idle and unprofitable Ceremonies. It was therefore but an affected quarrel, which the Def. picked, and the Rejoynder maintained, about these terms, as if they had any reflection upon the Papish difference, betwixt mortal and veniall sins. Nay in this fashion, the Def. and Rejoynder may accuse our blessed martyrs of symbolizing with the Papists that were the murtherers of them. For they were wont to use this distinction in the same manner that we doe. So heavenly Bradfords, in his epistle to the Universitie of Cambridge: these which a little after he applieth to Romish rigges, and in his epistle to Walden (extendeth them by name to Ceremonies) opinions are not only besides Gods word, but even directly against it. It is therefore more than time for the Def. and Rejoynder to pull in the horns of this doomsmons accusation, and confess that they were unseasonable and rashly put forth upon inconsiderate phantasie, easily uttered, but hardly excused.
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Concerning the ancient fathers arguing negatively from Scripture.

1. To diverse sentences of ancient Writers, about this matter alleged, the general answer is give. 1. that they speak of things contrarie to Scripture: which when the Repl. granteth, complaining of the Def. his wilfull mistaking, or mis-interpreting our meaning, the Rejoynder left he should seem lese wilfull, repeath the same imputation, which yet he acknowledgeth to be contrarie to the Repliers owne confession.

What should a man say to suche Rejoyners, that know full well our meaning, and yet will never leave threaping another meaning upon us.

Wee never sayd, or thought, that all particular rites pertaining to order and decencie, are punctually determined in the Scripture. Wee never dreamed that all suche rites being beside the particular determination of the Scripture,are against it, wee speak of double or treble rites as the Rejoynder stileth them, which no mere order and decencie doeth necessarily require, but onely the mere will of man injoine.

All this the Rejoynder knoweth: and yet he causeth not to beat the ayre, with endlesse repetitions of this imputation, guilded over with some varietie of tainting phrases, that it may be the caslier, swallowed by his un-
wary reader. It is secondly answered by the Def. that the ancient writers speak of doctrines, not of ceremonies. Wherunto the Repl. granting that to be true for the most part yet antityreth, that the truth of their sayings may be taken so generally, as to include all religious Ceremonies. Here the Rejoynnder objecteth that limitation (for the most part) is only to abuse the simple, and that the ambiguous term of religious Ceremony, is a bush to hide I know not what in.

Now for the former charge Compare here the Abbrigment and Def. The later acculation of hiding bush, etc. cannot otherwise be avoyded (as it seemeth) except to avoyd the same, we would upo every occasion when we are to speak of the questioned kinde of ceremonies, repeat the Rejoynnder his headroul of termes: double or triple significatn, sacred by application, mutable, ambalatorie, arbitrarie, redutively sacramentall, moral Ceremonies, immediate worship, in respect of means by verue of something else, in respect of the manner, and redutively, in respect of the utmost ende Divine Worship.

Whersoever we observe not these termes partly of his owne forging, since the Replie was written he may as well spie a bush over our head, as in this place. It is thirdly answered, that a generall proposition may well be extended beyond one speciall conclusion to which it is upon occasion applied. To this (after that out of splen (as I take it) he styleth it the mans stomacke) the Rejoynnder answereth that it may onely be applied to other of the like kinde. This therfor is onely the difference, whether those Ceremonies which bear all those titles
titles even now rehearsed, bee not of the like kinde, or have not one common nature, with some of those things which the Rejoynder calleth substantiall, and doctrinall, poynts: of which we have disputed before, and shall after, by Gods grace.

2. To Tertullian's wordes: Prohibetur quod non ultra est permisson: that is prohibited, which is not permitted, the first answer made by the Def. was, that our Ceremonies are permitted. Hecrunto it was replied, that Tertullians meaning must needs be of other permission then the Def. can challenge to our Ceremonies, otherwise there should be no sense in his wordes. The reason is, because the Def. doeth not say that our Ceremonies are otherwise permitted, then that they are not forbidden. Whiche kinde of permission if Tertullian understood, then his saying is: that is prohibited, which is not permitted.

The Rejoynder here for resolution of this dificultie sayth, that Tertullian's meaning was to account that not to be permitted by the word, against which any reasons out of the word may be given, though ther be no particular word against it.

Now if he had attended unto the question, considering that it was onely what Tertullian in this place meant by this phrase not permitted, and that his meaning for the word must be the same, with that immediately before opposed: Quod non prohibetur ultra permisson est, he would not have given that gloss, for then the meaning of this sentence must be: that which hath no particular word against
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against it, can have no reasons out of the word made against it. Such a suitian is that clause of the Rejoynder, our meaning and is, are alike, and we hold our Ceremonies to be so permitted, and therefor not prohibited. So permitted is, by his interpretation, not to be prohibited by consequence, prohibited must needs be either the same, or else prohibited by particular word: if the former, then he saith thus: our Ceremonies are not prohibited by consequence; therefor they are not prohibited by consequence; if the latter, then this is his saying: our Ceremonies are not forbidden by consequence only, therefor they are not by particular word forbidden. The former is no reason; the latter neither is consequence, nor toucheth any question.

The Def. his second answer was, that wee may blush, to speak of Tertullian, because he professeth traditions in the same book. It was answered, that then all may blush, which allege the Fathers for that which they in other places gainelay. The Rejoynder granting, that those need not blush, because the Fathers sometime are dease and hear not themselves speak, and in some particulars left their sound generall principles, yet will needs have us blush (if it be not impossible, as his Rejoyning charitie suspecteth it is) because they never held that which we allege them for. But how doth this appear, because they allowed of sundrie Ceremonies, not prescribed in the word. Now except he could prove, they were not as dease on this the ceremoniall ear, or side, as they were on the other, or that they did not leave their sound generallls, in the particulars of Ceremonies, as well or ill as in other.
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This occasion, especially with his affected exaggerations, is it not impossible.

And that the Rejoynder cannot prove this, D. Morton sheweth in his appeal, pag. 324. They that erred in points of doctrine, could not be altogether free from some sprinklings and spots of ceremonial corruption.

Moreover, how the best of those ancient writers allowed of sundrie humane Ceremonies, then in use, Augustine sheweth, epist. 119. Many such things I dare not so freely gainsay to avo, de the offense partly of some holy minds, and partly of some turbulent spirits.

Which is the very case of the best English Divines that doe so sparingly speak against our Ceremonies, and yet sufficiently intimateth, that they would speake more, if they durst for the times. How also our Divines doe not blush to alledge their testimonies against humane Ceremonies, though they know that in other places they speak for them this may be seen in D. Whitaker, tom. 1, pag. 116. Augustine will have us be content with those very few Ceremonies which are conteyned in the Canonical Scriptures. If elsewhere he have written ought that may lesse agree with this sentence, for my part I will not much trouble myselfe to reconcile all his speeches. D. Fulke, Rejoynder to Martial, ar 1. sayth plainly: The gates of hell in idle Ceremonies did assim't the Church. The fathers (in them) declined from the simplicity of the Gospel, and art. 3. Every idle Ceremony that prevailed, had the Prelates of the Church, cyber for authors or for approvers, but Christ committed his Churches to them, to be fed with his Word, and not with

The second part.  

Ec 24:10
S E C T. 15.

Concerning Protesants arguing negatively from Scripture.

1. The first quotation by the Def. chosen to answer, is out of D. Mortons Apologie: of which it is sayd by the Replier, that the Def. his answer is, he meant not matters nearly Ceremoniall, but doctrinall, and so he affirmeth the meaning of our argument to bee, if by mere Ceremonies, he mean mere order and decencie, as he interpreteth himself in the ende of this section, Heerupon the Rejoynder al- keth, if we call this a Replye? I answer yea: because it sheweth, all that is opposed, though it be granted as true, nothing at all to crosse or contradict our argument, in the right meaning of it. Now marke what he hath to say, why it should not be called a Replier. 1. The Def. selleth not onely what he means, but where his meaning doeth appear, and the Replier sheweth not that he hath not means as he sayd. As if eyther the place where a thing is spoken, did adde any weight unto the speache: or all, that mean as they say, doe speake to the purpose. 2. It is partialitse to take up the word mere in this place, and not seith. 3. But this doeth rather shew, that though the Replier took
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ook no knowledge of this, when he first met with it; yet afterward, seeing it often repeated, marked some emphasis to be placed in it, and so did not spare before, upon partialitie to one section more then another, which seemeth a strange conceit.

Howsoever this doeth neither prove the replie none, nor yet non-sufficient. 3. He pronounceth it untrue, that the question here is not of mere Ceremonies and rites: which charge he groundeth upon the word specially in the service of God. But that word doeth shew the specialitie of our question to be about the matters of God's service, or worship, suche as significant Ceremonies are, and mere order is not. 4. He is styled a deceived man, that thinketh significacion put upon a Ceremonie, doeth necessarily make it more then a mere Ceremonie.

To which I answer, that if he that thinketh so, is a deceived man, then the Rejoynder doeth deceive, when in his Manuduction, pag. 33. and 39. he teacheth that speciall instituted significacion, doeth make a Ceremonie double or treble more then mere single rites of order.

2. The second quotation is out of D. Mortons Appeal, l. 2. c. 4. sect. 4. where is confessed, he speaketh of Ceremonies, but of Doctrinal only, suche as sipping in of tred into the cup, etc.

Wherupon question was made, why this Ceremonie should be accounted more doctrinal, or more unlawfull, then the Crosse in Baptisme.

To the former part of this quære, the Rejoynder an-

E e 2

swereth
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Swereth that the Def. bee himself & all suche, in this question, meanes by Doctrinall, a thing taught in the Word and that the Sacrament of the Lords Supper is taught in the word. As if it had been asked, why the Sacrament is more doctrinall then the Crosse? and not if Sopping be so? But here it is diligently to be observed, how wee are deluded in this whole argument, and other also, with the shadow of a worldly distinction, betwixt Doctrinall, and Ritual Ceremonies. Wee say, God hath appointed all Ceremonies properly religious, which are to be used. They answer, that this is true of all doctrinall Ceremonies, but not of ritual: that is to say, as here we are taught, God hath appointed all Ceremonies that he hath appointed, but not all that he hath not appointed. Wee say, it is not lawfull for man to adde unto Gods institutions, in religious worship. They answer, this is true of Doctrinall, but not of Ritual additions: that is, by this interpretation, man may not adde unto Gods institutions, any of Gods institutions, but mans onely. Let this be borne in minde for all answers that hange on the hinges of this distinction.

To the other part of the question, the Rejoynder answers that sopping of bread in wine is worse then the Crosse. 1. because the crosse maketh no alteration, of what Christ did ordaine saying doe this. 2. it is not substituted in the place of Baptisme, as sops in wine were by those Harteckes in place of the Supper. 3. it is not esteemed an instrumentall signe of any grace given by the use of it, as they took their sops to be. 4. their sopping destroied the very Sacrament. And for these differences, the Repl. is bidden to hang downe his head.
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head, for asking such a question. But 1. Addition is as evil as alteration. For when Christ said, *do this*, he meant as well, *do this only*, as *do this all*. Fac hoc totum: fac hoc tantum: as Zanchie expoundeth it. Addition also is some alteration, if not of the things instituted, yet of the institution, as making it insufficient, or incomplete, by itself alone.

2. Sops and wine were not substituted in place of bread and wine, but were bread and wine. Neither were they first or only, or (for anything appeareth) at all, used by Harehicks, as the Rejoinder for his advantage, without ground, avouched, but by ancient Churches, at least in some cases: as is manifest out of Prosper, *De Promissionibus*, *Dimidium temporis*, *cap. 6*, Pella particular, *Domini intimam percepi*, etc. Sopping was so farre from being a matter of Harellie, that as it seemeth, it was receyed among the Fathers, so longe as infants communicating in the Lords Supper, which was, as D. Morton confesseth, *Appeale*, *lib. 2*, *cap. 13*, sect. 3, for sixe hundred yeers.

3. Sopping of bread in wine, considered abstractly from bread and wine, was no signe instituted as an instrument of grace.

For so saith Cassander pag. 1027. out of Ivo: *this some of sopping prevailed onely through fear of shedding, and not by direct authority.* 4. It is too severe a sentence, against those ancient Christians, in Prosper's time and (which is more) as Cassander and Hespinian judge, in Ciprians, that they destroyed the very substance of Sacrament. The setting forth of Christ's death was not excluded.

Ec 3
excluded, though some part of the blood was representatively joined unto the body. A man is dead, that lieth in his blood, though some of it soak againe into his body. The Fathers, sixe hundred yeers together, did not destroy the substance of the Sacrament. Hither to therefor appeareth no cause for the Repl. to hang downe his head. Let us see if more cause be in the comparisons he maketh betwixt sopping and crosing.

The first was, the bread and wine (the onely things used in sopping) were ordeyned by Christ: so is not the Cross. The Rejoynder answereth here nothing to the purpose, save onely, that they were ordeyned to be used apart. From whence it followeth onely that it is unlawfull to use them not apart. And so it followeth, that Baptisme must as well be used apart, or separated from the Cross: because it was ordeyned so to be used, and the Cross was not ordeyned for any religious use, eyther apart, or with other things.

The second is, that sopping hath some agreement with reason, Crossinge hath none. The Rejoynder hence maketh two consequences: 1. Ergo Christ in ordeyning the Sacrament otherwise, hath done some thing not agreeable to reason, 2. Ergo the Church in Crossinge hath been void of all reason, sixe hundred yeares. And upon these groundes, he crieth out of madnesse. But so madnesse may be found in any assertion, if it be first put out of the right wittes or sense, as this is. For the meaning was not, that Sopping is agreeable to right reason in the Sacrament, but in civil use, where the aerial Cross hath none.
yet it may be added, if it were lawful for men to add to God's ordinances in the Sacraments, then there would be found more probability of reason to bring in sopping into the use of bread & wine as a manner of food, the a mysticall aerall crosse into the use of water which is no manner of washing. As for the Church, it hath not universally used the crosse so longe, except the Waldenses, and others like unto them, were none of the Church.

The same Church, that used crosseing, used also for divers hundreds of yeares, to give the Sacrament of the Supper unto infants, without reason, and the continuation of the Crosse more hundreds of years, addeth no reason unto it, except reason in suche things doeth increase with their age. Many things have been used in the Church without reason: or else there is reason: weee should still use all that have been used, *ceteris paribus*. If there be any good reason in the crosse, lett that be tried by reason, and not by slippery conjectures taken from the persons using it.

The third comparison was, that Sopping was used by Christ, at the very table of the Supper, but Crosseing was never so muche honored by him or his Apostles, as to use it at any time. The Rejoynder answereth, that this argument would prove as well, that the easeng of a Paschall lambe before the Sacrament, to be better then sprinkling of water on the forehead of the Baptized. Because CHRIST did that, and not this. But this is not so well. For that
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1. Sprinkling of water is no instituted ceremomie distinct from that washing which Christ and his Apostles used. 2. It is very probable that the Apostles going into the colder part of the world did use sprinkling.

3. Concerning a Paschall lambe, used before the Sacrament, as a Ceremonie morally significant and reductively Sacramentall, I see not why it should not be preferred before the Corse or any suche invention, even because Christ did use it, if that Circumcision be now a lawfull Christian Ceremonie, as the Def. and Rejoynder profess and mainteyne, pag. 285. It is also crediblie reported a great Bishop, not long since living, that every Easter day, he used to have a whole lambe, prepared after the Paschall manner, brought to his table. D. B. knoweth well who it was, and of whom he hath heard it.

The fourth comparision was, that sopping was no new signe, but Crossing is. The Rejoynder opposeth that it had been an abomination to eat the Paschall lambe sodden, but the addition of sitting or leaning on couches (though a new signe added by them selves) was lawfull etc. Of which speache, the first part is granted, viz. a sodden lamb had been an abomination: nether is a sopping communion excused. In the second, ther is observable partialitie, in that he calleth letting an addition to the Pasleover, and yet in the same answer, with the same breath, denieth the crosse to be any addition unto Baptisme. The ground of all is rotten, viz. that sitting was a religious significant Ceremonie instituted by men.
These things considered, let any man judge what cause the Rejoynder had to talk in this place, of the Repl: his room conception, consensious spirit, smitten with godliness, forsaken of wisdome?

In that which followeth about sopping, ther is no new matter to fasten any dispute on, proper to this place, but only why some ceremoniall sopping may not be used, as near to the Communion, as the Cross unto Baptisme? The Rejoynder answereth. 1. Because it is not so safe, to use visible elementarie signes in holy actions, as a transient Character. 2. Because suche sopping were worse then the use of any other bodily element, as comming so near to the very institution. Where it is to be marked, that a religious Ceremonie, of soppes and wine, immediately before or after the Communion, is not found unlawful, but onely not so safe as the Cross. By the same proportion, Ceremonious eating of flesh, and fish, in the solemnity of the Communion, is onely not so safe, not unlawful. Hath not the Cross brought us to a faire market? 2. If the Cross be not a visible elementary signe, what kinde of signe is it? Character noteth a molt proper signe: acceleall is elementarie: crossing is eyther visible, or else it is no sensible signe: because it cannot be heard, felt, tasted, or smelled.

If he meaneth a permanent substance, beside that the crosseth his owne definition of a Ceremonie, an action &c. in other places he defendeth images, in this very section, he leaned even now, upon crosses, as upon safe Ceremonies amongst the Jews.

3. The outward neerneffe or likenesse of a humane The second part.  F f  Ceremo-
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Ceremonies, to a Divine Sacrament, is allowed on elsewhere by the Def. and Rejoynder both: as when cap. 3. sect. 7. they mainteyne as Christian, a Ceremoniall sprinkling of men with holy water, wherein, both water and sprinkling, have es great an outward neereness unto the outward elemets of Baptisme, as any thing ca have.

If the outward materiall show of neereness unto a Divine Sacrament, doeth make a Ceremonie unallowable, then much more, suche a formall significant neereness, as is betwixt Baptisme, signifying our putting on of Christ crucified, and the Crosse signifying our putting on of courage to fight under, and for Christ crucified.

See heer what further is to be sayd of Iuel, and Whi
takers, after the Def. and they are conferred.

3. The Replier, affecting brevitiue, and finding no new matter of dispute about the allegations out of B. Jewel, and D. Whitaker, passeth them over, with this reason: in excusing of them, nothing is sayd by the Def. which hath not formerly been confused.

Now the Rejoynder doeth not goe about to shew that any new thing is brought forth by the Def. about the, which had bee to the purpose, but onely catcheth up that word excusing, and repeating the accusation, of impertinent alleding them for the negative argument from Scriptures, in case of Ceremonies, which they doe except, bee taketh upon him to discover an undoubted close meaning of the word excuse: and therupon accuseth not onely the Repl. but I know not how many (they, them) of being scornfull out of pride of spirit. Who

Who
Who would have thought that one word (used according to the ordinary courteous fashion of those which instead of plaine denying, use the phrase, (excuse me) could have stirred up suche a passion, or occasioned suchean injurious surmise? But to excuse this, which I hope we may doe without any offense, I will yeeld so muche unto his importunitie and challenge, as breffly to shew, that neythe B. Iuell, nor D. Whit.did excepte suche Ceremonies as ours, when they speak of the Scriptures fullnesse. Iuel in the first article sect. 29. alledgedh for the negative argument, Origen, concluding that in the Lords Supper the bread is to be eaten, and not reserved unto the morrow, because that Christ did not commande that reservation to the morrow. Now that this reservation is a ceremonie, and a lawfull one also in D. Morton his judgement, appeareth plainly our of his Appeal, where (lib.2.cap.5.sect.1.) he sayth plainly, that we may grant a longer time of reservation then two or three days, with a reference unto the intent of participacion of it by eating.

D. Morton therfor cannot be defended in saying that Iuel excepted ceremonies.

For D. Whitaker his not excepting of significant Ceremonies from the Negative argument, may appear partly by his negative silence, and partly by his expresse alltertion, de Sacramentis,pag.203, for unto Bellarmine his alltertion, that the Churche may institute new Ceremonies,for ornament, and for signification, he granteth that of ornament,as he doeth after of order, but no suche consent is given of signification, but rather the contrarie.
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contrarie: Rudes non sunt Ceremonijs erudiendi: dehis
Fran, Scripturas, ut ex ijs rudes institutionem necesse
ram haueirent. So in Oper: tom. 1. pag. 116. Augustinus
nos illis paucissimis Ceremonijs contentos esse vult, qua in Ca-
nonicis Scrijbaturis contentur.

The truth is, that our Divines doe ordinarily reject
the Popish Ceremonies, upon this ground, So Galla-
lus in Exod. 22. 7.

(* Nihil tale a Christo aut factum, aut institutum, Ergo
ne sapientiores nos ipso & Apostolis fore arbitremur.)

* There is no suche thing by Christ, either done or
instituted, therefore let us not deeme our selves wiser
then he or his Apostles.

4. Another omission, wherof the Repl is accused,
for which he is called a gentle man, is, that the Def. in
the ende of this Argument, recalleth the state of the que-
STION, distinguishing betwixt mere Ceremonies, & mixt,
by mere meaning altogether indifferent, and by mixt,
some way forbidden, All which (sayth the Rejoynder)
the gentle Replier passeth by. Now sure he might also
him selfe have passed this by, with more credit of the
Def.

For what sense is in suche a stated question: whe-
ther the Scripture doest condemne suche Ceremonies, as it
leavish indifferent, or one:ly those which is some way forbid
deth: All that passe by, may see, that this was not worth
the taking up.

Yet concerning the mixture of ceremonies with
opinion of holinesse, justice, merit, efficacie, or real necessity,
which
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which here the Rejoynder maketh the onely grounds of forbidding, he is now, in suche gentle manner as is requisite, answered, in the head of Difference between our Ceremonies and ours.

5. After this, the Repl. is charged with quarrelling, onely because he saith the Def. answered nothing to a maine point, upon which this first argument, in the Abridgement, doeth depende, namely the rules of Ceremonies, that they should be needfull, and profitable, for edification, the more comely and orderly performance of God's instituted service, which being wanting in our Ceremonies they cannot be innocent, though all were granted which the Def. mainteyneth. And why is this a quarrell?

The Repl. (as it seemeth) can neyther by speaking, nor holding his peace, gaine so muche favourable with the Rejoynder as that in eyther he may passe without some shrewd censorious note. If he holde his peace, he is a gentle man, if he speak, he is a quarreller. But what are the reasons of blame in this place?

1. The Defender (perfooth) was not tied to the Abridgement; order 2. It were idle to speake of directive rules, if all humane Ceremonies be unlawfull. 3. If God hath left rules for direction of his Church in rites and orders Ecclesiastically, then he hath not determined of them in his word. 4. The Defender hath mainteyned, that our Ceremonies are agreeable to the rules of God's Word; so as no Friar dare deny it, nor the Replier professing his name. In all which there is nothing of any moment. For though it
it were granted, that the Def. was not tied to the Abridg.
order, yet he may be tied to their matter, if he meant to
give them a full answer. 2. Though it be needless to
speak of directive rules in unlawful Ceremonies as
they are simple unlawful, yet being rites of order and
decency, which are confessed lawful, are by the Def.
and others confounded with Cerem. by others estee-
med unlawful, it is very necessary, that at least the con-
ditions of lawful Ceremonies should be Demonstra-
ted to agree unto suche Ceremonies as are defended to
be lawful. 3. Though God hath left rules for rites of
order and decency, yet he hath determined of all Ce-
remonies significant by institution. 4. If the Def. had
maintained our Ceremonies to be agreeable unto these
rules of Gods word, it had been the most compendi-
dious way for the Rejoynder to have shewed, where,
and how?

For that of the Friar, I easily beleive it. For not
one friar of a thousand dare say that any allegation for
Popish Ceremonies, though it be out of a leadélegend,
is not as plaine a demonstration as any is in all Mathe-
manickes. As for the Repliers concealing his name, that
is a poor imputation. For I dare undertake, that the
Rejoynder may have names enough for that which is
sayd, and upon second thoughtes, he may profess his
owne name among them, except he can shew, where
and how the Def. hath indevored to prove our Ceremo-

46

nies agreeable to those rules about which this ques-
tion is moved. If the Def. had performed this before,
what need the Rejoynder to have made here a Solemne
digression
Concerning Rules for Ceremonies.

1. In the first place, he taketh great exception against one rule propounded by T. C. Rep. 2. pag. 62. that Ceremonies offend not any, especially the Church of God. To this, D. Whitgifts mayne answer was, that it was a rule for private men, & not for the Church. Of this the Rejoynder seemeth ashamed: and therefore seeketh after other exceptions. The first is, that the businesse for which this rule is given. 1. Cor. 10. 32. was no matter of Church Ceremonie, but of conversation. Where he should have considered 1. that some Church Ceremonies had of ould their place in ordinarie conversation, so these two are not apsolute one to the other. 2. that the eating of thinges offered to idols, was a heathenish Ceremonie, and therfor the abstaining from it required in Christian Ceremonies. 3. that howsoever this rule is in this place applied, yet Rom. 14. 15. 20. it is by the same Apostle applied to some kinde of Jewish Church Ceremonies.

The second exception is, that this rule is moral and general, belonging to all our actions, not particular, for Ceremonies. But if by particular, he meaneth proper, then he overthrowneth by this exception, all those rules by himself acknowledged for good (edification, comeliness, 

...
A fresh suit against Ceremonies. because none of these are proper unto Ceremonies.

The third is that a negative (suche as not to be scandalous) may be a caution, but not a rule. About which I will not conteste.

It is sufficient for our purpose, if it be a caution strictly to be observed in Ceremonies, for such a rule as is. Thou shalt not murder.

2. Another rule urged by T. C. (that Ceremonies tend to the glory of God) is also rejected by the Rejoinder as the former. But no new reason is brought, but only that it is a common rule, not proper to Ceremonies, which in many words is enlarged. Now for this (being the same with that formerly objected about not scandalizing) the same answer which before was given is sufficient. Yet this moreover is to be observed for both these rules: that though they be not proper to Ceremonies, our Divines notwithstanding doe usually apply these and such like general rules unto Ceremonies, because the breach of these rules is common to (and as it seemeth inseparable from) humane significant Ceremonies proper to religion, taken from Papists. They tend not in their nature to Gods glory, but rather to the glory of them from whom they have receyved their being. They are scandalous both to Protestants and Papists, as afterward is declared.

So Vesire, tom. 1. pag. 365. giveth one rule for Ceremonies, that they be not impious, which is not proper to Cerem: as Bucanus among the receyved rules of Cer. maketh this one, that they be not opposite to the analogy of
A fresh suite against Ceremonies. Because many of the Popish Ceremonies are impious and opposite to faith. And the same Vrseine addeth among other rules, that they be not scandalous. Junius also in his Hidelberg, theses de tradit. th. 58. requireth in a good Ceremonie, that it be to the glorie of God. So others many. D. Willet in his synopsis, pag. 170. giveth 4. rules for Ceremonies: two of which are 1. that all things be done to the glory of God. 3. that all things ought to be done without offence.

Yet these rules in T. C. are suche as may not passe without the Rejoynder his censure, layd out in divers digressing pages.

Lastly the Rejoynder himself when he would give a rule for distinguishing good Ceremonies from bad, useth to make this one, that they be free from opinion of merite etc. And yet he will not say that suche opinions are proper to Ceremonies.

3. H. I. is in the last place brought in, as not holding the rules of T. C. Whiche (were it true) is little materiall, or to the purpose. But what is noted out of H. I. repugnant? He in joins the same rules to be observed in the determining of mere Circumstances eher Civil, or occasionall, but denies the Church to have any power of appoining Ceremonies merely ecclesiastical. And this is in effect to take those rules away, removing the Ceremonies, which should be fromed by them.

Nay rather this in effect, and cause both, to acknowledge the rules, and onely to point out the true objects to be ruled by them, and to give warning of abusive objects which have crept in under the colours of those.
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true. Whether this discretion of his betwixt Circum
tances, and properly religious Ceremonies, be justifiable or no, that question belongeth not to this digres
sion, but to three whole chapters of this dispurse. But
if the Rejoynder would know who doth directly take
these rules, and the other also which he acknowledgeth,
as they are Scripture Rules, it is one to whom both he
and the Defend. are muche beholding to Mr. Hooker
by name, whoe p.95. sayth plainly of one, as well as of
other, they are Rules and Canons of that Law, which is writ
sen in all mens hearts. The Church hath for ever, no leues then
now, stood bounde to observe them, whether the Apostle had
mentioned them, or no. Neither sayth hee therin muche
amissse, except that same no lese bounde. So that as it see
meth, the Defend. and Rejoynder making suche cour
tesse of proving our Ceremonies agreeable to these Rules
can very hardly shew, that they are agreeable to light
&law of nature. After this light skirmish about 2. rules,
the Rejoynder founseth a retrait, and sayth, he will re
ferre the consideration of the Agreement of our Ceremonies
to the true Rules, unto a fitter place. But a fitter place can
scarce be founde, for here it was challenged by the
Replier, here it was promised by the Rejoynder when
he craved leave to speake more fully of rules to be obser
ved: and this is registred in the table, Rules about Ceremo
nies shewed in a digression. Now after all this, to make
only a few pragmaticall exceptions against 2. rules
which he termeth irregular, and out of square, not once
touching upon the rules which the Replier required
satisfaction about (v.13. if our Ceremonies be needfull, and
pref.
[Paragraph about the necessity of ceremonies being more comely and orderly, and putting service to an invisible and uncertain place.]

Thetruth is the Rej. in his Conscience, holdeth our Cerem. incommodious, or inexpedient, thought not simile unlawfull: and therfore can finde no place to shew, that they are needfull, and profitable for adification. I doubt, whether another Speciall Commande from the Kinge, would bringe him to printe a treatise about that question?

**SECT. 16.**

**Concerning Order, and Decencie,**


The onely place (by the Rejoynder his confession., for Ecclesiastical power, in constituting Ecclesiastical Ceremonies.

The Defender beginning to confronte and confute our tenent, nyether bringeth, nor can bringe any Scripture, for the authoritie of Churches,
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Churches to ordyne Ceremonies, but onely this one, 1 Cor. 14. He saith, in deed, that he nameth onely this place, not to trouble us with any other at this present. But the Rejoynder more ingenuously confesseth, that this is the onely place in the New Testament, by which all Divines doe conclude, that a power is given to the Church, to constitute Rites \\&\c.

This place is all the answer they give, or can give, to those that are wonte to trouble them with a quo warranto.

If this place then faileth them, or serveth not their turne, are not our Ceremonies confessed to be appointed without any warrant of the word, at least in the New Testament?

1. Now that it doeth not make to the purpose, it was first shewed, from this, that the Defend. himselfe concludeareth no more from thence, then that the Church may by vertue of this permission, ordaine any Ceremonies that may be fit for the better serving of God. Which makeareth nothing to the purpose, except first it be proved that God is better served with our Ceremonies, then without them. The Rejoynder here 1. denieth this to be his Conclusion, and yet they are his owne wordes, \\&\ no other conclusion is mentioned by him, as appeareth in the Rejoynder itself, pag. 74. But by this (saith the Rejoynder) hee undertakes to prove another thing. Let it be so, yet he must first prove this, which he immediately draweth out of the text, which he doeth not.

Neyther doeth he so muche as name that other thing.
which he undertaketh to prove, muche lesse performe his undertaking. This was therefore no fitte place for him to vente his phrase, of shooting beside the Fustz. 2. He accuses the Repl. of insulterg, because he denied the Consquence, and gave a reason of it: and yet referreth the answer of that reason, to a fitter place I know not where. Onely he repeateth the often exploded evasion, that the question is whether all lawfull things be particularly, or expressely commanded in the word, which none of us ever writte, sayde, or thought. Yet we must be troubled with this groundlesse, uselesse repetition, over and over againe.

3. The onely backe of the Consquence made out of this place, is that all Fathers, and all Divines, (the Rej. addeth, of whatsoever Religion not excepting Socinians, nor yet Anabaptists, whom he useth to acknowledg adversaries to his Conclusion) doe use this place for one and the same conclusion.

Now this is easier to say, then to demonstrate, I doe not finde this place muche ued to any suche purpose by the Fathers. Chr. Some expoundeth it of morall vertuous carriage, opposite unto suche perverse walking as if a man goe upon his handes, with his feet upward. Ambrose extendeth it no further then to things mentioned, in that Chapter: secundum ordinem supra dictum Occumenius also maketh it a recapitulation of things formerly mentioned, of speaking by course, and womens being covered etc. παρακελεῖς τὰ πρεσβυτα. He summarily gathers together all that wete before. Basil

expoundeth
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expoundeth it in one time and place, ed. gr pag. 530. kata

τὸ καὶ τὸ δὲ καὶ τὸ τρίτον, and of proportion to be observed be-

twixt divers members. pag. 459. These are some Fa-

thers, and (as I am perswaded) more then eyther Def.

or Rejoynder can bring, so to argue from this place, as

he doeth. Amonge the ancient Schoolmen, it is hard to

finde, where any one of them doeth conclude Cer-

emonies proper to religion, out of this place. Thomas

in his Comm. upon it, doeth so interpret it, that he lea-

veth no ground for any suche conclusion: Honestly

1. e. while one Speakes that other be silent, and that

woemen speak not in Church. in order] 1.e.that first

one and then another speake, etc.

Erasmus consenteth: Decently and in order that no

unseemelines or sumbles arise.

Amonge later writers, these words are often ap-

plied to rites, but in a diversemanner. The Papists, and

some other doe prove from hence,他们 double treble,

analogicall Sacramentall, as the Rejoynder calleth them.

See Hefius his Conf. de ritib. Cap. c. 37. Bell. de effect

Sacram. 1 cap. 31. Balthasar Chavallis. 1. 1. cap. 21. and

1. 2. cap. 7. where from hence they dispute against Cal-

vin by name. Feecius (sayth Muticulus upon this place)

In his. Commene places, in the title of humane traditions ci-

seth these words of the Apostle let all things be done &c.

to justify the traditions of the Bishop, as authentick & such as

ought to be kept with a Consciencie of obedience, but this pre-

script of the Apostle is not to be applied to any Episcopall tra-

ditions, but the Apostles owne, to wit such as he had delvered

to the Churches.

Our
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Our Divines (t. w. of note excepted) doe oncely from hence conclude rites of mere order and decorcie. And some of the graver, Papists, to this day can finde no more in it as Eius in his Comm. upon the place: It belongs to decencie that women speak not in the Church, to order, that many speak not at once. What is now become of all fathers, all divines, for one and the same conclusion? Mr. Hooker, pag. 95. doeth directly oppose the Def. his conclusion, contending that the Rules set downe in this place, are the Rules of natural reason, and not of the Apostle, or propertie of the Scripture. For if this be true, then that is false which the Def. so confidently avereth, that the Apostle doeth here grant a general licence and authority to all Churches, to ordeyne Ceremonies: except the Apostle did give Churches licence, and authority, to doe that, which by the law of nature, they might doe, and by the light of nature, know they might.

3. The Def. was requested to shew, by what Logick he formeth his consequence from order, decorcie, and adification, unto suche Ceremonies as ours?

The Rej. hath no other Logick to shew for it then this: sundrie divines doe manifest the consequence, because the same particular circumstances, would not be comely and to adification in all places and times, the Church must have power to instituse and alter them. But 1. this is not the consequence, meant by the Repl. expressed by the Def. The Apostle saith, let all things be done orderly, decorously, and to adification. Ergo, he granteth a general licence and authority to all Churches, to ordeyne any Ceremonies, that may be
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be fitt for the better serving of God. i.e. suche as ours are.

Nether yet is the Consequence, which the Rej. would have implied by the Def. upon supposition of the former: The Apostle hath granted a general licence, and authoritie, to all Churches, to ordaine Ceremonies, that may be fit for the better serving of God. Ergo, all Rites and Ceremonies, which are beside the prescription of the word (suche as ours are) are not unlawfull. It is in deed, the very same sentence, which the Rejoynder did so spurne from him, pag.72. when it appeared under the name of Mr. Iacob: in the distinction, betwixt mere Circumstances, Civill, or Occasionall, and Ceremonies meerly Ecclesiastical. What a miserable cause is this that our Opposites defende, which deeply concerneth the Consciences of all that urge our Ceremonies, or allow of their urging, and yet cannot be fathered, but on one onely place of Scripture, and that with an invisible and inexplicable consequence?

Concerning an Argument against our Ceremonies, out of 1 Corin.14. Which is acknowledged to be the onely place in all the New Testament, that can be allledged for their imposing.

T He Replier, seeing that all the cause (on the imposers part) dependeth on this place of Scripture, & finding nothing by any Logick could
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could be drawn from it for our Ceremonies, thought
good to trie, if there may not, from the same place be
formed a better argument against them. This the Rej.
alleth beating up of a new Hare, and loosing the way: as if
all the Def. his Restorations, and all the Rejoynder his pa-
per shot which he maketh after the Repl. when he
imagineth him to slie, or runne away, were new Ha-
res, and exorbitations. I know not else what privilege he
hath, to use a weight and a weight, one for the Defend.
with him self, and another for the Replier.

2. The Argument is thus put together, by the Rej.
pg.77. All that is left unto the Churches libertie, in things
pertaining to God's worship, is to order them in comely man-
ner. But to appointe and use the Ceremonies as wee doe, is not
to order in comely manner any thinge perteyning to God's
worship. Therefore, to appointe and use the Ceremonies as we
doe, is not left to the libertie of the Church, i.e., it is unlaw-
ful. The Rejoynder answereth first to the proposition,
and then to the assumption, but so as he mingleth
both together, in many words: Yet I will follow his
order.

3. First of all he denieth the proposition to be
found, in the Repl. his meaning. But I can see no rea-
son of this denial. Hee sayth, that Order and Order-
ing is taken sometime largely, for all discipline, or policie,
sometime strictly, for rancking of persons and actions hanc-
imely one before, and another after, and so is opposed onely to
confusion, as in this place, 1 Cor.14.40. Now this is far
from overthrowing the proposition, in the Repl. his
meaning. For the Repl. meant order in the strict sense,
The second part.

H h which
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which maketh also for his purpose: and this the Rey. granteth to be the meaning of the Apostle in this place 1, Cor. 14. 40. Which place the same Rey. pag. 75. confesseth to be the onely place (in the N. Test.) by which power is given to the Churche to constitute Cerem: Frō both which layd together it necessarily followeth that all which is left unto the Churches power under the title of order, is ordeyning in the strict sense, i.e. rancking of persones and actions handsomely, as the Rejoynder expoundeth it. Yet immediatly after he accuseth the Repl. for saying order to be the right placing and dispos- sing of things instituted, for time, place, etc. not shewing why this dishketh him, or wherin differeth from his owne explication. Only he sayth that etc. often by the Repl. put to time, and place, is a blind. Whiche is not so for by etc. is meant all circumstances of like nature with time and place, as number, measure, vicissitude etc. How many Psalmes shall be sune, or chapter read, what, and how much Scripture shall be at this or that assem- blie expounded, how one part of worship shall succeed another etc. without a blinde.

4. In the next place, the Rejoynder findeth a wrong meaning in the Repl. his use of the phrase (in comely manner:) because afterward in the ende of the Assum: tion, he sayth, that comelineffe is nothing but the commel- nesse of order. For (sayth the Rey.) beside that comel- nesse of order, ther is other comelineffe. Now this the Repl. professeth immediatly after the words quoted: other where comelineffe may conteyne all naturall and civil handsomenesse etc. Neyther will I contenda bout this, but
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but it implieth so muche in this very place. So that the Rejoynder hath not given any reaso, why the Proposition, or first part of the Argument should not be admitted. Yet after that he hath fathered it upon Mr. Jacob and made the Repl. his disciple, he commeth to examine the proofes of it, though he himself (as is now shewed) hath given sufficient assent unto all conteyned therin.

5. The first proof is, that it is manyseftly collected out of the place in question, 1. Cor. 14. and the Def. seemeth to grät as much. To which the Rej. answereth. that in that place, three distinct things are propounded, Edification, Decencie, Order: and these three cannot be one. But edification being the ende, Decencie and order themanes, they may well be conteyned in one: decent order, sending to edification, or (which is as much to our purpose) in two: decencie, and order, for edification. A holy Sacrament, decently, and orderly administered, for edification, is not four distinct things, but one. His 2. is, that these words are the conclusion of the whole Trea. beginning at the eleveine's chsp. wherein are handled some things onely concerning Decencie, some more properly pertaining to Edification, and some which belongeth more particularly to Order. Ergo more is commanded in these words, then the comely placing of one thinge after another. Let this be granted, yet it followeth not, that more is left unto the Churches libertie, then order, and decencie, unto edification. For all things that are commanded, are not left unto the Churches libertie.

But
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But that speaking in unknown tongues which the Rej. doeth referre to edification as distinct from order and decencie, is by good Divines accounted to offende against the order and decencie, spoken of c. 14. and 40. So D. Whitaker, de Script. q. 2. c. 18. disputeth against the use of an unknown tongue in God's service, out of this very place: 

\[ \text{πυγνατ ἢ ὅτι νῦν εἰμὶ πάντα ὡς} \] \[ \text{quam maxime.} \]

1. Cor. 14. 40. i.e. this mightily overthrowes that good order which he so much stands for. His 3. is, the Defend. doeth no way seeme to grant the proposition: because the Repl. undertaketh by argument to rescue this place out of the Def. his hands.

But this nothing at all argueth, that the Def. and the Repl. doc not agree about the proposition, though they dissent about the place, as it is handled in the assumption. The Papists grant us, this proposition: No phrase is used by Christ, in those wordes: this is my body, but a Sacramentall one. Yet because they denie the assumption: transubstantiating wordes, are not a Sacramentall phrase, we undertake by argument to rescue this place out of their handes. So the Def. requiring no more then order and Decencie unto Edification, to be left unto the Churches libertie, for the establishing of our Ceremonies, doeth seem at least to grant, that all which is left to the Churches libertie is order and Decencie unto edification, though he deny these to contente no more then mere circumstances, which is the assumption. Of Edification ther is not mention made in the proposition, because that as an ende, is out of question, and allways included.

6. Pete
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6. Peter Martyr is cyteth, out of D. Whitaker, de Pontif. pag. 841, 844, as agreeing with that which the Repl. would have. Here the Rej. inlargeth himself much for the sake (as he sayth) of those that are unlutined.

1. He teletteth us that P. M. doeth distinguish, though not divide, conmelineсть from order. Which wee doealso, for take the Repl. his wordes in the most rigorous sense you can, yet conmelineсть of order, doeth distinguish conmelineсть from order, no lesse then conmelineсть of a man, doeth distinguish it from a man. 2. He addeth, that P. Martyr doeth there instance in the Ceremonie of shrize dipping, and in the observation or institution of Feasts. But let the Reader know, that those words, Ceremonie, observation, institution of feasts, which the Rejoynder hath set downe in a differing letter, to be noted as P. M. his words, are not to be found in the place of P. M. but are added by the Rejoynder for advantage. P. M. expoundeth the meaning he had in all his instances by what place, what time, what manner. If therefore the Repl. did not looke upon that place, but took it on trust, from the trustie hande of D. Whitaker (as the Rejoynder objected to him) yet it proveth good and fitting. So that the Rejoynd. forgetteth himself muche, when upon this uncertaine, and momentlesse conjecture, he comparoth the Repl. to a hungrie creature (or dogge) that runneth away with a bare bone. D. Morton once (at the least) alleged some testimonies on trust: and therefore, being challenged for them, he confessed that he had them from Mr. Stone. Yet the Popish adversary (author of the Sober reckoning) did not com-
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pare him to a dogge, but only sayd, that he sente to stockes and stones, for satisfaction about them. Whiche I doe not allege to the disparagement of cyther D. M. or Mr. St. but only to shew by comparison how the Rej. doeth sometime overflow, in his termes. 3. For D. Whitaker, he telleth us, that hee only sayth, that Ecclesiastical laws belongeth only to order, or ordering, but not as it is distinct from comelineesse. As if any of us did so. The Repl. his words: ordering in comely manner, doe not (I hope) referre all to order, considered a part from all comelineesse.

This is the full summe, of all that Rejoynder had to except against the first allegation. And yet heere upon this nothing, it pleaseth him to accuse not onely the Repl. but these men, of haughty and Magistrall fashion, gulling, and deceiving, great and shamefull sinne, and the poor Repl. at the least, for a man delitute of common honesty. It seemeth he was very angry at something. Let the understanding Reader guesse, at what?

6. For more manifestation of the Repl. his vacuitie of common honesty, the Rej. referreth us to the second testimonie out of Iunius, against Bell. cōt. 3. l. 4. c. 16. n. 86, 87. and cap. 17. n. 9, 10, 12, 13.

Omitting therfore unnecessarie repetition, let us heare the reasons of extraordinarie dishonestie. 1. Iunius ca. 16. n. 86, 87. sayth only first, that those humane lawes are only necessarie, in the Churche, which tende to this, that all things may be done decently, and in order, 1. Cor. 14. 40. Secondly, that these are improperly called lawes in the Churche, being more properly conditions, or Canons.

Now
Now our of the first saying, the Repl. concluded, that
Iunius did judge the Apostle to leave no more to the
Churches liberty; then to order God's ordinances in
decent manner: And out of the second, he inferred
the same conclusion: because any constitution, above
ordering in decent manner that which before was in-
joined, is properly a law. What extraordinary dishonестie
is here? 2. Iunius cap. 17. n. 9. sayth only that to make new
laws in divine things is to decline i.e. in poyntes of sayth
or necessarie rules of sanctimonie. But Iunius maketh
no mention at all, cyther of faith, or sanctimonie, or nec-
cesstie; Nor Bell. himself in that place. Neyther is the
question there handled, of poyntes of faith or things
absolutie necessarie to sanctimonie. All double tre-
ble Ceremonies reductively Sacramentall, and worship,
are by the Rej. his owne dictates double sacred: and that
is it which Iunius meaneth by divine. 3. Bell sayth that the
addition forbidden Deut. 4. is of lawes contrarie to the law of
God, Wherunto Iunius n. 10. answereth, that any lawes at all,
added to God's lawes, are contrarie to the law of God, speaking
of proper lawes, without any backing of God's law, binding the
Conscience, as he sheweth cap. 16. n. 86. 8. Here the Rej. left
out those words of Iunius, neyther contrarie nor beside the
word; which if he had translated, then the Readers me-
morie might have recalled, how this place cited before
for the defence of that phrase, was but shifted by the Rej.
p. 46. 2. It is to be marked, that the Def. and Rej. there an-
swer to Deut. 4. is the same with Bel. p. 134. 3. That ex-
position of laws without backing, is of the Rej. his owne
forging. No suche thinge is founde in the places quo-
ted, nor yet did Bel. profess to desede any suche thing.
Of binding the Conscience, enough hath been sayd in the head of Difference betwixt our Ceremonies and Popish.

4. Iunius n. 12. answering to Bellarmines his saying, that God (in the N.T.) gave only the common laws of faith and Sacram. leaving the Speciall to the Church, etc. affirmeth Gods laws to be perfect restraint, & modo, and those of the Church to be but Canons and disposings of convenientce, for better observing of divine lawes.

Where note 1. an example of an etc. for a blinde, or blindinge, which the Rejoynder formerly tould of. For in that etc. is conteyned, pro locorum & temporum diversitate: quia non possunt diversissimi populi conuenire in iisdem legibus & ritibus. 1 e. for this cause, speciall laws of rituall thinges, are left to the Churches libertie, because of varietie, which falleth out now by occasion of times and places: Which is the very thinge that the Rejoynder pawned his credite, Bell.never sayde, pag. 15. 16. Note also 2. that Iunius doeth not in this place mention Canons, as the Rej. pleaseth to alter his words in reciting of them. But Cautions, and dispositions. Now a Caution about the performance of any thing, is not an institution of a new thing. 3. Iunius is found to say as muche as he was allledged for, and to the contrarie we have from the Rejoynder a nihil dicit.

5. Iunius n. 13. saith onely that Christ is the onely law-giver, that is, to give lawes, that in themselves and by the very authorite of the law-maker, doe binde the conscience. As if Iunius in confuting of Bell, did onely say the very same thing, with him that he goeth about to confute!
A fresh suite against Ceremonies: for Bellarmine in that very place sayth: Christ is the chief law-giver who by his owne Authority can judge and make lawes.

Now out of all these allegations, the Rejoynder maketh his interrogatories. 1. Where are these words all that is requisite, as spoken of Rites and Ceremonies? Answer the sense of these words as spoken of all Ceremonies above mere order and decency, is cap. 16.86. 2. Where finde you in Tunnus that the Church may constitute no new things? Ans. cap. 17. n. 9 this in things Divine is to turne aside, for the Rejoynder his interpretation of those words, that they mean poynets of faith, and necessarie rules of sanctimonie, is confuted, by conference of Bellarmine words there opposed, who in that place instanceth in Ceremonials and Judiciall laws, and speaketh not at all of faith and necessarie sanctimonie. 3. Where are those words, ordering in seemly manner? Ans. cap. 16. n. 86 those only humane lawes are necessarie in the Church, which make that all things be done decently and in order. 1. Cor. 14. 40. 4. If the Church may appoint no new things, but only see to decency and order, then sayth the Rej. what patent hath she to make particular ordinaies for time, and place? unless these be no new things. I Ans. 1. Time and place considered as mere occasionall circumstances, are no more new things in Gods service, then concreate time and place, were new things in Creation, distinct from the created world. And Calvin inst. 1.4. cap. 10. sect. 22. severely censurcth those, that call suche kinde of determinations new lawes: Quis nisi columniator, si non illum ius legem dici, quia constant dum. The second part.
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Excerpt from the text:

...a vayn thing for them to plead it, that cannot shew it under the great Seal. I doe not thinke, that any earthly Kinge would have his subjects submit the selves to that power, which is fetched out of a Patent, invisible, and onely avouched by conjectures.

7. A reason was given of the foresaid proposition, out of Iun. de Transl. Imp.l. l.c. 2. n. 26. 27. 31. viz. that the Churche hath onely a Ministerie, to observe suche things as Christ hath appointed, not authoritie of appointing new thinges. Here the Rejoynder 1. obser- veth, that those words, (new things) have no foot steps in Iunius. As if new things could be appointed lawfully without authoritie of appointing. Surely, he that denieth all authoritie of appointing, and leaveth onely ministe- riall performance of things appointed, he denieth appointing of new thinges. 2. He argueth thus: If the Churche have a ministerie to appoint and doe suche thinges as Christ hath commanded, then must she needs have a Commission legative to appoint and use rites serving to order and de- cem.ie. Adde to this onely, and then it is not onely that, but all that which we require. 3. He crieth out of mis- serable perversion, eather by grosse negligence, or misla- king.

And
And why so I pray? Because (forsooth) all that Iunius sayth is good to prove, that no Ecclesiastical person hath any power by his calling over temporall Princes. But this is nothing against their delegated dependant power, by Commission. But these are very strange distinctions: they have not any power by their calling, but some by commission. They have not any power over temporall Princes (though they be members of the Churche) but over the Churche they have. 2. The Rejoynder maketh Iunius only to deny that which Bellarmine never affirmed, viz. abso. use independant power of Ecclesiastical persons, as supreme Lords. Nay Bellarmine answereth to Calvin in the very same manner that the Rejoynder doeth: The Pope is not the cheife legiver but the vicar of Christ, & by Christes authority maketh lawes. 3. He addeth that Iunius disp. de trad. distingueth betwixt decensie, and the seemliness of order alone.

As if this were the maine question? Or any part of the Proposition! or denied by the Repl. at all. The Rejoynder having little to say that was to the purpose, cacheth hould of one word in the ende of the Assumption used by the Repl. seemliness of order (which yet is immediatly there differ eth from other decensie, as well commanded as this) and that he maketh the maine matter of the proposition: wheras the meaning is, that nothing is left unto libertie in Gods worship, above decensie and order, for which these testimonies are brought, and not for the other.

1 2 3. For
8. For more full support of the foresaid Proposition, a reason is added, from the fullness of a perfect law, which leaveth no more unto Ministeriall judges, then needs must.

For answer, the Rejoynder observeth, that some cases are of necessitie variable, and so left. So the occasions of different Rites and Ceremonies are so various, that if our Lord had fixed any one certain manner, he should have made rather snares than laws for his Church. As, if he had appointed sitting at a table in the Communion: or kneeling in prayer. This is strange fluence. So much is granted, as is desired, viz. that God hath left nothing (about his worship) undetermined in his word. i.e. uncommanded, and unforbidden particularly, save onely that which he could not commande or forbid. Now let any man think, and judge, whether it had not been possible for God in his word, either to have commanded, or forbidden the signyng of those that are Baptized with the signe of the crosse all so well, as Baptizing of them with water?

2. How can that too too bolde and inconsiderate assertion be excused: if our Lord had fixed (or commanded) any one certain fashion of Ceremonies, he had made rather snares, then laws for his Church. If it had pleased God to commande or forbid the signe of the Crosse in particular, what snare had it been? When God appointed all the Ceremonies of the olde Testament, he did not (I hope) make snares for his Church, though he did lay a burthen upon it. 3. Whereas the Rejoynder maketh sitting at a table, in the Lords Supper, and kneeling at prayer, to be suchethings as the Lord could not command
command, but as snares, because sometime a table may be wanting, or something to sit on, or ability to sit, and so of kneeling, this is as poor a snare to catch any man of understanding in, as one shall lightly see made. For 1. Many affirmative commandments of God there are, which in extraordinary cases cannot be fulfilled, and cease to bind: as praying unto and praising of God, with our voice: which is no snare, to him that cannot speak.

The appointing of wine for the Supper, is no snare, though some Countries have it not, and some me cannot well drink it. See Beza ep. 2. Pareus and Symb. Sacram. l. 1. cap. 9. 2. I would know, whether it had been a snare, if God had appointed sitting at the Table, with exception of such extraordinary cases? if yea, then make more when men appoint kneeling, sirpling, and crossing, if no, then our Argument may proceed.

Kneeling in publick prayer, might have been appointed without snaring, as appearing before the Lord thrice in the year, was appointed to every Male in Israel. Deut. 16.16. For (without doubt) many men in Israel, were, by accident, more unable to travel up to Jerusalem, than any Christian that hath knees, is to kneel.

After this observation, of which the rejoynnder saith it may be as we will, he answereth, that our Lord hath left nothing absolute to the will of his officers: but hath left even ambulatorie Rites, under general rules, which will trie them as perfectly, as if every one had been named, and with lesse cumber. But he: this is nothing to the purpose: because so the imperfectest law that is in any nation upon the earth, if it be worthy the name of Law, leaveth nothing
so absolute to the will of inferior Officers, as that it should be without the generall rules of justice, common good, etc. Nay not without the rules of order & decency.

2. Concerning the comparison of perfection, between generall and particular rules, though enough hath been sayd before, upon like occasion, yet this I will adde.

If he meaneth, that a generall rule if it be perfectly understood and applied, doeth as perfectly trie as particulars. I grant it to be a trueth. And so was the olde Testament as perfect a rule of Christian faith as the New, thou shalt love thy neighbour, as perfect as the six Commandements of the second Table. But if he meaneth that a generall rule is as fit and full for our direction of us imperfect men, as particulars are, then I think no man conscious of humane frailtie, will beleiv him.

Neyther doe I beleiv, that he himselfe is so fully perswaded in Crossing the Baptized, by any rule which he hath out of Gods word, for that, as he is for Baptizing, by the rule of that.

9. The Repl. having (as he thought sufficiently grounded the generall, that a perfect law leaveth nothing more then needs must, unto inferior Officers, goeth on to assume, that in the worship of God, all, but particular Circumstances of order, might easilly, be (as indeed they, were) appointed by Christ, and therefore need not be left to the Churches wisdome. Upon this, it pleaseth the Rejoynder to say little to the purpose, in many words. 1. He sayth, that Circumstances of order were not harder to determine, then those of
decency. Now it is plain enough, that the Repl. here, naming Order, did also understand Decency, though he named Order only. 2. He asketh, what School of Divinitie hath taught the Repl. to say, that our Lord forborne the determining of such circumstances, because all else was easy. I Answer, no rule of Divinitie did either teach the Repl. to say so, nor yet the Rejoynder to impune unto him, which he never said.

But if he meaneth (as it seemeth he doeth) because it was not so easy to determine circumstances of time and place as reall Worship.

I then answer, that this (as I think) the Replier learned out of that Divinitie School, out of which the Def. and Rejoynder learned. That which they cite out of Calvin, pag. 15.16. Iunius is cited to the contrarie, out of Cont. 3.14. cap. 17. n. 12. (which place the Rej. looked upon, by occasion of the Repl. his former citation of it.) But hee in that very place, distinguisheth betwixt laws, properly so called, and cautions, leaving onely caution to the Churches libertie, which is the very same that the Repl. meaneth. The plaine truth is, that supposing Gods will to be, we should worship him in any place, and any time, and any time fitting, it was necessary, that the particular choice of fitting time and place, should be left undetermined to any particular time or place, exclusively.

Calvin also is cited, as more comely expressing the cause to be, that Christ would not, then that he could not determine such matters.

Now
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Now though Calvin, being so excellent in his expressions, may easily be granted to have expressed the same meaning in more comely manner then the Repl. yet here was no cause of noting disparitic. For the Repl in saying, all things but particular order and decencie may be easily appointed, did not say what Christ could doe, but what might be easily for us appointed, or with our case, or with the case which we doe conceyve of in law giving, or of an ordinarie law giver, having suche authoritie as Christ had. And who doeth not see, that it is not so case, to appoint every particular place, and time, wherein God shall be worshiped, throughout all the world, then with what worship he shall be serv'd? For that particular description, a thousand books, so great as our one bible, would not have suffiz'd.

The world (as John sayth) would not be capable of the Volumes that must have been written. The Repl. himself pag 89 telleth us of cumber, and much ado, that would have been, in naming every particular, is not this as much as leffe case? Yet it pleased him to seek matter or altercation about this phrase, and that (which agreeth not) immediately after he had without reason accused the Repl. of picking quarrells pag. 88.

10. A Second reason, of the Repl. his proposition, was, that whatsoever in worship is above order and decencie, is worship. Bec. whatsoever is act'd by him that worshippeth, in that act, beside ordinarie civilitie, must either be an act or meanes of worship, or an orderly decent disposing of those acts, or else at the least idle, and so unlawfull. The Repl. answereth, that a signifi-
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A significant Ceremonie for edification, is lawfull, yet commeth not under any of those heads. But he himself confesseth a significant Ceremonie: instituted of God, to be essentiall worship, and instituted of man to be worship, though not in it self, of which distinction, enough hath been sayd, in the head of worship. Yet this by the way: A significant Ceremonie for edification, is the same, in it self, by whome soever it be instituted: because institution is extrinsical to the thing instituted, and alters it not in it self, internally. If therefore it be essentiall lawfull worship, in it self, when it is instituted by God, it is also essetiall (though not lawfull) worship, in it self, when it is instituted by man. Beside that Ceremonie whose proper sole ende is edification, toward God, is properly done to the honor of God, and so properly divine worship.

His answer is, that comlinesse grounded on civill humane considerations, is not mere civilisie, in sacred actions, and use, but sacred by application. Which is very true if civill application be meant by mere civill but then it is nothing to the purpose. For sacred by application is seemly clothing, put on for to goe to Church in, and yet is in it self mere civill. The question is not of application, but of internall nature.

Sacred things applied to Civill business, do not therefore become Civill, for who will say, that Prayer, at the beginning of a Parliament, is a Civill act, though it were used in the Upper, and lower house, and applied to that Civill meeting, as it ought to be? And why then shall application of Civill decencie unto

The second part.

Sacred
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Sacred business, make it alter the nature or name of it?

His 3d answer is, that all means of worship are not worship. But he knew well enough, that this was meant of proper means of worship.

His fourth is, that ordering and manner of disposing, is ill divided from comeliness. Neither did the Repl. intend so to divide, but rather to conjoin them, understanding by that manner of disposing, comeliness. But if the Rejoinder had not cached up some show of confounding comeliness with order, which was not intended by the Repl. he had been in this argument wholly at a loss.

His 5d and last answer is, that by Basils, leave some things, in themselves, may, and sometime must be tolerated. But he should have remembered, that the question here is not of tolerating, but of appointing and using.

Now if it be lawful, to appoint and use emptie and unprofitable Ceremonies in Gods worship, let those Worshippers judge, that tremble at the Majestie of God, and are afraid in any manner to appear emptie and unprofitable before him. Nay (to passe by our Divines) let the Papists themselves judge. Bellar. de Pontif. l. 4. c. 17. ad 4. confesseth those Ceremonies to be forbidden, which are unprofitable altogether, and vaine precepts, unprofitable & frivolous Ceremonies, onely by humane spirit invented. And de effect. Sacrament l. 2. cap. 32. empty and good for nothing. Morethen needs, and not a jot tending to any Godines, and who not?

II. And
Thus farre concerninge the Proposition of our Argument: the Assumption followeth, which is this: To appoint and use the Ceremonies as we doe, is not to order in comely manner, anything pertayning to Gods worship. The reason is, because order requireth not the institution or usage of any new thinge, but onely the right placing and disposing of thinges formerly instituted.

1. The Rejoynder answereth that order requireth new time, place, and measure: which is a Sophistrie in the Proposition before abused, and confuted.

2. His second is, that ordering in comely manner, or comelinesse requireth the institution of suche formalities, as shall be suitable to the dignitiie and varietie of direcie actions. Where the terme formalities is not so formall, that a man may spie in it the difference it hath from other things; the Rejoynd. in his manuduction, pag. 36. appropriate it to Bishops Rồhe's etc. even as they are distinct from Surplises: the Bishops went before the Hearse in their formalities, the Clearks in their Surplises. So that it seemeth to mean some Ceremonies of state, and dignitiie; of which kinde neyther Crosse, nor Surplice is any. Howsoever, unto ordering of one thing doeth not require another new thing, but onely disposing of that one. For if it did, then that new thing (because that also must be ordered) would require another new thing, and that also for order sake another, so that no one thing could be ordered, without an infinite heap of new thinges.
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As for the Dignitie of divine actions, that is best suited with mans reverent and humble simplicitie, not with outward shews of dignitie, invented by man. The womans ordinarie vaile was more suitable to the dignitie of Gods worship, then if she had adorned her self with golde, and precious stones.

Pauls plaine cloak was more suitable then the richest Cloak in all Rome. If Order requireth outward shews of dignitie, then Rome, which is a confused babel, may be to all Churches an imitable example of religious order, for the Council of Trent sess. 22. proffeth, their masse Ceremonies to be invented. That the Majesty

of such a Sacrifice might be set out.

12. To shew further that Order requireth not suche Ceremonie as ours, the notation of the word was brought in, signifying no suche thing. Now the Rejoynder granteth that originally the word doeth not conteyne within the compasse of it, suche kinde of Ceremonies, though by usage it may. Which is very true: but helpeth not, except the Def. or Rejoynder whose principall Argument is taken from this place and onely retorted by us, can prove, that in this place the word order is extended beyond his originall signification. He will not therfore stand with us, about the signification of the word in this place: let order (sayth he) in this place signifie no more then placing. But he maketh his retrait to the word Comeliness: asking in comeliness be nothing? I answer yes, it is some thing but the Replier did not insist in that word, because he looked
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Tooke the force of the Def, his Argument from this place principally to lie upon order.

But seeing the Rejoynder hath given up Order, I will adde a word or two concerning Comelinesse.

I take this for granted, that seeing the Rejoynder confesseth Order heer to be taken in strict signification, as opposed onely to confusion, pag. 78. he will also consent with us, that Decencie in the same place and sentence, is to be taken in strict signification, as opposed onely to the vice of undecencie. Now hence it followeth, that Decencie requireth nothing but that which is necessarie to the avoiding of undecencie.

I ask therfor, if undecencie in Gods worship cannot be avoided, without double, treble, sacred signification Ceremonies, of mans inventing? If not, then the Apostles did muche forget themselves, in their publicke worshipping of God, before men had invented suche Ceremonies, for that is no answer which the Rejoynder after giveth: all Churches are not bound to this or that particular way of Comelinesse. All Churches are bound to avoide undecencie, and to doe that which Decencie requireth, or bindeth them unto. If yea, then Decencie doeth not require suche kinde of Ceremonies.

Neyther doeth it in deed, any more the Order. So Mr. Perkins, lat. to. 2. p. 888. Decency is, when the service of God is performed with convenient and fitt circumstances of time, place, person, and gesture, and heereof the Apostle speaketh. 1. Cor. 14. 40.

The plaine simple truth, without Ceremoniall affection, is, that Decencie is (in this place) nothing but...
but good civil fashion, agreeable not onely to worship, but also to any grave assemblie. Decency (sayth Pas- reus upon the place) is opposed to vanity, Spottes, yea, it stands not in hoods, caps, or vizardes of fond Ceremo-
nies, etc.

I dare appeal to D.B. his conscience, if Baptisme be not as decently administered without the Cross, as with it? and publicke prayers made as decently without a Surplice, as with it? Let Conscience here speak, and the Rejoynder hearkening unto it, wil (without doubt) confess, that Decency in this place doth no more require either Cross or Surplice, than Order, and that both of them together doth no more require those Ceremonies, than a hundred other, which in England (though not at Rome) are denied unto them.

To this purpose, Mr. Attersoll, in his second book of the Sacram. cap. 5, saith well: If they referre all this trash and trumperie (of humane Ceremonies in Baptisme) to order and comeliness, as Hosius doth, doe they not herby blasphemously accuse the Baptisme of John, and of the Apo-
files, of uncomeliness and disorder? whereas the comeliness and dignitie of theSacraments is to be esteemed by the Word of God, by the institution of Christ, by the simplicitie of the Cospell, and by the practise of the Apostles: Nothing is more comely, decent, and orderly, then that which Christ commandeth and alloweth: nothing is more uncomely and unseemly, then that which man inventeth in the service of God, and in the celebration of the Sacraments, therby
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thereby innovating and perverting the holy ordinances of God.

12. The received definitions of Order are brought in to the same purpose, by the Replier. And the Rejoynder yeeldeth so muche as they importe, viz., that order in strict signification doeth not imply suche Ceremonies as ours.

He must therefor euyther prove, that in this place, i.e., Cor. 14.40, that word is not taken strictly, which he himself formerly granted, or give up this place which is (by his owne confession) the onely place of all the New Testament, for warranting of suche Ceremonies, or fie to Decencie, upon which he cannot any more fasten then upon order, as hath been shewed.

Nothing materiall is added in the rest of the Rejoynd. his answer unto this Argument (where our Divines are observed, to distinguishe order and decencie from mysticall Ceremonies, the context of the chapter. 1. Corinth i.4. Is declared to respect no mysticall Ceremonies, the phrase of Scripture is sheewed to consent,) nothing (I say, and the Reader may see) is added: but onely the same things are repeated about Order, and Decencie which are now sufficiently discussed.

So that the Rejoynder hath nothing to say to the contrarie, but that wee may safely conclude, Ergo, to appoint and use the Ceremonies as we doe, is not left to the libertie of the Church, i.e., it is unlawful.
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If their were nothing else against them, in all the Scripture, then this place, beside which the Def. and Rejoynder can finde none in all the New Testament, for them, any indifferent man would say they are not allowed.

Those that are devoted to the Ceremonies, may shuffle up and downe, first to order, and when they are beaten thence, to Decency, and from Decency, when they can defend that no longer, to Edification, as the Rejoynder doeth: but all will not helpe. Let them pitch or insist upon one of these grounds, without starting, I will pawn my head, their anchor will come home to them againe as finding no fast grounde, eyther in order, or Decency, or Edification, for double signification Ceremonies (suche as ours) to ride at.

The Def. could frame no Consequence out of any of these words, the Rejoynder saith ther is one, but he cannot shew it. To the contrarie consequence nothing is answered of any moment.

And is not this a miserable cause, which hath no place in all the New Testament, which the best Advocates can allege for it, but onely that, out of which it is utterly confounded? To the Defend. and Rejoynders mainteyning such a cause, this testimonie may be given that they would willinglie, so farre as they can, favour things which the times favour, and therefore strive to make somthing of that which maketh nothing for them. In the former section, when Order, Decency, and Edification, should have been handled as Rules, according to the title of the digression, the Rejoynder soddainly
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Dainly breaketh off, referring them to a sifer place. Now here in this place, he was constreined to touche upon them, but so softly and sparinglie, that it appeareth he founde this no sifer place then the former, for those reserved considerations. When shall we come to the sifer place?

---

**SECT. 17.**

Concerning the ancient Fathers allowing of Humane Ceremonies.

1. Of these, the Repl. answered, it cannot be proved, nor is probable, that from the first beginning of the Primitive Churche they brought in any new inventions. Upon this, the Rej. accusing not him alone, but others also, that they can believe no trutzhe crosse to their opinion, because they seek honour one of another, & presume of their new traditions, as if the spirit of trutzhe had some onely to them, or from the alone, answereth that it is a matter of fact, proved by Records of Churches, against which nothing can be sayd. But if he could keep-in his passion, so longe, as to hear this onely word, that there are no sufficient Records of any suche thing, extant from the beginninge, then he might see that sufficient answver is given, unto the name of all Fathers, alwayes.

Yet I will adde one conjecture, to shew, that those

The second part.  

Ll observa.
observations which seem to have been univerfalt, in the Primitive Church, were not in deed, without exception. Praying toward the East, hath as ancient te-

stimonie, as any other humane Rite. Tertullian Apol.
cap. 16. witnesseth, that that was one cause why the Christians were esteemed to worship the Sunne. And yet Socrates, lib. 5. cap. 22. doeth witness, that at Antioche which was the first Church of Christians by name, they used not to place their Mysteries which directed their posture of prayer, toward the East, but rather toward the West. And why may we not conceive the like of Easter, as well as of this East observation?

2. It was secondly answered, that those, Feast, which the Primitive Church is sayd to have observed, were not by Canonical imposition, but voluntarie accom-

modation to the infirmitie of some, as appeareth by the varietie of their observation, and Socrates his testi-

monie. Marke now, what a Rejoynder is given? 1. Hee telleth us of a strange conjecture of his, even from this answer: viz. that the Churches held it not only lawful, but also convenient, to impose upon themselves such Feasts. As if occasionall accommodation, were all one with imposition, or voluntarie joining in action, for the good that is in it, were always a certaine argument of holding that opinion which others doe attix unto it. But if they had thought them so convenieth, yet that Arg would be of little force. For many Ceremonies were thought then convenient, which longe since are universall, thought otherwise of, and therfore left off, though no reason of inconvenience can be shewed, which did

no
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not agree to those times as well as to succeeding times, except further abuse: which cannot be denied of our Ceremonies in question, as religious use of milke, bony, or abstaining from washing one's hands for certain days after Baptism, etc.

2. That which was mentioned of infirmities occasioning this accommodation, the R. (after his manner) crieth down as a fiction, boldly delivered, without proof, or colour, meerly for opposition sake: Whereas notwithstanding it is so clear, that the infirmities of men newly converted from Judaism, and Gentilism, did bring into Christian Churches customs like unto those in use among Jews and Gentiles, that Cardinal Baronius, from that ground mainteyneth many Ceremonies. What wonder if the grown customs among the Gentiles (and we may add the Jews also) were such as from which, so they were converted to Christianism, they were yet so hardly taken, that it might seem impossible to put them quite off, what wonder I say then if the most holy Bishops have granted them place in the worship of God?

Doctor Jackson, in his Originall of Idolatrie sect. 4, chap. 23. sheweth the first occasion of Superstition in Christians, to have been the infirmities, whereby it came to passe, that heathenish (and Jewish) Rites, whereto men had been longe accustomed, could not easily be extirpated. Where also about suche accommodations, he hath this remarkable observation. To ouststrip our adversaries in their own policies, or to use means abused by others to a better ende, is a resolution so plausible to worldly wisdom, that even Christians have mightily overreached and intangled themselves, by too much being seeking to circumvent or goe beyond others.
About the Varietie which was of olde in the observ-
ervation of these feasts, the Rejoynder answereth, that it
notwithstanding the agreeement for the things themselves
was universall. Which if he would take with a graine
of salt, viz. that after some space of time, it was (for
ought we know) universall, but not upon any Ecclesi-
asticall imposition, nor upon any knowne groundes
out of Gods word, it is the same that the Repl. affir-
meth, and Socrates lib. 5. cap. 22. laboreth to con-
firme.

3. Mention was further made of the mischeife that
came in by those humane observations. To which the
Rejoynder answereth, that the anniversarie solemnities
have not obscured, but preserved that simplicitie of the
Gospel. And if they had so done by accident Satan's malice,
and man's frailtie, that is nothing but what may be affirmed of
Divine ordinances, But 1. the Def. his position was in ge-
nerall of universall Ceremonies by humane institution,
and not Feasts alone. Now those first Ceremoniall ob-
servations are guilty of opening that gate, for all the
humane præsumptions to enter into Gods house, which
pressed in after them: which gate could never be
shutte from that day to this. 2. Those very Feasts made
a composition or mixture of humane institutions with
divine, and therefore did not præserve simplicitie. They
also were from their first rise not onely aequalled unto,
but also extolled above the Lords day. Easter brought
in a superstitions Lent to attend upon it, made Baptistime
wayt for her Moon: and conformed our Lords Supper
unto the Jewish Passeover in unleavened bread, etc.
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was the first apple of contention amongst Christians, the first weapon, with the Bishop of Rome played his prises against other Churches, & after flew so many Britons with, by Austin the monk. Holie-days in honor of Christ invited unto them Saints holy Days etc.4. It is præsumtion, to make mens inventions as guiltlesse of evill consequences, as Gods holy ordinances. They are aside efficacious occasions given of evill; these are onely passive occasions taken.

Nether is ther any corruption of Gods ordinances, whose originall occasion may not be founde in mens (nay fathers) Ceremonious præsumtions.

4. It was finally answered by the Repl. that the allways of these Feasts, cannot include the Apostolical times, and for other allways, Bellarmine Cont. i.1.4. c.9. hath the same plea, and the answer given unto him by our Divines, may serve here. The Rejoynder here in finuateth that it is very likely, these Feasts, or some of them, were on foot while some Apostles lived: because Polyscarpe pretended John to have taught Easter.

On foot indeed was the mysterie of Antichristian corruption in the Apostles times. But that which Polyscarpe is sayd to have pretended, was for the fourteen day of the moneth, and is confuted by a contrarie prætense of the Latine Churches, from Peter and Paul. Socrat. I. 5. cap. 22. He 2. addeth, under Augustines name that it is insolent madness, to thinke that not to be well done, which hath been done by all the Churche, though it beganne after the Apostles times. Now though I finde no suche sayling of Augustines, in the epistle quoted

L 1 3
A fresh suite against Ceremonies.

...ted for it, but to the Contrarie, I finde this rule, that it is lawful or not lawfull to beleev or not to beleev other witnesses or testimonies besides that of the Scriptures, so far as you see they beare or do not beare weight to make us give more credit to a thinge. Which being granted, the fact of the Churche cannot so confirme, this or that to be right and well, as that it should be madness to denie it. Yet let it be his saying, I answer, if this be true then it must needs follow, that giving of the Communion (and that as is most likely sopp'd) upon opinion of necessitate, cannot be denied well and good, for that (as is well known) was done generally in Augustines time, and longe before. It must follow also, that they were speciall insolent mad men, that first began to disallow eyther that, or any other ancient thinge of generall observation: which Augustine would never have sayde, whose professsed of his time, that the Churche of God sett in the heape of chaffe and tares, did only suffer many thinges, onely ep. 119.

He 3 distinguisheth betwixt Bellarmines, and the Defendants alledging of traditions, because Bell. spake of doctrines necessarie to salvation. Which is not true for Bell. in that chapter maketh no mention of doctrines necessarie to salvation: and in the next chapter but one cap. xi. he confesseth, that all thinges absolutely necessarie to salvation, are written in the Scriptures, and (which is much more) all thinges that are eyther necessarie, or profitable for all men to know.
Concerning Protestants witnessing against the Negative argument from Scripture.

1. Bellarmine was brought in by the Def. as an indifferent Adversarie, confesssinge that Protestants holde the Apostles to have instituted some things, perteyning to rites and order, which are not written. Which was also granted unto him, as making nothing against us. Onely the vanitie of that allegation was in some particulars declared, which how they are cleared (it being a matter of no moment) I referre to the Readers judgement.

2. Chemnitius was alledged, saying, there be some Ecclesiasticall Rites, which have neyther command, nor testimonie, in Scripture, which yet are not to be rejected. Answer was made, that this in a right sense is granted by us. The rejoynder taxeth this as an idle shift, because Chemnitius did not intende suche a restrictive sense. 2. Circumstances of order have command and testimonie in Scripture. But 1. It is no idle shift so to interpret an allegation objected, as that the interpretation cannot be confuted, but barely denied. 2. As Circumstances of order and decencie have their generall command or testimonie in Scripture, so have those Rites which Chemnitius understandeth, or else his sentence is without any grounde out of Scripture.

3. The
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3. The same answer is given, and no other Rejoynder made, about Calvin, Darius, Whitakers and Zanchie, saving that of Zanchie, it is observed & urged by the Rejoynder, that he sayth some Ceremonies may help for the furtherance of piety which have no foundation in the word: giving instance of the solemnities of Easter, etc. Trait de Sacra. Scriptura. For whom I answer, that his sentence must be understood of no particular foundation, or else he should give more than any Papist will require, concerning their humane Ecclesiasticall Ceremonies. As for his instances in the solemnities of Easter, it seemeth he reckoned them amonge Ceremonies of order and decencie, because as the Def. and Rej. confesseth, that is the onely place authorizing humane institutions in Religion. If he meant otherwise, he did as a man, cross his owne rules, as after (God willing) shall be shewed.

For the present, let that testimonie of Zanchie be well considered, which he setteth downe in Col. 2.8. It is certayn, that this consequence is very good: this or that is not according to Christ: therefore it is not to be admitted. This ought to be enough to any Christian man: It is not according to Christ: therefore I admette it not, in the business of atteyning to salvation. Where is to be noted, 1. That according to Christ, is opposed (by the Apostle) to according to the traditions of men, and therefore is all one, with not appointed by Christ. 2. That all Ceremonies instituted to teache the doctrine perteeyning to salvation, are part of the means whereby we are supposed to be helped & directed, in seeking and atteyning salvation.

4. About lumius, ther is more adoe, because his
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Wordes are set downe at large on both pars. But as for that which the Def. and Rejoynder cite out of him, pag.109. I cannot say much more then hath been answered to the other Divines, untill a consequence be framed out of them, more effectuall to the purpose, then is in that which the Rejoynd. only questions.

And doeth the rule 1.Cor.14. concerne nothing but circumstances of Order? Or can our opposites be accorded with this saying? For it hath been formerly manifested what that rule doeth require, and how it may be accorded with our tenent.

On the other part, this professsed, sworn sentence of Lunius is allledged: If any man, either by Civill, or Ecclesiasticall authority, will adde things not necessarie, nor agreeable to Order, wee would not pertinaciously contend with him, but desire onely that he would seriously consider of three things. 1. By what authority, or example, he is led to thinkes, that the holy Churche of God, and the simplicite of the mysteries of Christ (whose voice onely is heard by his sheep) must be clad with humane traditions, which Christ doeth reject? 2. To what ende he judgeth, that these things should be added unto those that are divine? For if the ende be conformitie with others, it were more aquisitio, that other Churches should conforme to those, which come nearest to the Word of God (as Cipriani counsel is) then that these should conforme to the other. If the ende be comelinessse, what is more comely then the simplicitie of Christ? What is more simple then that comelinessse.

If there be no other reason beside will, then that of Tertullian is to be thought of: The Will of God, is vice the chief necess.

The second part.
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First, and that the Church of God is not tied unto mans wise dome in things Divine. The third thinge to be thought on is, what event allways hath followed upon humane traditions, as longe experience doeth shew? Eclesiastici, lib. 3. Cap. 5.

This testimonie is so full, and clear, that it needeth no candle of Commentarie, or Consequence, to be set by it. What can the Rejoynder answer?

1. His first is, that Iunius doeth not here condeme our Ceremonies even because they are not commanded in the Word. But he might have remembred out of sect. 2, that the argument is of warrant and direction from the Word, not of directive and speciall commanding. Now Iunius plainlye denieth authoritie or example of the worde, or any thinge but mans will, to be the grounde of suche Ceremonies, and for that cause would have them avoyded.

2. His second is, that Iunius wrothe not this of suche Ceremonies as ours: because he spealeth of those that are neither necessarie, nor according to order, rejected by Christ, added to Divine things, which must needs import necessitie and worship of fixed unto them. But had it not been better counsel, for the Rejoynder to have helde his peace, then to let every man see what miserable shifts he is driven to? Iunius having made this conclusion: that Magistrates may not constitute, and change persons, things, Ceremonies at their pleasure, and that those which tell them they may (as our Def. and Rejoynder doe in part) are therein no well-willers to the Church, pro-poundeth this question: if it be not in the Magistrates power
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power, to appoint, or abrogate such things, to which he answereth negatively: because all necessaries, and essentials are appointed by Christ, and as for other not necessarie things, above the sphere of order, he gives those reasons, which are in the wordes, largely cited. Now s. what a wretched evasion is this, that he spake not of our Ceremonies?

He spake of all not necessarie not appointed by Christ: but yet he spake not of ours.

This is as some should denye that rule which some logicians call de omni & de nullo, to holde in Ceremonies: or affirmre that to be false of English Ceremonies which is true of all Ceremonies. 2. When our Divines speake against Popish Ceremonies, the Rejoynder his ordinarie answer is, that they speake of Ceremonies held necessarie, and thersore not of suche as ours. Now when Iunius expressly speaketh of Ceremonies not necessarie, the Rejoynder conclueth, that he could not meane ours or suche like. How shoule any man speake, to put suche a Rejoynder from having some thing to speake? 3. Iunius sayd, that those Ceremonies are unlawfully appointed, which are not convenient to, or required by Order: Ergo (sayth the Rejoynder,) he could not speake of suche as ours are. And yet the same Rejoynder manuad. pag. 33, confesseth our Ceremonies to be double or treble Ceremonies and those of order, to be onely single. Neithr he ever yet finde any fit place, to shew our Ceremonies agreeable to order.

M m 2

Nay
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Nay when the Repl. by this argument, out of 1 Cor: 14.40. proved these Ceremonies unlawfull, the Rej. fled from Order, to Decency, and Edification.

And yet heer in this place, being beaten out of those coverts by judicious Iunius, he betaketh himself againe to that hal'smoon of order, which before he had quitted. 4.Iunius sayth, suche Ceremonies are rejected by Christ; Therefore (sayth the Rejoynder;) he cannot mean suche as ours. As if he should say, those that affirme our Ceremonies are rejected by Christ, cannot meane our Ceremonies. 5.Iunius speaketh of Ceremonies added to divine things: and so (by the Rejoynder his collection, not of suche as ours, because that must needs import necessitie, and worship appoxted to them. And yet both Def. and Rej. cap. 2. sect. 3. can finde out many additions to Divine things, which are intended onely for preservation of them, and therefore (by their owne judgement) must not needs import necessitie, and worship. Suche turning, winding, and running against walls, you shall seldom see an ingenuous man use in a good cause.

5. Two things yet the Rejoynder noteth in the by: 1. Iunius would not resift suche things pertinaciously, as the Repl. doeth 2. Iunius speaking against clading Gods ordinances with the garments of humane Ceremonies, had another meaning, then the Def. p. 3. Rejoynder pag. 5. where he calleth suche Ceremonies as ours, the garment of Religion: because by clothing Iunius meant adorning and hiding of nakednesse, but the Def. opposid garments to members of the bodie: and therefore the Repl.
Repl. need not by his marginall note have applied Iunius his clothing to the Def. his garment. Now for the first of these, there is difference betwixt perusing con-
tending, without reason and measure, which Iunius modestly putteth from him, and that constant resistance which he himself teacheth here in this place, where he affirmeth that Christ's sheep (even in suche Ceremoniall matter) will not nor ought to hear any voice but Christ's. For this, hee foreseeing that it would be accounted perusing, disclaimeth that, and yet doeth thoroughlie resist. So would the Rep. if he may have leave: If not, I see not why he may not doe the same thinges, though he be censured for it, as Iunius feared hee should be.

And this I may truly say, I have heard the Repl. more then once profess, that when in studying of Divinitie, he was something perplexed about Ceremonies and suche like humane institutions, by reason of some ambiguous, and ill consenting passages of some others, this one place of Iunius (so solemnely confirmed with the oath of suche a man, for his syceritie and unpartialnesse in the buisinesse, and alleging suche grave reasons for his judgement therin) did very muche affect him, and first settle his minde for suche matter. So that if he be deccyved, Iunius hath deccyved him. But he hath now morecause then before, to esteem muche of this place because, the utmost that the Rejoynder could say to it, is as good as just nothing.

As for the difference which the Rejoynder would find, betwixt that clothing of religion, which Iunius taxeth,
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taxeth, and the garments of Religion, which the Defend mainteyneth, I cannot discerne it.

For 1. If Iunius meant adorning, as the Rejoynder sayth he did, that is one office of a garment, and suche one as the Rejoynder ascribeth to Ceremonies in respect of Religion, pag.95, where is sayd that they are comely formalities, suitable to the dignitie and varietie of divine actions. 2. If Iunius meant hiding of nakedness of Religion, he meant it onely in the esteem of those which impose suche Ceremonies. And so all they that adde their Ceremonies to Religion, as usefull garments, doe seem to account it (in comparison) naked without them. 3. If the Def. meant to shew, that our Ceremonies are not essentiall limbes of the bodie of Religion, so did Iunius mean to shew, that those which adde their Ceremonies to Gods ordinances, doe pretend, they adde onely clothing, not members, to the body of Religion. NCyther is this snatching at words, as the Rejoynder termeth it. For it is, and hath beene an ordinarie commendation of Ceremonies, that they are as a garment to Religion. Whence it was that a Scottishman (as I remember) at the first comming of King Iames into England, hearing them mainteyned under that name, answered that he wondered then how Religion did live, and thrive, in the colde countrie of Scotland, without suche linfiewoollie garments?

6. Vnto this full testimonie of Iunius, the REPL added the words of Zanchie, another wittes of the Defend. His words in his epistle to Q.Elizabeth, are these
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there: the Church must be ordered by the rule of the Apostle call Church, as well in Ceremonies, as in doctrine. The rejoinder answereth that this is no more contrarie to the Def, then to Zanchie himself, acknowledging (elsewhere) some Ceremonies lawfull, which have neither commande nor testimonie of Scripture, which he would never say of doctrinals. Now 1. If it be also against Zanchie himself, yet it disableth his testimonie, for the Def. 2. This which is alledged out of him, for Ceremonies without testimonie or foundation in Scripture, hath been answered before, that it must needs be understood of particular foundation. And so he might well say the same of doctrinalls. For in this there is no difference betwixt Ceremonies, and many other things, which are not Ceremonies, and yet apperteine to Conscience. As the Apostle sayd: let all things be done comely and in order, so sayd he also: whatsoever things are venerable, or honest, just, of good report, and proper, let them be done.

All the particulars of these latter, are not Ceremonial: and yet many hundreds of suche things have no more command, or testimonie in Scripture, then the particulars of order and Deceencie: Neyther have the generalls of order and Decencie, lesse command and testimonie in Scripture then the generall of these.

His 2. answer that Zanchies comparison is to be understood of similitude, not of aequalitie, is in the former words answered.

For no disparitie can be shewed, betwixt many particulars of Doctrinall pointes, in their cases of practice
A fresh suite against Ceremonies practised, considered with all circumstances, and the particulars of Decency and Order: much less betwixt their generals. As for example it is as difficult for D. B. to fetch from any doctrine in Scripture, this particular: It is venerable, just, and of good report, for him to write such a rejoinder as he hath done, as this particular: the Cross in Baptism is orderly, decent, and to edification. I take both to be impossible. But suppose both to be probable, the former (being no Ceremony) is no more determined in Scripture, then the latter.

There hath been a fashion taken up of speaking otherwise, but no reason can be rendered of it. Let any man shew the reason, and I will yield.

The epistle out of which this quotation is, was written in deed against our Ceremonies, yet the repl. leaving to a sittier place, noted only for the present purpose, that it was written of them. But the rejoyned, being great with an observation or two, addeth about that: Moreover Zanchie when he wrote to Q. Eliz., to persuade her not to urge the Ceremonies so severely, did write at the same time to B. Jewel, that Ministers should 'rather yield to them, then leave their places; because they are not simple unlawful'.

To which I answer 1. Zanchie wrote to Q. Eliz. not only that the Ceremonies should not be so severely urged, but also that they ought not to be urged, imposed, or allowed of at all, but abolished. And of this his judgement, he gave such effectual reasons, as can never be answered. Amongst other, one is proper unto this place, and fit here to be remembered, because it over...
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throweth all that warrant which the Def. and Rejoynder have hitherto, or can heerafter plead for them, out of 1. Cor. 14. Order, Decency, Edification. These Ceremonies faith he make not for edification, but for publick dissenstion, private perturbation of conscience, with scandal of good and bad. They make not for order, but dis-order, and confusion of good Ministers with evill or Popish, who ought even in garments to differ. They make not for decency of Christ's Spouse: because they are a strange ridiculous, idolatrous, attire of this Romish whore.

2. Zancie when he writ unto B. Jewel, gave no reason of this counsel for yealding, but left them to be invented by B. Jewel. Now because those reasons of yealding were never yet made knowne, whereby the former reasons directed by Zancie against urging can possibly be overborne, I cannot otherwise thinke, but this later counsel was more out of charitie guided by humane erring prudence, then out of judgement grounded on Scripture. Howsoever our question is, not onely of yealding in case of extreame necessitie, but also of appointing and urging men to that extreame necessitie.

3. Zancie doeth not perswade to allow of these Ceremonies by subscription, or silence, but onely in extreme necessitie, to yeeld unto them, and that with Protestant. Now this was according to a kinde of charitable Pollicie, which Luther is author of about all Popish Ceremonies: de Libertate Christiana, in these words: Although we must manfully resist those Masters of traditions, and the laws of the Popes wherewith they overrun

The second part.
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the people of God are earnestly to be dispraised, yet the nimorous multitude (Where those wicked Tyrants lead captive with the same laces) must swoop till they be pl. inely laid open. Too may inveigh against the laces and law makers, but withall you may observe them with the weak, untill both they do know the Tyranny and come to understand their liberty.

But 1. what warrant have we for such a course but of Gods word? 2. Mr. Hooker. pag. 247. derideth this course, as a Theorie neyther allowable, nor any way practicable in England.

3. Our opposites, that defend, and commend the Ceremonies, as orderly decent things, tending to Edification, cannot without contradiction affront unto this counsel. D.B. in deed did formerly beginne after some manner, to put some peice of this course in practive. But the ill successe that he found in it, hath since made him, & others, keep far from that part of it, which concerns Protestant, and in stead thereof, to turne them unto Commendation. Did ever any that writ for our Ceremonies, write suche an Epistle as Zanchies, unto Queen, or Kinge? Can they lay so moche, and doe as they doe? Nay is ther any Bishop, that dare license Zanchies his Epistles, to Queene Eliz and B. It wel, both together, for to be printed in English?

These things being so, I leave it unto consideration, unto whom the Rejoynder his affected centure belongeth: Now woe sorr a good stomacke: Hee cannot resist, but hee will not yield.

Sect.
S E C T. 20. 21.

Concerning Reasons against the Negative Argument from Scripture.

1. The Def. his first reason is: Whatever is unlawful is a transgression of some law revealed in the word. Ergo against it. Ergo not onely beside it. The Repl. granteth all: and sheweth, that it is a meer fantasy, before confuted, as a cavill, in the Replie, and longe since, by Mr. Cartwrights, 2 Rep. p. 56. not agreable to the very words of the Argument, to which it is opposed. Upon this the Rejoynd. pooreth out words. He turneth head: O strange! a Babe owned from the birth, suckled by many Scriptures, an ill favoured, vexed brat, absurd, contradictory, when he is taken in a snare, he saith he is mistaken. And what reason hath he to back or bear out all these words with? If the Scriptures (sayth he) condemn what soever is done not onely against, but by the direction thereof, then doth it condemn something as unlawful for being onely beside it, and not any way against it. To which I answer, that it doth not follow: because a thing may be onely beside the word some way, and yet some way against it. Onely beside the particular prescript of it, and yet against the generall command of it.

If a Father charge his sonne, or a Master his servant, first that for a certain time, he doe nothing beside that which he shall bid him: and then commande
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him for that time, to read in a certain booke, if that sonne, or servant, shall beside reading paint amick faces in his booke, he shall doe only beside the particular commande, and yet against the generall charge, & both ways censurable. Let the rejoynder therefore spare his words, and see better to his Argument, or rather eat both, that others be not troubled with them.

2. The second reason, brought by the Def. was: Nothing that is indifferent, can be pronounced simplicem laudandum. But some Ceremonies of mans invention are indifferent. Ergo, nec to be pronounced simplicem unlawfull. All which is granted of circumstances of Order, if by invention, be meant determination; otherwise, the Assumption is denied. Though it was added also (ex superabundante) that things indifferent are sometime taken to generally, that in that sense, the proposition may be denied. Against this, I cannot discern, what materiall thing is rejoyned. He sayth, that it is easy to say the Assumption is false, and not to shew wherein. But I have hitherto thought that it is sufficient for answer to any Argument, to deny the Assumption, until it be proved: and that the falsity of any sentence, doth consist in this, that it pronounce otherwise then the thing is, and therefore in saying an assumption is false, it is not necefull, to shew wherein.

He sayth also that the largest sense of things indifferent, doeth make, no variation of things indifferent. But the Author, and place, was named to him: Sopinguus in his Apologue ad lib. Anonym. p.166. Where the case is very pertinent. For Doctor Sibrandus was challenged by
by a Remonstrant, who intituled his book, Bona Sides Siblandi, that as in an Epistle Dedicatory to the Arche-
Bishop of Canterbury, he had, to winne his favour the-
more against Vorstius, and his, declared his judgement
of the Hierarchie (and Ceremonies) of England, to be
things indifferent, so he spake of the Magistrates power,
under the same terme unfitly, Sopinicus, a godly
learned man, whose had bee a Scholler under Sibrandus,
and so desired to help him out of this brier, had no
other way to doe it, but by saying that all those things
are sometime called indifferent, which are not necessarie
to salvation, or without which a man may be saved.

Now in this sense, the Repl. sayd, the proposition
might be denied: viz, that nothing indifferent i.e. not
necessarie to salvation, is unlawfull. The Rejoynder (it
seemeth) had not the booke, and so ventured to contra-
dict he knew not what.

3. The third argument was: There must needs all-
ways be varietie of Ceremonies in Severall Churches. Ergo
all are not prescribed.

The Repl. answereth, that ther neyther need, nor
ought to be any varietie, but onely in particular circum-
stances of order, for time and place etc. Here the Rej.
(complayning of Colesorts, and is not caring to say any
things, so is he in opposition) bringeth in to the contrarie
some examples of civill decencie, variable according to
times and places. But all suche things the Repl. con-
teyned in his etc. He addeth also varietie of solemn feasts
But before those can have place here, it must be pro-
ved, that suche feasts must needs be. But (sayth he) never
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any Divine so spake before Mr. Jacob. And hath he soon forgotten, what was even now recited by himself out of
Jn. 11? Suche kinde of rejoyners will neverbe wanting.

4. The Def. his fourth reason was, that the Non.
conformists like well, that every Minister in his Parish, should
determine of Rites and Orders: Whence would follow varie-
tie. Ergo they holde some rites of humane invention and or-
dination, lawfull.

To this the rejoynder addeth, as an explication in
text, and table, that Non-Conformists set up Parish-om-
nipotence without reference to Bishops, as some teache, or to
Synods, as other. Wherby a Minister, and some of his Parish-
ioners, may ordayne some Rites and Ceremonies for their use,
and the King, and Church, under his authoritie may not.
Now before we come to the Repl. his answers unto the
Def. his reason, let us consider a little the Rejoynder his
addition. 1. The malignant imputation of Parish omni-
potencie, ill becometh our Opposites, except that they
can shew, more power to be given by us unto Ministers
and Elders, in their severall Congregations, then by
them is given to Bishops. For untill they can shew this
(which they are as able to doe, as to call effectuallly that
which is not, as if it were) in accusing us, of setting up
Parish-omnipotence, they confesse themselves, to set up
Diocesan omnipotence, Convocation-omnipotence, etc.

2. It wotse becometh D. B. then most other, ex-
cept he wil confesse, that he, when he was Minister at
the Haagh, in Holland, and with the consent of his peo-
ple, ordered thinges in that Congregation, as to re-
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(eyre the Communion sitting at the table, to leave out the Cross in Baptisme, and Surplice in all Divine service) did then and there set up Parish omnipotencia. 3. It is an injuri, more then ordinarie, to make us (any way) extoll the authority of a Minister, above the authoritie of the King, in any matter of appointing and ordaining. For though a Minister may doe something in his administration, which no other man can lawfully doe, yet none of us ever thought, that he may appoint and ordayne anything to be done, with coercive authoritie, which the King may doe, in all things lawfull, and convenient, even in Churche affairs. So that our tenent is, that the Minister, and his people, may use no Ceremony, nor exercise any publicke set of worship, which the King may not appoint, commanded, and compell them to. For in holding that no suche thinge is to be done, beside that which Christ hath appointed, and that the King may, and ought to see that all Christs institutions be observed, we must needs be confess'd to hold that assertion, which is the conclusion of these two. 4. The fallacious ground of this accusation is, that the Minister with his people, may occasionally order some things, which no man absent can, not for want of authoritie, but for want of presence to observe the occasion; as what time the Churche meeting shall beginne, upon that day, that the Communion is to be administr'd, together with Baptisme, and other busines, more then ordinarie. 5. That which he intermixeth, of reference to Bishops, bringeth all the Churches of France, Netherlands, etc. under his Censoriall note, of Parish omnipotencia. Thus
Thus much for the Rejoynder apart. Now to the Def. 1. His Argument is rejected, as supposing, all circumstances to be of like nature with these in controversy. No (sayth the Rejoynder) but one that one would like one thing, and one another. But I say yes, or else he cannot argue from one to the other. For what consequence is in this: Men may determine of simple circumstances for order and decency: Ergo they may ordain double, treble, sacred, significant Ceremonies proper to Religion? besides he nameth in his supposition Festivall days.

2. The second fault, found in the Def. his argument was, it supposeth all circumstances to be of institution. No, sayth the Rejoynder againe. Let him therefore put ordaining out of the Summe which he hath made of the Def. his reason, and confess also, that this reason maketh nothing for mens instituting of Ceremonies.

3. The third was, it supposeth contrarie circumstances, ceremoniously to be practisde by the same men as of institution. Not so (sayth the Rejoynder); but cery contrarie fashions practisde by severall men, out of their election. Yet it seemeth to be for the most part so; because the question is of Ceremonies, and Ceremonious practicing, not of incidentall fashions. Of institution, which the Def. calleth ordeynings, not of voluntarie occasional election. If by curitie of observing Festivall days, and not observing them, was by the Def. understood of severall men, then in that part he was misunderstood by the Repl. Now upon these premises, the
the Rejoynder concludeth all the Repl. his answer to be nothing but bogling and scurrilitie. What would he have sayd, if one had accused him of setting up Diocesan, and Convocation omnipotence.

It seemeth that (though he aboundeth in that facultie) he would have wanted reproachesfull words, to express his indignation of suche an imputation.

5. In opposition to this mishapen Argument of the Def. taken from Non-conformists confession, the Rep. propounded one, from the Conformists confession: You say these Ceremonies are Divine, and yet dare not denie, but the rejecting of them in other Churches, is Divine.

You retayne these Ceremonies as Divine, and yet reject other Ceremonies, of like nature, as divine as these. What divinitie (or agreement) is in suche courses? To this, the Rejoynder answereth, that this argueth an ill conscience: because the Def. doeth not say that these our Ceremonies are Divine, but that in respect of permisive appointment, and in these, they are divine, in particular, r, and hypothesis, humane. And this may be sayd of the different Ceremonies of several Churches. For ill Conscience, I will not be so liberall in charging the Rejoynder as hee is prodigall of it toward the Repl. But ill Science I can easily prove. For r. He denieth the Def. to call our Ceremonies Divine: because (forsooth) he calleth them so in the generall, and not in their speciall: for so the Def. doeth interpret his owne termes.

Which is as muche as to say, he that doeth not call
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them
them every way Divine, doeth not call them Divine.

2. He passeth by the mayne termes of our Argument Divine, rejecting of the same Ceremonies in other Churches, Rejecting of other Ceremonies, as Divine as these in our Churches, and for these he putteth onely, different divine Ceremonies in several Churches. This sure is no scientifical kind of answer. 3. No Divinitie will suffer any thing to be called Divine, but that which (all circumstances considered) may at least necessarily be concluded out of the Divine law. Otherwise all good humane laws may be called Divine laws. Now wee have hitherto expected in vayne, when our Ceremonies may be so concluded.

It is altogether impossible, that the institution, and Rejection, of Cross, and Surplice, in divers places, should be both Divine, or that the urging of these, and abolishing of Images, should be Divine, in the same place, and time. This part therfore of the Argument, the rejoynder thought good, to answer with silence.
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SECT. 22.

Concerning the Assumption, of the maine Argument, handled in this Chapter.

1. The Repl. set downe the Def. his plea, with a generall answer thus: After all this adoe about the Proposition of the first Argument, Now we are tolde of an Assumtiō, out of the Abridgement, and Mr.Hy: viz: that Ceremonies have no warrant out of the word of God being humane inventions, For Mr. Hy: I cannot say muche (because his reasons are not in printe) but for the Authors of the Abridgement, they have great wronge done them. Whosoever will turne to the place quoted by the Def.in the Abridgement, shall see, that the words which our Def. hath turned into a Proposition, are there but part of an illustration, belonging to this proposition: All Ceremonies that swerve from the Rules given in the Word, for the Churches direction, in matters of Ceremonies, are unlawfull. The Assumption of which is: But the Ceremonies in question, doe swerve from those Rules. Now all this chiefly, both of Proposition, and Assumption, is by the Def. omitted: A by thinges is put in place of the Proposition. A new assumption is formed: and yet all fathered upon the Abridgement. What hath the Rejoynder to say against all this? 1. This demurrer should have come in at the first. But first, or last, if
A fresh suite against Ceremonies. if it be true which here sayd, the Def. cannot be defended.

2. The Repl. granted the whole Argument, sect. 2. In saying (forsooth,) that he took for granted, whatsoever was there sayd for the all-sufficiencie of Scripture.

3. This of itself, is an Argument against our Ceremonies. What then? the Authors of the Abridgement, may yet have wronge, if it be made theirs, against their will. 4. It is fit to be the first Argument, because if this be granted, all other rules are void. The question is nowhere of fitness for place, but of fitting it to the Abridgement. Yet this whole Argument being granted (according to our meaning) of those that the Rejoynder calleth double triple Ceremonies, the Rules have use about single ones.

5. The Proposition is taken out of the Abridgement, pag. 44, and the Assumption is fitted to it. Let it be so, yet if that be made a proposition of theirs, which onely was an illustration, or confirmation of their proposition, and (a new assumption fitted unto it according to an adversaries pleasure) the whole argument gathered upon them, as a first and chief one, this surely cannot be excused from wrong doing.

2. To the Def. his answer unto the Assumption, viz. that in generall and permisive appointment, our Ceremonies are (not humane but) Divine, the Repl. sayd that he understood not a permisive appointment, to be other then an appointment without appointment; because to permit, is nether to command or appointe, nor forbid.

Here the Rejoynder amongst many shrewd wordes, hath
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 hath this reason that the same things are commanded, in general, but in particular are one, permitted. And for ignorance of this, he writeth the Repl. with want of logicke, but I cannot yet see, out of any logick how a general can be commanded, generally, and any true special or particular of it be only permitted. He that commandeth all order and comeliness, commandeth also every special of it. Every general command, applied unto his true special subject, maketh that specially commanded.

It is commanded in general that every husband should love his wife, not in special, that Aquila should love Priscilla: yet suppose Priscilla to be Aquila his wife, she may chalenge conjugal love, all so well as if her name had been in that Command in special. Else we may as well say, that superstition, will-worship, or at least disorder, to which order is opposed, is forbidden in general, but some specials of them or it, are only permitted. The truth is, Cross and Surplice, cannot with any shew of reason, or common sense, be said to be commanded in general, any more then in special, nor yet permitted, either in special or in general. The Rejoynder hath yet found no fit place, to prove the commande though it mainly concerneth his cause, and of it self alone might satisfie any mans conscience, if it could be proved, and the permission is the maine question of this whole Dispute.

Chapter
Chapter second, Concerning worship.

All the materiall doctrine of this Chapter is before discussed, in the Manuduction, sect. 5, 6, 7. Where the nature, distinctions, and differences of worship, are weighed, and found of no moment for our Ceremonies aide. It shall suffice therefore here, to referre the Reader unto those places, adding onely some notes, upon some passages, formerly not declared.

Sect. 1.

Concerning worship, distinguished into proper, or essentiall, and unproper, or accidentall.

1. The Def. sayth, that by proper and essentiall worship, he understood Ceremonies so necessarily required to Gods service, as that the contrarie therof must needs displease him.

Hereupon the Repl. inferred, that all Ceremonies, which serve for decence, and edification, must needs be proper and essentiall worship: because the contrarie of decence and edification must needs displease God, in his worship.

Marke now the Rejoynder his answer: The contrary of
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Of decence and edification displeaseth God. But the contrariety of particular Rites, serving to decence and edification, do not displease him: because they fall into one and the same generall kind, without contrariety thereof, or therein. 

As fire & water are not contrarie to an elements, nor blacke and white, so is it not reasonable, and unreasonnable, to a creature: so contrarie orders, contrarie formalities of decence, and contrarie means of edification, are not contrarie to order, decence and edification. All this answer dependeth upon a distinction betwixt generall, and special.

Now 1. This is a certain, infallible rule: what essence soever is founde in any generall, that must needs be in every speciall, conteyned under it. Ther is no essence in an element generally taken, which is not both in the fire, and water, none in colour so taken, but is both in blacke and white, none in the notion of a creature, which is not in man and beast. From hence thencefore it necessarily followeth, that if order and decence in generall, be essentiall worship, every true speciall of them must needs be so.

2. It is not of, or for nothing, that the Rejoynder doeth so waver in his speache: contrarie Ceremonies, serving to comeliness, and edification, contrarie of orders, contrarie of formalities of comeliness, and means of edification. For this meanes, all his answer is at least put out of comely order serving to edification. For that which serves to comeliness, and order, all formalities of them, and all means are not specialls, under the genus or generall of decence, order, edification, but under the generall of
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of meanes, formalities, etc. So that the whole distinction is confounded, by this wordy explication of it. 3. Contrarieties of orders he confesseth, and yet denieth them to be contrarie to Order: As if order contrarie to order, were not contrarie to order! He will say no, not to order in general. But then that order in speciall, must have some specificall difference, not conteyned in the generall of order, making the contrarieties: which should (if it could) have been declared. By the same proportion, also as he acknowledgeth contrarie orders, he must also acknowledge contrarie decencies, and edifications: and this hath need of declaration, because it is a new inventio, not to be trusted, before it be tried. 4. By order, in this place, must needs be meant good order, otherwise, it were as well order, to set the carte before the horse, as the horse before the carte. Now in good order, the things ordered may be someway contrarie, as blacke and white horse set before the carte: and yet the order one and the same: and so in decencie. Edification is only an ende. But good order, and decencie of the same things, in their particular or inviduall use, can be no more contrarie to any good order, & decencie of the same things in the same use, the black to black & white to white. 5. The playne truth is, that order and Decencie (as they pertaine to our question) doe arise out of the outward disposition and temper of things, as health doeth out of the inward disposition and temper of the body, and therefore doeth admit no more contrariety, then good health doeth.

2. Because the Def. in his distinction, placed Edi
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ration onely on the part of Accidental worship, that was noted as a flaw. To which the Rejoynder answereth, that essential parts of worship serve also to edification, and worship of themselves. But this can be no more gathered out of the Def.'s words, than that all essential worship serveth for decency: for he placeth these two together, as ends of accidental parts of worship, that they serve for decorum, and edification. This is but to help a broken legge, with a broken crutche. For essential worship tending to worship of itself, is as broken a phrase, as the former was a distinction.

3. It was noted also, that the Def. confounded appurtenances, and parts of worship. The Rejoynder answereth, that those things which are appurtenances onely in proper, simple, and strict sense, are parts of worship improperly, and in a sorte. So in deed at the Universitie, amonge Sophisters imprropriè, laxè, modo quodam, quodammodo, are wont to helpe at a dead lift. But that which is onely an appurtenance of worship, is no more worship, then a Bishops Rochet, is a Bishop.

4. About the same distinction, a question was made how any worship can be not essential, that is, not having the essence of worship in it. The Rejoynder answereth, that these appurtenances have in them the essence of accidental worship, but not the essence of substantiall. So then, they are essential accidental worship: and why not as well substantiall accidental? A Rochet hath no more in it the essence, then the substance, of an accidental Bishop.

5. The Repl. his last was, that those which the Def.
A fresh suit against Ceremonies: call'd accidentall parts of worship, have not (by his owne expresse confession, in this sect.) so muche communion with the essentiale, as the haire of the body (which is but an excrement) hath with the body, and therefore cannot be accounted a part of worship. The Rej. here. 1. answereth, that they are in deed no part of essentiale worship, but of the complement of worship, as garments are of mens externall honour. So that now we are come to have that express'd, which before was implied, the Ceremonies may be called worship, as a Bishops Rochet, or other Bishoply garment may be called a Bishop. Though it might be also further inquired, if Ceremonies be parts of the complement, what the other parts of that complement may bee? Certes he that divided worship into essentiaall and accidentall parts, did not mean worship, and the complements of worship, muche lesse parts of essentiaall worship, and parts of complement. If he did, his speache, and meaning, doth not well agree together. 2. He taketh great exception against the terme of excrement, as not well appliable to the haires boast, favouring of a spirit full of rancour, to be judged of God as a reproch, tending to breed scorne and atheism of these Ceremonies, in the mindes of ignorant men. At all which a man might have laughed, if Gods name had been spared, in so frivoulous a matter. All Philosophers, that ever I heard, or read, heathen, and Christian, call and define the haires of mens bodies, an excrement. All Divines, when they speak of hypocrites in the Church, compare the to the haires of a mans body, under the terme of excrement. I thencefore would not be loath to hear one call
A fresh suit against Ceremonies. the hay of my beard, an excrement. Neither can I smell any savour of a rancorous spirit, or any reproach, in that phrase. As for breeding of scorne in the minds of ignorant men, one would thinke, it should not be objected by him, that a little before, Spake of Parish-omnipotence, and stuffeth his booke with suche termes, as I am loath (for his sake) to repeate, but that they cannot be more gently refuted, then by bare repeting, after the occasion of them is discussed.

SECT. 2.
Concerning adding to Gods worship.

In the second section, the Rejoynder hath nothing materially, to be newly, or now first confuted, save onely that about adding to Gods word, and worship: which onely thencefore, needeth here to be discus-

* 1. Gods lawes of Premunire, against all humane presumptions, in his Worship, are famoulsly known. Deut.4, and 12. Thou shalt not adde any thing thereto. No man ever writ one shet of paper against Popish Ceremonies, which did not confute them by these places. The Papists have marked this: *Heredis accusantes Ceremonias sunt non institutas, superstitionis, & idolatriae, fundamenta precipue in Deut. 12. Suarez de Relig. vol. 1, lib. 2, cap. 1. The Def. and the Rejoynder their answer, is the same, that most Papists use. In these places, where*
addition is forbidden, is meant only addition of corruption, not any addition of preservation and additions made divine, not humane. Now 1. for the first part of the first distinction, God forbiddeth only an addition of corruption. It is worth the considering, which learned Chamier answereth, The bringing in of a Contrarie precept is neither used for, nor can be called Addition, for in Addition both remaine, but contraries destroy each other. He that setteth a house on fire, or pouleth a man, or corrupteth any thing, is not usually layd to adde unto them. 2. By the second distinction, no addition unto Gods will and testament, is more forbidden, then unto mans. As it were a sinne to adde any thing unto Gods Testament as divine, so also were it to adde any thing unto mans testament, or testimonie, and make it his, when it is not his. None may add any thing to D. M. his Defense, or D. B. his Rejoynder, and make it theirs, when it is not theirs. Suche additions, are usually called yes, sufficiently forbidden by the ninth Commandement: so that no indifferent man will thinke, that nothing more is contained in these prohibitions, so often and earnestly urged, in strict reference unto the holy ordinances, and worship of God, which by this interpretation, can challenge no privilege from them.

2. For the second part of these distinctions: humane additions of preservation, the Repl. observed, that addition was, in the text, expressly forbidden, as a means of keeping or preserving Gods word, and worship: Deut. 4.2. To which it seemeth a contradiction, that addition may be for keeping, or preserving. To which the Rejoynder
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joynder answere nothing else, but that, therefore addition be forbidden, but not addition keeping. That is, he denieth the conclusion, but answere not to the proof. But he addeth an example: He is not sues that leaves a jewel to be safely kept, doth not forbid the provision of a Cabinet, with locke and key, to keep it in. True: Neither doeth any man dreame, but the Kinges authority, and Churches care, may, and ought to be as a Cabinet with locke, and key, to preserve Gods ordinances and worship. But what is this to additions? and to suche additions, as our Ceremonies in question? The Lords ordinance is, that the Sacrament of Circumcision should cease. For the preservation of this ordinance, the Def. and Rejoynder pag. 285, provide a lawfull Cabinet, under locke and key, that Circumcision as it is used in some places, may be lawfully appointed, and commanded. The Lords ordinance is, that Baptisme should be administered according to the primitive institution, without suche sacrilegious crossings, as are in use among Papists. They have provided a Cabinet, under locke and key, for this, that all which are baptized shall be crossed. The Lords will is, that his holy supper should be receyved, and used as a supper, notadored.

They have provided, that all men shall kneel in the receyving of it, for a Cabinet, like to the former.

3. Cardinal Cajetans interpretation, was (by the Repl.) alleged addition is forbidden even with the pretext of keeping the commandments of God, as more judicious, and religious. The Rej. answere, that Cajetan doeth allow
allow the distinction of additions, into corruptive, and
preservative, in Thom. p. 3.q.6.a 8. and that in the alleg
ged wordes, meaneth additions corrupting, though pre
tended for keeping. Now this is as true an interpretation
of Cajetan's meaning, and ours also, as can be invented:
onely that is wanting, which Cajetan (with us) inten
ded, that all additions for preservation, are but pretense.
But as for Cajetan his allowing this questioned distinc
tion in 3.q.60. (for 6. was an error) whosoever will
looke upon the places, shall finde, that nether in Tho
mas, not in Cajetan, is any mention of addition preser
vving, which here is the onely question. They speak in
deed of adding words, to the forme used in Baptisme,
and note, some words doe corrupt the sense, and some
doe not: but not a word of adding Ceremonies prese
rative. The wordy additions, which they speak of, are
as Thomas hath it, I Baptize thee in the name of the
Father, the Sonne, the Holy Ghost, (and the Virgin
Marie:) or as Cajetan hath it: I Baptize thee (Sexton
What is a clocke) in the name of the Father, the Sonne,
and the Holy Ghost. If these be additions of preservation
let any Chitian, that regardeth Baptisme, judge.

4. It was wished, that the Def. had set downe some
examples, of preservative additions. The Rejoynden
undertaking it for him, nameth for the Text divers
readings, marginall notes, etc. and for the sense, interline
glosses, notes, marginall references, and commentaries, and
then readings by sections, building and ordering of Syna
gogues, and a thousand such. And in deed he might as
well name diverse thousands, as these. But if to man
thoufan
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Thousand Ceremonies may be added lawfully to Gods law, what meant Augustine, and all our Divines, out of him, to complaine of suche an intollerable buershen of Ceremonies, in regard of their number. 2. Diverse readings, are no more additions, then Coningstable and Constable, are to the Statute of Constables. Marginall notes, no more, then an exposition is to the text, which kinde of addition, the Papists doe wickedly allege for their doctrinall traditions. Interlinearie glosses, notes marginall references Commentaries of the same nature. Reading by sections, building, and ordering, are evidently thinges of meer order, of which, if any man shall say they are additions, then if he be a poor man, he may make great addition to the littemony he hath, by dividing it into sections, placing it shyly, and disposing of it orderly a hundered ways, to the increase (as it were) of a hundered folde: which would be a welcome doctrine (if it were true) to many a poor man, and even to those which are impoverished by the Bishops silencings, deprivations, and excommunications, for not allowing of additions to Gods worship.

5. It was also justly questioned, if ther were not deminution, or taking from, for preservation, as well an addition of that kinde: because in the Text they are joined together, as drawing in one yoke? The Re-ponderanswereth no. And denyeth the consequence, by example of hardning, and shewing mercy, joined together, without the same mortigious cause. But the example both not agree: because the question was not of a mortigious cause, but of a finall. And in the cheif or last
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Last end hardning, & shewing mercie doe agree. I can easily finde out a detraction, as of good preservation, the addition of a Cabinet with locke and key.

For from a sword, or any other yron weapon, a man may well detraet rust, for the preservation of it. From a aguish man, blood may be detraeted, for the preservation of his life; may sometime a leg, or an arme, may be cutte off, for preservation of the bodie. So that, all things considered, the Rejoynder will upon second thoughts, either cashier in Gods worship, his addition of preservation, or else adde unto it, a detraction or diminution of preservation. Calvin in his nineteenth lection upon Deutrinomie, hath this remarkable sentence.

Let us assure ourselves, we shall ever be unruly and wilful, headed, untill our Lord hath tamed us, by long handling, as made us sticke to this grounde, that it is no more lawfull for us, in any wise, to add any thinge to his law, then it is lawfull for us, to take any thinge from it.

6. It was likewise observed, that this pretence hath been allways the shoeing-horne, to draw on superstition with. For (as Calvin noteeth on Matt.) Legislatoris ipsi non jactabant, se novum quicquid trader sed tantum adiere caviendi formulas, quae medias offere adniciula, ad servandam Dei legem. The olde Maisters Ceremonies pretended always, that they meant onel to bringe-in additions of preservation. Like enong (sayth the Rejoynder:) But this very inlets of superfluous thinges, under the presence of bringing in onely preservation, doeth witness, that suche additions as are pr
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Tis true, were all ways allowed by God's people, as confirmation of error by Scripture, doth show the dignity of Holy Scripture. This is indeed as faire a prætence, for an inlet of superstition, as can be made. But withall it is manifest from thence, that is is no sufficient, but a very suspicious answer, for Ceremonies, accused of superstition, to say, and not to prove, that they are preservations. Yet these Ceremonie-mongers had all their pretense properly from means of preservation, which are and were always allowed by God, and his people, not from additions.

Our Parliament statutes made for establishing of true religion, are a means of preserving it in England: but I think that Hon. Assemblie would take it ill, if the Rej. should publish to the world, that their Laws are additions to the word, and worship of God.

The Rejoynder addeth, that Calvin in the place alleged, doth account these pretended additions to have been corruptions, from the first. Now (though this is not soer, but in another place, after to be handled) let the Reader gesse of Calvins account, by these his words: afterward there came teachers who did not think themselves should be esteemed acute enough, unless they did patch something of their owne to the word of God. Yet no addition so that word is tolerable. Those secondary laws are devised of curious men, as if the single and simple command of God were not enough. To invent new washings was an idle vanity. Had they rested in the law of God, their modesty would have been more pleasing to him, then their Scrupulous anxiety in doing otherwise.
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If this be not enough, to shew Calvin's judgement, of Ceremonious additions, let that be added, which he saith to Cassander, and therefore to the Def. and Rejoynder teaching the very same doctrine of Ceremonies, that Cassander did. Opusc. pag. 355. He taught that the Ceremonies ordained by Christ are to be kept entirely, and incorruptly: and nothing must be added to their institution, as if they were lame or imperfect, which indeed is something, but it is not all, because by an indirect shift he would let into the church all other rites. But this half truth is overturned, when he believes a right given to the Apostles and their Successors, to institute such ceremonies in the administration of the Sacraments which may be for ornament. Therefore he which confessed before nothing should be added, doeth now not only admit such by Ceremonies, but also commands them. Yet will he help himself with a subtil shift, viz., additions are to be induced, if the Sacraments be not held lame or imperfect; therefore with what mixtures you will, the Sacraments may be wholly changed, and yet all be well, so be you charg'd Christ to his teeth, that any of his institutions be lame, and halting etc.

7. It was lastly added, that this answer of the Def. was Bellarmin's answer to Calvin, about this very point and place: de effect Sacr. lib. 2. Cap. 32. 1 prohibet Dominus additionem corruptissimam, as the Def. translateth it, an addition of corruption is forbidden. Which was the rather added, because the Def. had so vainly objected unto the authors
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Authors of the Abridgement, symbolizing with Bellamine. It might otherwise have been added, that it is not only Bellamines answer, but also Gregories de Valentina, tom. iv. disp. 6. q. 11. p. 1. et tom. 3. disp. 6. q. 2. p. 7. Suarez, de Relig. vol. 1. lib. 2. cap. 1. Baronius, ad an 33. p. 459. and that it is the common answer of Papists, in defense of their Ceremonies against this place, urged upon them by our Divines. Yet some few stating the vanitie of this answer, as being ashamed of it, have found out another, of like stamp: For Cornelius a Lapide, in his Commentarie on Deut. 12, 32, so expoundeth the wordes of this prohibition: In rebus & Ceremoniis Dei, sic tantum illud, quod Deus vel per se, vel per vicarios suos, puta sa. erodes praeceperit. Which agreeth well with that of the Deists and Rejoynder. Vse those Ceremonies onely, which God, either by himself, or by the Convocation house doth command. And some more ancient, and therefore lesse prejudiced Papists, confess, this law did forbid all humane Ceremonies to the lews. So Toftatus, Defensorij par. 2. cap. 8. as also in Deut. 12. q. 12. that consequence is found among the Hebrewes about the observation of Ceremonials. Something is not found written in the law, therefore the lews are not bound to keepe that. Yea, which is more, it was not lawfull for the lews to observe any Ceremonie about the service of God, unlese that were written in the law as appears Deut. 12.

The Rejoynder hath many wordes, wherewith he raiseth up a great dust, to darken the cause with all. But
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But no man can discern any direct answer of his to the allegation, save only his confession, that the Dei, his answer, was L'Eclairante's answer to Calvin's, about this very place. All that he addeth to that confession, hath been before confused. It shall be sufficient in this place, to set downe Calvin's resolute conclusion, out of Sermon 85. in Deut. It is diabolic blasphemie, to say, that God hath not taught men all that it behooveth them to doe. The common by-word here hath place: thou art the Diuels servant: for thou hast done more than was commanded thee. Here is no limitation, of new worships properly so called, which is the Rejoynders shift, but all that it behooveth us to doe, is limitted to God's command.

In the fourth section, about Isa. 29. Mat. 15. Col. 2.27 hath nothing materiall in it, beside those distinctions of worship, which before in the Manduction, section 5.6 and 7. are distinctly examined, and discussed. To those places therefore I refer the Reader, for satisfaction, if there be any needfull.
A fresh suite against Ceremonies: 125

Sect. 6.

Concerning our Divines judgement about Ceremonious Worship invented by man.

Though those three staple sections of the manuduction. 5. 6. 7. may be sufficient also for clearing of all the materials here extant, yet referring the Reader thither for the maine, I must add something about diverse particulars.

1. The Repliuer sayd, that Worship doeth not vary according to men's opinions, but consistseth in the nature of the action it self. This is (sayeth the Rej.) to speake monsters, if he had sayd, things to him unknown; it had been enough. For all that he hath not known, are not monsters. But what is his reason of this so deep a censure? Because (forsooth) opinion, by error of opinion, doeth make that to be essentially false worship, which without such opinion, were no such worship. Of which I may as well say, that this opinion, by error of opinion, doeth make the reason essentially false. For 1. the question was not here of essentially false worship, but of essentially, and accidental worship, whether opinion did make the difference? which the Def. affirmeth, the Repl. denieth, and the Rejoynd. declineth. 2. The Rejoynder hath not yet (that I know of) nor can (as I thinke) define unto us, what is essentially false worship, according to his rules.

Qq 3 3. Every
Every error of opinion doeth not make essential false worship: he should therefore have told us, what error he meant. The Dec. nameth opinion of justice, sanctity, efficacie, or divine necessitie: and the Rejoynder mentioneth often suche and such opinion, held of the Papists, concerning all their Ceremonies. Of this enough is sayd, Manud. sect. 7. For the present, I deny, that suche an erroneous opinion, by itself, and of itself, doeth not make essential false worship. Opinion is but an adjuvant, efficient cause of that affective act, wherein the essence of internall worship consisteth: and the externall acts of worship, though efficiently differenced by opinion, or faith, are essentially distinguished by their forme, and ende. A man may have an opinion, that is just, holy, efficacious, and necessarie, to performe diverse works of the second Table, nay upon some occasions, to tell a lie, even against the second Table. Yet none speaking properly, will call, that essential false worship, which is a sinne directly against the first Table. Hitherto therefore, I see no monster of the Repl. his making. And if we consider his reason well, which the Rejoynder made to it, the mishaping of things will be found on the other side. If (sayth the Repl.) worship did varie according unto mens opinions, then a man may goe to Masse, conceyving another privat opinion to himself, then Mas-mongers use to have: and our Convocation may appoint us the grossest of all Popish Ceremonies, if they set another opinion upon it. The Rejoynder his answers are diverse, and some of them strange ones. 1. His first is, that going to masse may be a sinne
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some of scandal and presumption, though a man go not thither to worship. By going to masse (according to the use of our speech) is meant, doing all those external actions, which Mas-mongers use to performe. Now the question is, whether he that performeth all those external actions (intending only to save his life thereby, as having no opinion of any other good in so doing, doeth only sinne a sinne of scandal, and presumption, or else over and beside this, is guiltie of external false worship? the rejoynnder seemeth to say, no, he is not guiltie of false worship. But when the Christians of the Primitive Church, did with suche an opinion, lay but a little incense upon the Heathens Altars, they were by all Orthodoxe censured for idolatrie. The storie of Origen is well known, how he delivered Palme, to those that offered it to the image of Serapis, with this expression of his intention: come, and receive the bow, not of the image, but of Christ. Yet was he therefor censured as a worshipper of that Idol. Calvin writing of purpose concerning this very case, of going to masse with suche an opinion, accuseth them that doe so, of external professed idolatrie: and therein was justified by Melanchton, Bucer, Martyr, Opus de vitandis superstiti. And if this be not right, then all external acts, and reall professions, whether symbolizing with Papists, or with Turkes, or Heathens, may be in themselves, (let scandal and danger aside) easily excused. So Calvin argueth, in the forenamed treatise and in a Homilie, Opus, pag. 532. he sheweth, that those wise men which thinke otherwise, would have desided the simplicitie of Sidrac.
drac. Misach, and Abednego, if they had then lived, in such a fashion: Miserable men, how may doe that external act which is required of you: it is no worship, so long as you have no faith, trust, or devotion to that idol. 2. His second answer is that those which are present at false worship by violence, are not false worshipers, and upon this he triumpheth, with sic man, sic. I may better say, a'as a's, th good D. B. (I speak as I think) should be driven to such extremities, in defense of those Ceremonies which he never loved, nor doeth at this day. For going to Masse, or doing all those external acts, which Mamonsters use to performe, implieth more then viole carying thither, and deteyning there. 3. His third is, that nothing but opinion doeth make humane inventions essential worship of God. Which is an essentiaull denying of th conclusion. 4. For that which was inferred of the Con vocation house, he sayth first, it is a stinge. Let it be so, yet may hit that Ceremonious Goliah, as it is suche, in thfore head. He addeth, that the grossest rites of Poperie cannot possibly be washed from their opinion. Which is no for a Rite, being an external thing or act, any Rite may be separated from any internal opinion. The last is that some other Popish rites might be lawfull, if they could be cleansing, though we need them not. As if the grossest might not be lawfull, if they could be cleansing, or the Rejoyn der had shewed that we more need the Cross, the those other.

3. Because the Def. placed so muche in opinions sanctifie, the Repl. in the second place, opposed, the Sanctifie cannot be separated from suche Ceremonies.
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as are proper unto Religion, only used in the solemn worship of God: because they are neither civil, nor profane, and therefore holy. Heer the Rejoynder being put to his shiffts, as before, answereth that they are in deed holy by application, but not with inherent, or adherent holiness in them, or their use as those which God hath sanctified, nor so as they sanctifie the actions, and actions, which is proper to Gods ordinances. Now how many strange things are here? 1. That Ceremonie, whole essence consisteth in application and use, is holy by application, and yet not by any holinesse that doeth adhere to them, or their use. Holiness is an adjunct received by the thing that is holy, and therefore either inherent, or adherent.

2. Is this a good reason? They are not holy truly, as Gods ordinances, therefore they are not by men made holy? 3. Have any outward ordinances of God inherent holinesse in them? 4. If God hath no way sanctified our Ceremonies, who can make them holy? 5. Do not Ceremonies teaching holiness, sanctifie the actions, actions or spectators, after the same manner, that the teaching word doeth sanctifie them?

3. Upon occasion of the other part, in the Def. his distinction, (that Accidentall worship is any rite, which serveth for the more consonant, and convenient discharge of essentiall worship,) the Repl. wheres he might have sayd, that this is a mishapen definition of Accidentall worship in generall, as it may be divided into true and false, good, and bad, opposeth onely this: that no judicious Divine useth to call circumstances of mere order and decencie, (which notwithstanding

The second part.
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Serve for the more consonant and convenient discharge of essential worship) that is a Pulpit, a Table, a fair Cloath, etc. Worship.

The Rejoynder answereth, that in deed, the Ceremonies themselves cannot be called worship without madly, but only the use and application of suche circumstances, rites. Now 1. marke here, how the Rejoynder who doth a Ceremonie, it is an action etc. and laffeth at the Repl. (because he sayd, some Ceremonies may be to other good use, as if all Surplices were turned in poor folkses under-garments) as if the good wife of Ffils had burnt a Ceremonie, whether she burnt a Surplice in her own marke (I say) that this same Rejoynder doth distinguish Ceremonies from their use and application. 2. Wheresoever was so mad (because it pleaseth him to use the terme) as to say, that standing in a Pulpit, the better be heard (which is all the use of it) is to be called worship? 3. Crossing with suche expression of the signification thereof, as is used in Baptisme, can nyther be distinguished from the use of a Crosse, nor xalled the use of a pulpit, not yet lawfully styled true worship without a spice of one disease or other.

4. The first witness brought in for us, is Calvin in 1. 4. cap. 10. sect. 8. All those constitutions are wicked, in the observation whereof we place any worship. The Def. answereth, he meant not by worship, circumstances of order. Which the Repl. readily granted: because it were nonsense, to say, all observations in which circumstances of order are placed, be wicked. To this the Rejoynder sayth first, it is a babie. 2. he sayth tha
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that Calvin meant not to condemn all constitutions of order: which is as true a babie as the former. 3. Calvin (layth he) defineth what Constitutions are contrarie to the word of God, namely suche as are ordeyned and imposed as necessarie for conscientie, etc. But Calvin doeth onely shew that suche are of the forbidden kinde: and every notifying of a speciall, is not a definition of the generall kinde. 4. He addeth, that Calvin doeth allow of some significant Ceremonies sect. 14. Of signification, we are to consider in the next chapter. In the mean time this: Calvin generally speaketh against all worship invented of men, without any distinction. One ambiguous phrase of Ceremonies in generall, without any example, save onely Divine, in which he instanceth immediately after the words cited, doeth not make a contradiction to the former sentence. All the rest of the rejoynder his allegations out of Calvin, about this answer have their answer, in the staple sect. of the Manuduction. 5. 6. 7.

The Def. having thus told us, what Calvin did not mean, addeth that Calvin meant by worship, the inward virtue of worship, which consisteth (layth he) in an opinion of holinesse and justice. The Repl here justly noted the sound of those words: the inward virtue of worship consisteth in an opinion, to which the Rejoynder layth just nothing. And yet in all this chapter maine cyntheth all that doctrine of opinionated worship, which the Def. let fall. But a man would thinke, that upon this occasion, he should have declared, how, and how farre worship doeth consist in opinion? As for inward

R. 2

virtues
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Verities and vices consisting in opinion, it is as great a paradox, and greater also, than that of the Stoickes, who made all other differences of mens estate, beside vertue and vice, to consist in opinion.

In the second place, it was asked by the Repl. how an inward vertue, can be planted in an outward Ceremonie; the Rejoynder by error of opinion. But it is more then error, nay more then ordinarie madness, for any man to thinke, his inside, is in his out-side, his heart is in the feather that he weareth on his hat.

The Repl. added in the third place, that the proper nature of worship, doeth not consist in holinesse, and justice, but in the honoring of God: so that all externall Ceremonies, whose proper use, is the honoring of God, are externall worship. This was directed against those words of the Def. the inward vertue of worship (placed in outward Ceremonies) consisteth in an opinion of holinesse, and justice. Now what sayth the Rejoynder? 1. Nobody can in any action avise God's honor, without opinion of justice and holiness in that action. Which may be granted, if justice (in this forme of speache, whereby our Divines use to condemne many Popish Ceremonies) did not signify justification as it doeth. But yet it doeth no follow from thence, that every opinion of holiness and justice, doeth make worship, much lesse inward worship, and least of all, the inward vertue of worship.

2. Then (sayth he) all externall Ceremonies must need be worship. And this is that which we avouche, of all Ceremonies, whose proper use is the honoring of God.

3. It is not (as he addeth) the immediate and peculiar
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Of our Ceremonies, to honor God, but to a dispose man unto the honoring of God.

No more (may I say) is it anie otherwise the immediate ende of preaching the word, to honor God, but onely by edifying of men, to the honoring of God: and yet preaching of the word is essential worship. 4. Pulpits. Fonts, Tables, Table-cloths, and Cups, are as muche appropriated unto religious uses, as our Ceremonies in question. But this is confuted in the staple section of the Mannuclct. 3. and 4. And the difference is acknowledged by the Rejoynder, in that, he maketh Pulpits etc. to be onely simple Ceremonies, and ours in question, double and trible. For by that it followeth, that our questioned Ceremonies are twice, or thrice more appropriated to worship, then Pulpits.

5. Calvin (sayth the Rejoynder) doeth marke our false worship by a false opinion of worship and necessities: He doeth so in deed: but never meant to make it a convertible, or reciprocal marke, muche lesse that wherein the essence of all false worship consisteth, as hath been cleared. Paul Phil. 3. marketh out Dogges, by urging of Circumcision: but he never meant, that ther were no other Dogges but suche. Calvin also many times marketh out false worship by an opinion of merit: yet surely a man may use false worship, without suche an opinion.

In opposition to these allegations out of Calvin, the Repl. nameth one place, epist. 259 where he sayth, according to the Rejoynder his owne translation: If is be well and thoroughly looked unto, what it is, that doeth so much a
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muche provoke man, to the making of Ceremonies, We shall finde, that they all flowed from this spring head, because every man made bulle to fanifie some new worship of God: whereas God not onely refuseth all forded Worshipes, but utterly abhorresh them. This (layth the Repl.) is a direct confutation of the Def. (and I adde, of the Rejoynder.

For if all humane Ceremonies flowed from affectation of will-worship, then a Pupit, and suche like matters of order, and decenecie, are no Ceremonies. If all the worship which is placed in humane Ceremonies, be unlawfull, then no suche Ceremonies are lawfull, what opinion soever then be of their necessitie, etc. If this be so (answereth the Rejoynder) then Calvin hath confuted his more pubrick writings, in a private epistle.

Which is nothing so, but onely it followeth, (as the Repl. sayd) that he hath confuted the collection which the Def. made from a shred or two of his more publicke writings. He hath expressed so muche in publicke writings as he doeth in that private epistle. As to adde one place of note, opusc. pag. 356. disputing against Cassander, who mainteyned humane Ceremonies, upon the very same groundes, terms, and condition, that the Def. and Rejoynder doe, he saith of them: Seing God will be worshipped by the rule of his law, and therefore detests all seined services, it is undoubtedly contrary to faith that any thing be added to his precepts by the judgment of man.

But that answer being onely for a flourish, the Rejoynder his second is, that Calvin spake of mysticall Ceremonies excessively multiplied. As if both these could not stand together, for to speak against any suche excessively multi-
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Multiplied, and yet withall against sinne. The Prophets often speak of multiplying idols, altars, formations, according to the number of cities, or townes, on every high hill, under every green tree. Doe they not withall speak simple against all idolatrie? But Calvin (as the Rejoynder addeth) alloweth in some case, the mixture of a like water with wine, in the Lords Supper. What? for a religious Ceremonie? shew the place, and after that, see how it can be justified, against those accumulations, which the Rejoynder layeth upon Sipping the bread in wine, pag. 61.62.63. Calvin (as he lastly addeth, epist. 130. could have wished, that Hooper had not so muche strugled against the Cap, and Roches, or Surplice. But beside that Calvin did not nor we neyther esteem a Cap, or a Roches etther (a Surplice is added by the Rejoynder) so evil as the Crose in Baptisme, Calvin could not say so muche, without a threwned item, (as illa etism non problem, though I do not allow of suche things:) Which manifeyly declare that his withe was not grounded on suche an opinion, as the Def. and Rejoynder mainteyne. It might also be added, that Calvin in the same place accused them, of wicked perditiones, who though they seemed to favour the Gospel, yet made a partie against Hooper, about that trawe, unto the hindering of his Ministerie: which is the case of al our depraving and silencing Prelates.

5. The second witness, produced by the Def. for to be answered, is Chrysostomus. To whose condemning of all worship instituted without the word, the Def. answered by his wedge, saying, that he meant onely that which is made
made essential worship, not accidental. Concerning this distinction, enough hath been said in the 5th and 6th section of the manuscript. Let this only be remembered, that it is all one, as if he should divide worship into worship and no worship: for both the Def. and Rejoynder often lay accidental worship is no worship. They add some time, for explication, that it is no essential worship; but so they may say essential worship is no worship, and then add that they mean no accidental worship. The Repl. therfore justly required, that should be shewn, if Chemnitus distinguish will-worship, as he doeth, into lawfull and unlawful.

Upon this occasion the Rejoynder crieth out of a falsehood shamefull, and to be blushed at, for saying that the Def. distinguisheth will-worship into lawfull, and unlawful. But let any man judge where is the falsehood, shame, and cause of blushing. The question is of worship invented by man, which Chemnitus (with other Divines) call will worship, whether it be lawfull or not? the Def. answereth by a distinction, that some is unlawful as essential, and some lawfull, as accidental. What can be more plaine? But (sayth the Rejoynder) accidental worship be denied to be properly worship, and therefore such is to be will worship, unless it be imagined essential. What a consequence is this, to bear up so weightie an accusation? It is not properly worship, and therefore it is not will-worship. He may as well say: it is not proper worship, and therefore it is not lawfull worship. May it not be improper will worship, though it be not properly worship? Or no improper worship come meaner
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from the will of man: it is rather a property of Ceremonies, to depend meerly on the will of the institutor. So Tostatur in Exod. tom. 1. 148. et in Levit. pag. 585.

A Ceromnie is a certain observation, or a special manner of worshipping God determined out of the sole Commandment of the lawgiver.

His second exception is frivolous. His third is this: Chemnitius hath this distinction in substance; though not in terms. For he sayeth, that right inward worship being supposed, right externall expressions will follow of their owne accorde, and they are externall worship, though not acceptable in themselves. Where 1. Mark the partialitie of the Rejoynder.

In the former answer, he requireth the repl. to shew the distinction which he attributeth to the Def. in his words, or terms, otherwise he may blush for shame. Now, when he is urged to shew his distinction out of Chemnitius, he forlaketh words, or terms, and relieth to substance, without once thinking of shame and blushing.

2. This substance is a meer shadow. For first, Chemnitius acknowledgeth no outward expressions to be right worship, but onely those, that flow of their owne accord, without any institutiō, from inward worship. And who will say, that the Def. and Rejoynder their accidentall worship, of Cross and Surplice, do so flow from internall. Secondly, those externall expressions, are as essentiaall to externall worship, as profession of faith is to a visible Church. Nay ther is no externall worship, beside the expressions, and setting forth of the internall. Thirdly, Though those expressions, be not accep-

The second part.
A fresh suite against Ceremonies.

Table of, or in themselves, being separated from the internal, yet it doeth not follow from thence, that they are in their nature accidental worship, and noways substantial. For the Rejoynder confesseth, that all Gods ordinances are substantial worship: and yet he will not say that Gods outward ordinances are acceptable unto him, when they are separated from internal worship.

Upon supposition (which now appeareth true) that the Def. could not shew his distinction out of Chemnitius, he was desired at the least, to shew, that there is some worship, which is not necessarie: because otherwise he must needs sinke under Chemnitius his charge. To this the Rejoynder answereth, 1. that Chemnitius understandeth by will worship, whatsoever of mans device, is imagined necessarie. 2. that there is some external worship, which is not in the particularities of it necessarie. For the first of which, enough is sayd, in the 7. s. of the manud. Yet here I may adde, that it is so farre from truth, (for will-worship can be without imagination of necessarie,) that on the contrarie, whosoever doeth take upon him, for his will take professedly to apoynt any worship, cannot possibly imagine it absolutely necessarie, but acknowledging ther hath been worship, without his addition, he professeth to adde something, not simplicie necessarie to the being, but onely to the better being of it. As for the second, In Gods own ordinances, which were substantial, and essentiaII, by the Rejoynder his confession, the particularites were not allways absolutely necessarie Levit. 5. a lambe, or two turtle doves, or two young pigeons.
And this answer may serve for all that is further rejoyned about Chemnitius. For it beareth wholly upon perpetuall necessitie of the same particularities. The expressions which he instanceth in, are naturall gestures, suche as kneeling, lifting up of eyes, or hands to heaven, etc. which have as manifest impressions in them, of Gods will, without mans institution, as the offering of doves or pigeons ever had, and in their particularities upon occasion carie as much necessitie with them. What is this to such unnecessary worship, as Crosse and Surplice?

6. About Peter Martir his testimonie, beside the repetition of that thred bare distinction of worship, into essentiall and accidentall, he looseth also a knot by it. Peter Martir sayth, it is lawfull for men, to appoint circumstances of order, but unlawfull to appoint any worship. The Def. contradicteth him thus: if it be lawfull to appoint circumstances of order, then it is lawfull to appoint some worship. The rejoynder excepteth here to, that the repl. calleth that some worship ambiguously, which the Def. called accessorie, and accidentall worship. The accidental worship belike may be called worship, but not some worship, without ambiguities.

2. He answereth, that P. M. condemneth onely the framings of essentiall worship. But first P. M. his words are, lest any thing should seeme to take for worship the Apostle absolutely damns all will worship.

Secondly he discerneth all worship from order and decencie. Thirdly he opposeth order, to significant Ceremonies, of mans institution, admitting the one and rejecting
rejecting the other. Others argue thus: the people is un
learned and rude, therefore to be held in with Ceremonies.
For this difference is between us and them of old, they had many
Ceremonies, and we exceeding few, but some there must be for
order and decency.

To the instance of bowing the knee, called by P. M.
externall worship, answer was given a little before. It is
no voluntarie invention, or institution of men.

7. In the next place, D. Morton sett downe himself,
as last at this table: which was excepted against by the
Repl. because divers others were invited to this mee-
ting. Hereupon, the Rejoynder after a few words of
forme, not all sound (as that he would have him that
rette himself downe last, not to be too hastie, though
he shutte the door for hast against others that were in-
vited) taketh occasion to say something, of Melan-cton
Bullinger, Bucanus, Polanus, Cartwright, Fenner, Tile-
nus, Chamier, and Perkins.

But he bringeth no answer of moment, but that we
ther-beaten distinction of essentiall and accidental wor-
ship, which is examined, Manud. sect. 5. 6. 7. Where all
is handled of Tilemus, Polanus, Bucanus, Cartw. and
Fenner, by name. It is not therefore needfull to add
muche in this place: yet something in brief, of th
rest.

8. Melancton (sayth the Rejoynder) reckoneth
an error, in constitution of thinges indifferent, to ac-
count them worship: but he meaneth, with opinion of
rightousenesse, and necessitie, worship of themselves, who
immediate ende is Gods honor, not vestements, fasts, an
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Now concerning all these exceptions, enough hath been spoken. Manud sect. 5.6.7. Yet concerning Melancthon, he meaneth by righteousness, justification, by necessity, that which is necessarie to justification, by themselves, considered apart from Gods ordinances, by immediate ende, that which belongeth to the first table.

Now the Rejoynder will not say that any humane worship, is lawfull, beside that which is held absolutely necessarie for justification, for then it may be lawfull, though it be every way equalled to many of Gods ordinances. 2. The signe of the Crosse, to signifie our courage, and constancie in Christ's service, were worship, though it be considered, or were used alone by it selfe. 3. Our Ceremonies belonge to the first table, so farre as they belonge to any part of his law. 4. Epistles, fasts, and feasts also, are accounted by Melancthon, matters of mere order. For so Tom. 1. 297. and 305. he compareth them to order of lectures in schooles, and to the order of reading and praying, in families, morning and evening. And so farre, we also allow of them. Yet one thing is worth the noting, that whereas imposters of Ceremonies doe muche ground themselves upon the Apostles example, Acts. 15. and are therein allowed by the Rejoynder pag. 45. 46. of his manudefinition, Melancthon doeth so disallow of this collection, that therein he condemneth all imposition of suche Ceremonies as ours. For Vol. 3. pag. 91. he sayth thus.
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It followeth not: the Apostles restrained the rise of blood and things strangled, therefore we may set up new things as matters of worship, that consequence is false, because the Apostles did not establish this rite, but only take it up for a while. Though they had instituted some new thing here follows nothing for innovation. This imitation hath ever been hurtful to the Church. The Bishop is the bearer, and takes the word and rises from the Apostles with a certain charge, that he delivereth them over to the Church unchanged.

9. Bullinger (sayth the rejoyneder) undoubtedly condemneth all worship of God, which is meerly of man's tradition: but not Ecclesiastical laws, nor worship agreeable to God's word, as publick meetings for worship, set times, places, manner of administration, holy days, and fast days.

Now in all this we fully agree with Bullinger, understanding only by holy days the times of preaching and praying, and by days of fasting, occasional times of extraordinary humiliation.

10. Chamier (sayth the rejoyneder) To, 31. 20 c.s. four times, useth this distinction, of worship proper and accidental. But Chamier onely calleth those special material acts, which are conjoined with formal acts of worship, accidental parts of worship: as if a man vowed to drink no wine for a certain time, his abstinence from wine perteyneth to worship, onely by accident. So if in solemn prayer for a Prince, his titles, and style be rehearsed, or any special terms of honor, this perteyneth
perteyneth to prayer, by accident. What is this to suche instituted worship, as the Crosse?

11. Mr. Perkins (sayth the Rejoynder) condemneth that worship instituted by men, which is so simple, and in it self. For he granteth a bodilie worship necessarie (as kneeling, lifting up of hands, and eyes etc.) terming it lese principall worship. As if this were not the very same things that we professe. But if any man see Mr. Perkin on the second Comandement, in his golde chaine, in his explication of the Decaloge, and in his treatise of idolatrie, he shall finde this constantly taught by him, as a positive doctrine, that all worship, all things obstrued under the name of worship (without any exception) if they be not by God commanded, are unlawfull, superstitious worship.

12. Now last of all (in due place) the Rejoynder answereth for D. M. that he in that place, Apol. par. i. c. 89, condemneth Komish Ceremonies, because they were so man, and burthen some. Now except he meaneth, that these were the one ly causes, it is no answer, and (though I have not his Apologie now at hand) I dare venture something on it, that other reasons are there alleged. This I am sure of, that in his Defece, cap. 6. sect. 6 he condemneth them not onely for their number, but also for their nature. And it is as manifest, as any thing can be, that a number of them have no other nature then ours have. Beside one or two humane Ceremonies may be burthen some.

If Circumcision were imposed in England, a the Crosse is, upon which condition, the Def. and Rejoynder
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dearow of it, pag. 285. I think these allows of it would account it a burden. And howsoever the light aerial Cross is not so burthensome to the body, as that, yet to the Conscience of many thousands, it is all together as importable a burden.

13. Upon occasion of that reason which the Def. rendered for condemning of popish Ceremonies, the Repl. addeth: because he had heard men often speak in this manner, of the fault that is in multitude, he would willingly know, what certain limits, and bounds are set, by God's law, for the number of humane Ceremonies, such as ours? If they may be three, why not four, five, sixe, and so forth, as many as shall please the Convocation? Surely (saith he) if once we depart from God's institution, there will be no place to rest our foot on, but we must ever follow winde and tide, which in religion is baseness itself. The motion is reasonable, even according to receyved groundes: because we must have a rule for number, if some number doth make Ceremonies to be justly condemned: and if that number doth make them condemned by the word we must also have that rule out of God's Word. Now see what fluttering and flying answers are given, by the Rejoynder. His 1.is, that all our Divines doe censure Popish Ceremonies for their number. So did all or most of the Prophets censure not onely the Idols of Israel, but even their high places, for their number. His 2.is, that just so many Ceremonies must be allowed, as shall not clog, or overcharge the Churches, in the judgement of those, to whom distention it belongs, to judge thereof. Where he meanet the Convocation howse, for England. Now to pass
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by here, that which formerly hath been noted, (how corrupt this position is, to appropriate the judgment of discretion; even in Ceremonies, unto Prælatæ) if this be all the rule, then Augustine was too rash, in his time, to judge the number of Ceremonies used then to be a burden more then Israel. For it did no more belong to him, for to discern of Ceremonies used especially out of his Diocæse, then it doeth belong to every Minister in England, to discern what Ceremonies he and his people may use. Nay then all our Divines doe wrongfully charge the Popish Ceremonies, for their number: because in the judgement of those among them, to whose discretion it belongs to judge of suche things, as well as to our Convocation, they are not thought to clog and overcharge the Churches. Thence also it would follow, that no Prælatæ could offende, in instituting of Ceremonies, without sinning directly against their Consciences: whereas we are more charitable persuaded of many, even of Convocatio me. His is from a comparilo, of kings laying up of treasure & multiplying of horæ, Deut. 17. as likewise of eating more or less.

But if there be no more certaine rule of instituting of mysticall Ceremonies, then for these things, then wiser men then any in our Convocation, may abuse the people with them. For so Solomon without question did, both in horses, & treasure, 1. King. 10. And so what assurance have our Consciences, from their judgements of discerning? Kings multiplying of treasure, and horses, concerneth (in conscience of acting) onely themselves, and their officers, but the Ceremonies (in
acting) concern all the Churches. In that there is not only a disparitie, and dissimilitude, but such a one, as requireth the rule to be more accurate in one, then in the other. 3. Within a latitude, it were easy to determine, how much the treasure, and how many horses, ordinarily are lawfull to be multiplied, by this or that King, as also how much is lawfull, for an ordinarie man to eat at one meal. But if the number of Ceremonies do depende wholly on the Prælates discretion, there can be no other rule given of them, then: so many as the Convocation house think good to injoine. His 4. (as I take it) is, that on the margin, from another companion, one or two cruces may helpe a weak man in his going, whereas 6 or 7, would hinder him. Which is very true. But if it should be appoynted to all men in England, to goe upo three Cruches, though they doe not see, nor any could shew them, that they had any need of them, one, upon this grounde that the Parliament judged, they had need first of cruces, and then of just three cruces were not this (think you) a wise statute and to be obserued as a law? His 5. and last is, that perill of leaving God's institution, there may be some, in matters of faith, and necessarie dueties to salvation: but in other matters, to speak of perill, is ridiculous. But some in matters of faith and principall obedience? none to be feared but ridiculously, in poynct of Rites? It is strange that ever any man of D. B. his knowleage, and profession, should let fall suche a sentence.

He himselfe will recall it, when he hath consider.
Now deadly a thing it is to depart from God's institution in fundamental points, and also, how great mischief hath arisen, by leaving God's institution even in rites. It is well known that Ceremonies and rites, opened the door and paved the way for invocation of Saints in heaven, and evocation of men out of Hell, for the Sacrifice of the Masse, and Idol of the Altar, and suche like pretie stuffe to enter into the Church. And they were Ceremonies which came in with the winde and tide of custome, to which winde and tide if we yeeld ourselves againe, God knoweth, what will become of us.

But this especially is in the conclusion, to be marked: the Def. and Rejoynder have hitherto sayd much upon the generall rules for Ceremonies, Order, Decency, Edification, as if they did trie the tast of every occurrent Ceromony, as perfectly, as if every one had been named: they are the Rejoynder his wordes, pag. 89.

Now when we are come to the issue, they are found to benothing, but onely winde and tide of custome. As if winde and tide did trie the tast, or discrierne distincty of every ship, or boat, that is carried by them. What meant they to trouble us about certain rules, if every winde and tide be enough? If the practice of this be not businesse, in any kinde of worship, essentiaill, or accidentall, then it is not base, for a Christian mans conscience, in some worship, to be led through hedge, or diche, onely because some went before, or to crouche upon every Masterly mans word, or nodde, which certaynyly is
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against the dignitie both of Conscience, and also of Wn. Shp: because neyther of them are subject to any men's pleasure or custome of men. Mr. Latimer Serm.: before King. Ed. seemeth to respect Ceremonies, when he sayd, that the Lutherans, in Germanie, made mingle-mangle hotchepotche of Poperie with the religion, as in his countrie, they call their hoggcs to the swine-trough: Come to thy mingle-mangle, come pyr, come pyr. If this be not base, to be thus called to mingle-mangles, let any man judge, that is not wont to be fedde with huskcs.

Beside, one question yet remaineth, when winde, and tides, fall crosse, as often they doe, the winde of authoritie driving one way, and the side of good Christians bent, the clean contrarie, what is here to be followed? If we may make conjecture of D. B. his judgement, in suche a case, by his practise, it will be very uncertain.
Here (for brevity sake) the question was repeated, in these words: whether all will-worship, whatsoever, is to be condemned, or no. The rejoinder upon this, first accuseth the repl. of falsifying and changing the proposition. Now he cannot mean this of words: because the verity and falsity of a proposition, doth not consist in words. And the sense he cannot deny to be falsified. For humane ceremonies, imposed and observed as parts of God's worship, must needs be worship proceeding from man's will, or will-worship. This therefore is but a blushing at the name of that which without blushing is defended. 2. The rejoinder himself doeth, in the very next words, confess so much, when he professeth, that some will-worship is not condemned.

But I wonder from what good Divine he ever learned this assertion? The Papists are ordinarily charged by us for teaching, and practising of will-worship: yet diverse of them are ashamed to profess the defense of such a monster, in plaine terms. E S T I V S upon the Epist. to the Col. Cap. 3. ult. disputing against someone.
or two Jesuites, that had been forced to let fall such speache, saith of them, as we say of the Rejoynder, De sicere non possumus Thelodexxath unquam accepti in bono. They can never shew, that will-worship is taken in good sense, or is wi'd of, and not condemned. All our Divines might here be opposed to these two Doctors opinions. But it shall suffice, to allege only two for the contrarie, and they are Vrslin, and Zanchie, whose authoritie are so muche urged by the Def. and Rejoynd. in this section. Vrslin in the place quoted by the Def. upon the 2 Commandement saith thus: All fained worship is forbidden all worship which is not of God, but sett up by men, when worship or honour is fained to be done to the true God, in some work which he hath not enjoyed. Zanchie also upon the same Com. q. 4. thus: We may not worship God with any other worship (though it be in the kind of external and Ceremonial worship) then with that which he hath require in the holy Scriptures to be worshiped of us by. 3. Concerning the examples, which are here brought for the warrantable will-worship, free will offerings, vows, and kneeling in publike prayer, enough hath been answered before. Yet briefly againe free will offerings were only to be made of suche things as were manifestly knower to be prescribed by Gods revealed will: and so the offering, but undertaking of it, at suche a time, in suche a measure, was left unto the free choice of men according to occasion.

It is no will-worship, to pray thrice or seven times in a day, or to preach thrice in one Lords day upon special occasion. Some voves are no more worship, so the
the matter of them (and that only is left unto choice, or the manner) then fighting in a lawfull warr, upon the bond of an oath, is religious worship. Kneeling in prayer is expressly allowed by God's revealed will: and the determination of it to this or that time, is to be ruled by occasion. 4. As for that conclusion which the Rejoynder draweth from the former groundes, viz. that order cometh from edification. 1. Cor. 14. doeth give power to men, for to appoint accessory parts of external worship, first, it hath no connexion with them, as hath been shewed in part, and may further be observed by this, that the inference is, from free-will offerings, vows, and kneeling, therefore the Apostle 1. Cor. 14. doeth give Churches power to appoint suche formalities as our Cross, and Syrplise: which is to tie harp and harrow together with a rope of lande. Secondly, suppose it had, then it is not fully and resolutely expressed: because will worship of free-will-offerings may as well be concluded essentiall, as accessory will-worship to be in the Churches power for to appoint it: because they were essentiall offerings, as other sacrifices, which were by name commanded. If by accessory worship, he meaneth that which is appointed by man, in opposition to essentiall, as appointed by God (which his manuductive interpretation beareth) then in stead of a conclusion, we have a mere confusion: the Church may appoint that will-worship which God hath not appointed, but man doeth. Thirdly, the appointing of this or that, doeth not follow upon the practice of free-will-offerings, and vows, except it be under-
understood, that the Church might have appointed, what, and how many free-will offerings they should offer, which were to turne free worship into forced.

2. About Vrulin's testimonie, wee have such meanings, and windings of words obtruded upon us, afford no matter capable of lad dispute. It shall suffice therefore to note onely the passages, which seem to looke towards the question. The Rejoynd pag. 179. could us, that the Def. offered to confute, of Vrulin, this proposition: All Human Ceremonies which are imposed, and observed, as parts of Gods worship, are lawful. Now first upon this, the Repl.brought forth the maine assertion of Vrulin in the place allledged, viz. that humane Ecclesiastical Ceremonies, not onely are not the worship of God, but also they binde not the conscience. To this the Rejoynder answereth, that Vrulin in his answer to an objection made against this assertion, saith, that suche Ceremonies are not worship in themselves, therefore (addeth the Rejoynder) his meaning is, that there is some true lawfull worship, improperly, and hie accident.

Which is as if from these words: mans clothes, or armour,are not a man by themselves, one should conclude, that therefore they are affirmed to be a man improperly, and by accident.

Secondly, the Repl.note diverse words of Vrulin, founding wholly to the denial of the honorable title of good worship unto human institutions. Upon which the Rejoynder complaineth, of willfull omitting these words of Vrulin: worship properly so called doeth so please God.
God, that the contrarie of it would displease him. Where
(sayth the Rejoynder) we have an exact description of
worship properly so called. But he is herin deceived.
For if this be an exact description of proper worship,
than whe a child honoreth his father, he doeth proper-
ly and immediately honor and worship God: because
such an act doeth so please God, that the contrarie of
it (dishonor of ones father) must needs displease
him.

And so, in very deed, was the meaning of Vrsin, to
call the morall duties even of the second table, worship
properly so called. Which forme of speaking, though
it cannot be excused from great improprietie, yet ma-
keh it nothing for, but rather against the Rej. because
Vrsin heerby denieth human Ceremonies so much to
participate the nature & name of worship, as any mean
moral dutie of the second table doeth, no not so much
as the hang-mans office, in the due execution of
it.

Thirdly the Repl. observed, that the Def. conclu-
deth the very same thing out of Vrsin, which we main-
teyne, and he undertooke to confute, viz. that divine
worship properly so called, is that which is ordeyned of
God.

To this the Rej. answereth (after an angrie charging
the Repl. with a contradetioun spirit) that this is not allled-
ged, because wee dense it, or so confute our proposition, in
the sense of Vrsine, but to shew what sense we must holde
of it.

Now did not the Rejoynder himself tell us pag. 1794.
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that the Def. offered to confute out of Vrsin, our proposition. How can this be excused from contradictory (I will not say spirit, but) dealing, to say, and unby the same thing, in the breath of one and the same section?

Fourthly, to that which the Def. sayd, of Ceremonies, in a large sense, to be helde worship, the Repl. answered, that this should be proved. The rejoinder is, that the large sense is set downe, viz. as circumstances apperteyning to the setting out of divine worship.

As if we had not required a proofe, but onely an explication. Yet this explication hath no more truth in this large sense, then it one should say, that all circumstances apperteyning to the setting out of a man area man.

But (sayth the Rej.) Vrsin, or at least Pareus sayth, that the genus commune nature of these Cerem. as well as of civ. laws is moral, and therefore worship. What could he have sayd more to confute both Defendant, and Rejoynder? they are worship. (and that onely in their generall nature) just as civill things: that is not otherwise then all good deeds are worship. So forbidding, or hindering of falte worship (which may be doen by Atheists) is worship, in this uncouth manner of speaking.

One argument yet is of the Rejoynder his owne invention: Suchethings done to the honoring of an Idol are idolatrie, as to build a temple, to the honoring of an Idol. Therefore the same things done by the rule, to the right ends, are some way a Worship to God. Wherin ther are two ambiguous phrases observables: 1. Suchethings. 2. to the honoring
honoring of an idol.

If by suche thinges, he meaneth suche as crosse and sur-
price, we not onely grant, but urge, that suche thinges
doen to the honoring of an idol, are idolatrie, and ther-
from conclude, that suche thinges doen to the hono-
ring of God, are (not some way but) properly, latris, or
worship of the true God, though (being defirite of his
allowance) false, or superstitious worship. But if he
meane suche as circumstances of time, and place, then he
accuseth all Princes, that ever granted time, and place,
for idolatrous worship, to be Idolaters. Let him consi-
der, how farre this stretcheth.

Secondly, if by to the honoring of an Idol, he meaneth
a devout intention of suche an honor, wee grant, that
the taking up of a straw directly to suche an immediat
ende, is idolatrie. For howsoever suche intention is
not necessarie to externall worship, yet the presence of
it doeth make that worship which otherwise were
none.

Yet all circumstances of time and place, which
are occasionally applied to idolatrie, are not idolatrie,
eyther essentiaall, or accidentiall. For then the same cir-
cumstances, should be (in diverse Cities) both Idolatrie,
and also true worship of the true God, as being cir-
cumstances of both.

3. Concerning Zacharie. His name is by mistaking,
muche abused. For howsoever he distinguisheth wor-
ship into that which he calleth essentiaall, and suche
thinges are annexed unto it, yet under these annexions,
he comprizeth suche thinges as God hath commanded,
A fresh suit against Ceremonies, all which the Def. and Rej. call essentiall worship. His words are these: Things annexed to worship are holy ordinariness which among the Jews were very many, as the temples, Altars, persons, garments, vessels, times &c. And afterward Ministers, Elders, Deacons, Lords Day &c. are the holy things of the Christian Church. So that Zanchie calleth those annexed, which these men call essential worship: What an unhappie wittnesse is he, that doeth not agree with them of whom he is produced: But to take all that the Rejoynder would have, this is the summe: If human Ceremonies be some part of externall worship, and yet not of that worship which is essentiall, as Zanchie sheweth, then (in a large sense) Ceremonies applied to religious actions, may be called parts of Gods worship, though not essentiall.

To which I answer, that according as Ramus sheweth, about distribution, sometime adjuncts of a thing may (in a large sense) be called parts, and yet they cannot have the abstractive name of that subject attributed unto them: because the adjuncts of a man cannot (with any sense) be called men. The consequence therefore of this argument is rotten at the root.

But such a reason, as that from the adjuncts of a man, to a man, was thus propounded by the Repl. the crosse is annexed to a Sacrament. To this the Rejoynder answereth, that the Crosse is not annexed to the Sacrament, but only to the solemnitie of the Sacrament, and so it is not a part of the Sacrament, but of solemnitie.

Now here let any man of reason judge, t. If the Crosse
Crosse in Baptisme, be not so muche as a circumstance a Ceremonie, or Rite (which all Papists, Lutherans, and our Conformists ordinarily, acknowledge) annexed unto Baptisme? Common use of speache calls that annexed, which is joyned unto another thinge, as an adjunct. Now who can doubt, but the Crosse is so joyned to Baptisme?

2. If the Crosse be not an essential part, or mem-
ber of the solemnitie, and therefore not an annexed ad-
junct of it, no more then a mans hand is to be esteemed a thing annexed unto him, or his bodie?

3. If this being granted, that the solemnitie of Baptisme is annexed to Baptisme, it doeth not follow, that the Crosse, a maine part of that solemnitie, be not also annexed to the same Sacrament? Such fig-leaves, to ill-favoredly sowed together, cannot cover the nakednesse of will-worship.
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SECT. 8 & 9.

Concerning Mr. B R A D S H A W his argument, whereby he proveth our Ceremonies to be esteemed, imposed, and observed, as parts of God's worship, viz. because they want nothing to true, or right worship of God, but only a right efficient cause, or author.

1. The section was neglected by the Repl. as conteynynge nothing but affirmation on one side, and negation on the other. This omission (sayth the Rejoynder) was for advantage, because (forsooth) here the Def. his assertion was clearly set downe, namely, that our Ceremonies are not imposed, or observed, as proper, essentiall and necessary parts of God's worship.

But s, If this had been a clear explication, yet seeing we meet with it, and handle it in a hundred sev'ral places, before, and after, little reason had the Rejoynder to suspect advantagious craft, in passing by the same termes in this one place. 2. Ther is no clearnesse at all in heaping up termes, without any explication of them. 3. When these termes proper, essentiall, necessary worship are now expounded, by the Rejoinder to mean nothing else but worship specially commanded of God, the sense is so absurde, that it was for his advan
tage, if they were omitted. For what answer is this: men appointing ceremonies of their own making, do not say that they are specially appointed of God?

2. The argument was thus formed by the Repl. Those ceremonies, which have the kind, nature, and definition of worship belonging to them, so that they want nothing but a right author, to make them true worship, those are in their imposition and use, worship, and for want of a right author, false worship. But our ceremonies are such. Ergo. Here the rejoynander first complaineth against, that the terme Real, is left out of the assumption, into which it was put by the Def. But who gave licence to the Def. for to put new termes into our arguments? It is not true, that he put any such termes into the assumption, but only mentioned in the title of this section. 3. Except such a ridiculous sense be put upon this terme Real, as was ever now observed, of proper essential, necessary, it may be understood both in the proposition, and in the assumption also. For if the kind, nature, and definition of worship doe agree to our ceremonies then they are not only verbal worship, in some fashion of speech (as the rejoynander distinguisheth, but real worship.

3. Upon occasion of that scorne which was cast on the authors of this argument, viz. that this learning never saw print before, as the Def. thinkesth, Mr. Bradshaw was named, as a man not to be slighted for his learning, who had longe since put in print, without receyving any printed answer, unto it, or the booke wherein it was contained. To this diverse thinges are rejoined, not worthy any answer, but that they tende to the disgrace of a godly.
godly learned man, whose memorie is worthy of all honour. 1. Mr Bradshaw is ranked among discontented persons. Which imputation if it be understood of discontentment for want of preferment, or great living, could hardly have lighted upon any man in England, whose course and conversation would more beat it off than Mr. Bradshaws did, in the consciences of all indifferent men that knew him.

2. His tracts of indifference, and worship are styled little Pamphlets, such as doe creep in the darke, and are hard to be seen of men that walk by day lights. This is (up and down) the language of great prelats, when Goliath like, they confute their adversaries with scorn of their little stature, and ignoble state. But the Def. or rejoinder might have put that little pamphlet into the belly of a whale, by setting it forth with a large consolation, in folio, and so also have helped it from creeping, to some kinde of riding on horsebacke.

Neyther is it harder for day-light men, to see such treatises, though thrust by their command into dark corners, then it is to open their mouthes for to ask after them, and then their eyes to looke on them. Howsoever, if this be a sufficient answer, then what shall become of many little bookes for instruction, and helpe, dispersed by good men amonge the Papists, where publicke authority doeth make them to keep the selves in a little coppasse, & to creep in the darke, for fear of being apprehended by the inquisitours day-light walkers? Mr. Bradshaw was made for accurate, short, & neat logical fashion of writing. So muche appeareth out of
of other treatises of his: as that of justification. For to have drawn forth him unto large wordy discourses, it had been as hard, as to confine wordy men, unto the accurateness of mere logical dealing.

3. Because the learning of this argument was derived by a Bishop, the Repl. doubted not to equal Mr. Bradshaw, for his skill in framing of an argument, unto any of the Bishops. To which the Rej. answered, that this is no more praise to him, the it is for a carpenter's boy, to drive a pinne as well as his Master. Which might be admitted for true, if there be any Bishop, that may in this kind of learning be Master ejus. Howsoever, it is not to the purpose, except the Master carpenter, may derive his boy for driving a pinne, which is as well driven as he himself can drive any.

4. The Rejoynd. raiseth up a report, without shewing from whom he receyved it, that Mr. Bradshaw reversioned his owne opinion of things indifferent. Which untill it be some other way confirmed, then by an adversaries bare telling, and that in a humour of disgracing his person, it must be accounted a mere tale. But he had good reason to reverse his opinion (sayth the Rejoynder) because against all reason and sense, he resolved that ther is nothing indifferent.

If this were so as it is related, reason would persuade to some recantation. But it is onely the Rejoynder his telling againe, without any shew of proof.

I, for my part, can finde no suche wordes in Mr. Bradshawe his treatise, neyther any thing from whence suche a raw sentence may be reasonably collected. He
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concludeth in deed cap. 3. that ther is no absolute indiffe-
rent thing, i.e. everestway, as well in order of nature, as if
morallitie. He affirmed also cap. 7. ther is nothing alway
indifferent, which is not potentially good or evil, and cap. 8.
ther is no action of mans will so indifferent, but the doing
thereof, by some circumstances, may be evil. Ther is no tio
that a man can dely the power of his will, that is men.
ly and absolutely indifferent. These passages come the
nearest to that which is here fathered upon the nati
se: in all which this cruditie appeareth not: ther is
nothing indifferent. Nay the hardnest of these asser-
tions, may be found not only in little Pamphlets made
by Carpenters boys, against learning and sense, but in great
volumes, written by those that goe for very learned,
and sensible in suche matters as this is. Thomas Aqui-
nas, in the great booke, called his Summe, prima secundae,
q. 18. ar. 9. hath this conclusion: It must needs be that every
individual act of man (proceeding from deliberate reason)
is either good or bad. And all (or allmost all) those
which have written upon that place, doe confirme, and
defend the same, who yet were men, that in question
of suche a nature, did not usually write against all learn
ring and sense.

4. At length, we have leave given, to examin the
Argument itself: but with this remembrance, that is
not like to be very sound, which all this while came into
mans head, till Mr. Tradshaw rife up. But who could th
Rejoynder that it never came into any mans head be
fore? though if that were true, the soundness he may be
likely enough.

Man
Many reasons have been in other mens heads, which never came to the knowlege of our Def. and Rejoynder. And he is immeditely toould, that it is for substance in every one of our Divines, which hath written of worship: because they all, teaching that the common nature of worship required no more, then that it hath the honoring of God for the direct ende of it, they adde, that if this be according to Gods commendement, it is true worship, if not, false. And the Def. was urged to shew one instance to the contrarie. The Rejoynder is made, 1 by repeating over the emptie terms, of in its selfe proper, essensial, reall, necessarie, etc. Which have been so often discovered to be nothing but terms, that it were an idle tedious businesse, for to insist upon them againe. Yet some few things may be observed, as proper to this place.

First we are tooled here, that it is essensiall to proper essensial worship, be it true or false, that it sende of it self, and immediately, to the honour of God. So then we have the common nature of proper worship, as it is common to true and false worship. Now adde unto this that which is added, pag. 125. 126. that this worship, if it be required of God, is true, if not, false. Now this being granted, our wholle Argument is granted, so farre as it concerneth proper worship. For by this confession of the Rejoynder it is plaine, that the institution of God doeth not make a thing proper worship, but onely true proper worship, and the want of it doeth make proper worship false.

And this is all that we intende in this Argument, X x 2
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for which also we are twitted with new learning by the Def. pag. 184. where also he affirmeth that Gods institution doth distinguish essentiaall worship from accidental, and therein he is mainteyned by the Rejoynder as by and by we shall see.

But how can these thinges stand together. Gods institution is first the specificall difference, whereby essentiaall worship is distinguished from accidental, and yet the specificall difference also whereby true essentiaall worship is distinguished from false? Can any one thing be a specificall forme of diverse effect, or difference of diverse subordinate thinges, such a essentiaall, and true essentiaall worship are? Can ther be one and the same difference, betwixt a living and a liveless creature, and also betwixt a reasonable and unreasonable living creature.

It is in the second place observable, how the Rejoynder seeketh to convey, or (to speak playnely) liew away from us, that which he had given. Divin (sayth he) doe distinguish proper worship, from the which is after a sort so called, by immediat ende, and per se.

Be it so: this doth not contradict any thing here in question: and it hath been expounded before, in the head of worship. The Divines of Saxoune and Witten berge, Vrsin also, and Zanchie are allledged for the same purpose, i.e. nothing to the purpose of Vrsin and Zanchie, enough hath been spoken in the former section. As for the other, see how the
agree.

It was required, that one of our Divines should be named, who handling the common place of worship, doth not distinguish true worship from false, by this, that one is appointed of God, and the other not.

He bringeth in some Lutherans not fully consenting with our Divines, neither treating on any common place of worship, but only writing a breif confusion, teaching a difference betwixt lawfull rites of order, and proper worship, which we never doubted of. He taketh hold of those terms immediately, & of itself, by which (faith he) these divines distinguish proper worship from that which is after a sort so called.

But it is more probable of the places cited, that they rather distinguish worship (by those terms) from mere rites of order and decencie, which they do never call worship, after a sort. Beside, of our Ceremonies, it hath been shewed, that their immediate end, is to honour God; in which respect also, the Rej. himselfe ranketh them under the head of immediate worship.

As for per se, or of itselfe, it may meane also as muche as ex opere operato, the mere work wrought. In which sense some Divines pronounce generally of all externall worship, that of itselfe, and in it owne nature, it doth not please God. Perkinse, in his Cases, lib. 2. cap. 6. Howsoever, to shew X x ; how
how the authors of these confessions did not esteem significant Ceremonies Cross, Surplice etc. to be matters of lawfull order, those words of the Wittenberge Confession do sufficiently declare. It is not lawful for Bishops, to thrust upon the Church, the Ceremonies of the olde law, etc., where come in the words quoted by the Rejoynder and immediatly after, these: Namely is it unlawful, either to restore the olde Ceremonies of the law, or to devise new, to shadow forth the truth already laid open and brought to light, by the Gospel: as in the day light, to set up candles, to signifye the light of the Gospel, or to carry bunners and Crosses, to signifye the victorie of Christ thorough the Cross. Of which sort is all the furniture of Masaingarie.

Upon suche groundes as thefe, the Rejoynder concludes thus: Therefore the institution of God alone is that which makest the same things to be worship truely, and really, which without suche institution, were no suche real worship, though done to the same ende, and in the same manner. But I know not how the term truely, and then againe such worship came into the question. Wee stand upon this, that Gods institution of worship, doeth make true worship, and deny onely that it maketh that worship, which otherwise, or without suche institution, were no worship at all. How can then the Rejoynder be excused in confounding true worship, with real worship in this conclusion? Now take away this intruded truely, and then let any man tell me, how this conclusion can be reconciled with those his principles of concerning worship, pag. 125? Any action done to the honoring of...
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immediately, and that act itself is proper immediate, except all worship of God. If God requires it not, then that worship is false. And even now: such an act is proper worship of God, be it true or false. Proper and Real to him are all one: and yet granting some proper worship to be false (for lacke of Gods institution) he denieth it to be Real worship, if it wante Gods institution: as if Gods institution did make that Real proper worship, which for wante of that institution is false worship.

This wilde conclusion is further confirmed by a reason out of Tilenus, which is answered before, in the head of worship, and by one example out of Fenner, whom the Rejoynder is pleased to call our owne Master. Where, I will not say, what kinde of men may (by like reason, be proclaimed his owne Masters, but only desire him to consider, what reason he had, to avouche, that to hold the Ceremonies unlawful, is a new tenet lately broached, contrarie to that which was helde in Queen Elizabeths days, whenas he accounteth Mr. Fenner our Master in this doctrine, who had to doe in the first infamous silencing of Ministers for Ceremonies, in the beginning of D. Whitgits Dominatiorion? But what is that which is brought forth out of our own Master? Nothing but this: that after publick worship, the people are to use a reverent gesture, as bowing downe the head before the Minister. Wherupon the Rejoynder demandeth, whether this adoration be essentiall, necessarie worship or no? and in what sense this respect of the Minister be by him called worship of God? To which I answer, that
that I doe not finde it by him called *worship of God* at all. 2. that it were a great absurditie for him to call a respect of man, *worship of God*, as the Rejoynder doeth. 3. that the adoration spoken of Neh. 8. 7, from whence he tooke that observation, was proper essentiaall exterior small worship. In this therefore nothing is founde to purpose.

One observation is added further by the the Rejoynder, namely, that diverse of our Divines doe make this part of the definition of proper worship, that it is according to the commandement of God. To which I answer, that suche definitions are to be understood of true and lawfull worship, even as those definitions of an oath, which require the true God to be sworne by, and to be taken of right and lawfull oathes onely, because swearing by false Gods, is swearing, as all worship ping, of false Gods, is worship, though both unlawfull.

In the next place, answer is tendered to this rea son of Mr. Br. *The bare ratifying of the present use of any thing*, cannot make it true and lawfull worship, if it had not before some nature of worship in the use of it. The force lieth in this, that bare ratifying or authorizing of any thing to have that use which it had before without suche authoritie, doth not change the physicall entie, essence, or use of it, but onely the authoritie, or legitie of it. The instances brought by the Rejoynder to the contrarie, may have some shew, but have no force to that purpose.

1. *The sole flampe of the ling*, make that current money, which was not money at all before, but
only used by way of bartery. In which comparison, he utterly mistaketh and varieth the equalitie wherein it consisteth. For on the one side, it standeth thus: If God should command us to use our Ceremonies, after the same manner that we have used them, without his commande, they should be parts of Gods proper outward worship. On the other side it standeth thus: if the Kings commandeth that price of metal to be used for current money, which before was not used so, but onely for bartery, it should be current money. Here is no similitude, because no proportion of qualitie.

2. As the sole word of God, made living creatures of those that were not living, before, so sayth the Rejoynder: the sole institution of God, makes that action to be true worship, which was before no reall worship at all, though used to the same ende, and in the same manner. But the creating word of that which was not before in being, differs so muche from that ratifying word which presupposeth the being of the thinge ratified, that here is not so muche as a shew of proportion. 2. This is a direct contradiction to that which the Rejoynder teacheth, pag. 125. If any thinge be done to the honoring of God immediatly and of itself, which God requires not so to be done, it is proper immediate externall false worship. For hence it immediatly followeth, that nothing can be done, to the same ende with true proper worship, but it must be proper worship, eyther true, if it be required of God, or false, if not so required.

3. The place of Sacrifice, before God had determined the particular place, though used to the same ende, and in the same manner, was not in its self any part of...
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of real worship to God; and yet after God's determination, it was. I answer. There was a great difference in the manner, wherein the place determined (so as it was) ought to be used. For ther was speciall mysteriall signification to be observed in the one, which was not in the other.

Otherwise, I see not what more real worship ther was in Jacobs place of sacrificing at Bethel, upon Gods speciall determination, Gen. 35. then in Abraham's sacrificing at Bebron, without any suche speciall determination of God, Gen. 13.

When all other Essays faile, the Repl. himselfe brought in as guilty of contradiction, because he affirmeth these two things: the institution of God doeth distinguish true worship from false: and yet it doeth not alter the common nature of worship. For (saith the rejoynder) it is as if one should say: the reasonable soule doeth distinguish man from creatures that have not understanding: and yet it doeth not alter the common nature of the creature. But the Repl. had answered this before, if the rejoynder would have attended unto his words, as they are by himselfe set downe, pag. 189. alter the common nature of worship, this is, make that worship, which otherwise, being used to the same end, and in the same manner, without God's institution, was no worship at all. In which words he plainly expressed, that by altering the common nature of worship, he meant nothing lesse, the making true worship of false, but only creating or making the common essentiaall nature of worship. And certain it is, that the reasonable soule (as it is reasonable) doeth not make the com-
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mon essentiall nature of a living creature, for then ther could be no living creature, without a reasonable soule as the Rejoynder affirmeth, ther can be no proper worship, without Gods appointment.

1. Against the Def. his invention of indifferent worship, it was excepted (to passe by repetitions) that no Scripture, Divines, or good reason doeth acknowledge any suche worship. The ground is, because in Scripture, all worship is eyther approved as good, or condemned as evil: all Divines doe distribute worship into true or false: and they have reason so to doe. To this the Rejoynder opposeth nothing but the contrarie attention, grounded upon examples. 1. So farre (sayth he) as we may call the particularities of externall disposition, in the manner of worship, respectively to their ende, worship, so farre may we call them indifferent worship: as kneeling, standing, bowing, or prostracion, the place, and houre of worshipping, singing of this or that Psalme.

I will not here write over againe, that which hath been declared about these things in the head of Worship. But in breif thus: 1. The question is not, what this or that may be called, by a Rhetoricaall trope, but what it is in the nature of it. 2. Respect to the utmost remote ende, doeth no more make matters of order, time, and place, worship, the it maketh worship of eating, & drinking, and whatsoever we doe to the honor of God, 1 Cor. 10. 31. 3. In place, and howre, or in the election of one Psalme, before another, ther can no worship be placed, except we will make one worship to be worshipped by another, when it is timed, placed, and chosen.
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4. Ther
4. There is no special worship in one of the gestures named that is not in the other. Neither is any of these gestures so indifferent, as that it may be lawful, to forbid, or refuse any of them, generally, and for all occasions, nor yet so, as that by circumstances (without any law or canon) they may become necessary. These examples thence serve not the turne they were brought for.

2. There is also (addeth the Rejoynder) an arbitrarie choice of essential Divine worship, as when we will pray, read, etc. Wherein respect of this libertie of choice, the kind of worship is indifferent in some respect. Of which assertion I know not what to say: Necessary worship is in some respect indifferent. Certainly that respect must make a worship distinct from that necessary worship, whereof it is a respect: or else, as (by the Rejoynder his doctrine) all things in respect of their relation, are Ceremonies, and in respect of their utmost end, worship, all things, or at least all human actions, are also in some respect arbitrarie and indifferent. There is no end, or bottom in suche reasons. The truth is, that this when which is here spoken of, is one and the same thinge with house which was mentioned in the former instance, and thencefore needeth no new answer.

6. The Def. for proving of his assertion, (that God's institution doeth difference necessary and essential worship, from indifferent and accidental) did bring in the instance of lambes for colour unspotted, which was necessary and essential (as he affirmed) after the law; though before indifferent and accidental.
To this it was first answered, that this law of offering 
ubves for colour unspotted, is no where extant, and 
and therefore that this instance was alleged eyther out of ig-
urance, or for want of due consideration. The Rejoynder 
being constringed to grant this exception to be just, 
uneth himself to those last words, eyther ignorance, or 
want of due consideration: and for them accuseth the 
Repl. of flying in the Def. his face, without Christian mede-
ration. But if it be so great a crime, to impute eyther 
some ignorance or some inconsiderateness (suche as 
no man alive is wholly free from) unto the Def. and 
if this be unchristian flying in his face, I am sure the 
Rejoynder hath gone beyoyn the face and stabbed 
deeper into our Vitals, in many passages of his Rejoyn-
der.

As succedaneall instances to the former, which was 
found salling, the Rejoynder bringeth in diverse, out 
of the Leviticall, or Ceremoniall law, which were ar-
bitrarie before the law, and necessarily essentiaall after. 
To all which, the second answer to the failing instance, 
giveth direct satisfaction. As for those Rites, which 
are further allledged, out of the Legende of fabulous 
Rabbines, by Mr. Ainsworth, and ratified by the Re-
joynder we regard them no more, then the Popish 
leaden Legendes. Onely the marginall conclusion 
out of these Instances is observable: The Repl. fallaci-
ously supposed, that all worship is onely true or false, not ob-
serving a subdivision of true worship, into substantiall, and 
sircuitstantiall.
For what reason can he render, of that which he layeth upon the Repl. as if he had supposed all worship to be only true or false.

The Repl. never denied, but all worship is also good, or evil, internal, or external, natural, or instituted, etc.

2. The reason which he bringeth, is solely from the subdivision of true worship. But that doeth not hinder a superdivision, or equidivision, into common, and special, Ecclesiasticall, and domesticall, as Mr. Perkins did in the place before cited. 3. That division into substantial, and accidental, cannot possibly (with any reason) be more applied unto true then false worship, except the Rejoynnder will say, that no false worship is eather substantial, or accidental.

The seconde answer to the former instance (belonging to all those by the Rejoynnder adjoined) is, that before the law, the same worship had been performed with the same minde, that is, in the same manner, and to the same ende, it had been as essential worship, as after, though not so true, and lawfull.

The Rejoynnder here first, observeth a contradiction to that which was formerly sayd sect. 6. worship doth not varie, according to men's opinion. But if he understand the matter well, he shall finde both sayings well to agree. For though the want of some opinion doeth not varie the nature of worship, so as that the absence of this or that opinion, doeth make any external worship, not essential: and yet it doeth so varie the nature of worship, as that the presence of some opinion, doeth (as an efficient, not as a formal cause) make some exteral
A fresh suite against Ceremonies.

The rejoynder his second observation is, that our Ceremonies are hereby discharged from will worship, and superfluous, except it can be proved, the imposers, or users of them, doe holde, that God is better pleased with them, then without them, in themselves, or that they are as pleasing to him, as if he had commanded them.

The consequence of which hereby conclusion, no logician in the world can make good. Yet, taking out in themselves, as an intrusion) all the consequent part may be maintained. For if ther be any more good done in the imposing and observing of them, then in the omitting of them, then God is better pleased with them, then without them. And that which is lawfully and justly commanded by men authorized therto, is as pleasing to God as if he had commanded it. Nay it must be received, as commanded of God himself.

7. It was also by the repl. brought into the Def. his remembrance, that matter, and forme does usually make up the essence of things, and that to instituted means, a proper ende is also required, but a right efficient cause not so. About this, the rejoynder sheweth himself perplexed. For he answereth, that this notwithstanding actions have as it were matter, some and essence of accidentall, though not of essentiaall worship.

Where he manifestly separateth the essence of worship, from essentiaall worship, as if the essence of a man could exist without an essentiaall man, 2. He gathereth from
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from that which was sayd of respect to the ende, in institution, that therby their assertion, is cleared: viz. that Cer. respecting the honour of God medially, are not properly parts of Divine worship. As if here had been any mention or question of medially, or immediately, proper, or improper, and not only of essential. But for so much as the Rejoynder would needs heer cite D. Abbot, for his term immediatly, I would desire him to consider of the whole sentence in that place pronounced by him, viz. Def. of Mr. Perk. pag. 84. Order and comeliness (sayth the popish Bishop) is some part of God's worship. But (sayth D. Abbot,) who taught him this deep points of Philosophie, that an accident is a part of the subject, that the beautie, or comeliness of the body is a part of the body? Order and comeliness properly and immediately respect men, and sherefore can be no parts of the worship of God. If this be not a plaine refuting of the Def. and the Rejoynder their assertion, then none is attempted in all the Replie.

3. He in like manner conclude, that every respect of the honor of God, doeth not make a thinge to be properly religious worship. As if the Repl. had ever spoken, or dreamt of suche a phantasie, except it were in the Rejoynder his name! His wordes are: beside the respect of the ende, is also required institution of means to an ende. What Paracelssian can draw so wilde an assertion, from suche a grounde as this?

8. It was (in the last place) demanded, whether, if the Temple of Jerusalem had been built, with institution of all the appurtenances, sacrifices, and observances, there used, without any Commandement of God,
God, according as they were by his appointment, whether (sayth the Repl.) they had not been essentiel false worship, eracted to God? The Rejoynder answereth: Yes no doubt, if we may call (as the manner is) essentiel dmonster worship, essentiel false worship: eyther in respect of the thinges themselves, or in the opinion conceyved in their use. Now marke (all readers that have sense) how this Rejoynder (here in the conclusion of all) is constreynd to confesseth, that to be true, which he hath hitherto striven against as false. 1. The Repl. his assertion was, that God's institution doth make that worship, which being used in the same manner and to the same ende, were otherwise no worship, or (as it pleaseth the Def. and Rejoynder to speake) no essentiel worship? The Rejoynder hath contended against this, as against a great error.

Now in the winding up of the whole Argument, he confesseth, that some essentiel worship may be, without any institution of God. Certaynly, if this be so, then the institution of God, is not required to essentiel worship, neyther is it of the essence of essentiel worship, that it be instituted of God. 2. He affirmed before, pag. 125. that proper immediat, (or essentiel) worship are onely suche thinges as God hath to that ende ordained. Yet here he confesseth, that essentiel worship may be without any commande of God. 3. The Rejoynder before, made essentiel and accidentall worship to be a sub-division of true worship. Now he confesseth, that ther is an essentiel worship under the head of false worship. 4. He acknowledgeth, that in all the former senselesse assertions,
A fresh suit against Ceremonies. assertions, he did not speake, as the manner of speache is. That was thersore against the manner of speache, which the Def. & he used before. 5. He graunteth some worship to be essentiaall, in respect of the thinges themselves, separated from mens opinion. Yet hitherto, he would have made us beleive, that opinion did varie the nature of worship, as sect. 6. If this be not a plaine yeilding, and granting of the whole Argument, ther can be none, save onely in plaine termes, to say, I yeeld.

S E C T. 10, 11, 12, 13, 14.

The former argument being (though demonstrative) yet to the Def. his apprehension new, was derided as new learning: these following are excused from that censure, as being more popular, and seeming more fadomable. Of which it is to be observed, that most of them are fetched out of incerte papiers, under the name of Mr. Hy. and others, upon the Def. his credit; wherein, what equall dealing hath been used, it is very suspicious to any judicious reader, and some of those others, (for Mr. Hy. is past writing to) being asked, have testified, that in diverse passages they are muche abused. Yet even these reliques of Arguments are defensible.

1. The first is: because they are imposed to breed an opinion of holiness, by Mr. Hookers doctrine and therfore, as purls
parts of God's worship. To which the Def. answereth, that it is no meant of operative holiness, eyther by infusion, or inbasson, but onely significative. Whence he concludes, a perverse purpose of calumniatiition: and the Rejoynder (adding another distinction, betwixt holiness in them, and in the users of them) maketh mention also of dosage. But the Def. his distinction is vaine: because even significative holiness is also a part of God's worship. Otherwise some holiness must be gained, which having no other immediat ende but that which directly and immediatly tende to the honoring of God, is no part of his honor. The Rejoynder also is vaine in limiting the matter to holiness in them.

For those things which are instituted to that immediat ende onely, that they may breed an opinion of holiness, and so holiness, in others, doe (in all reason) deserve the opinion of holiness, some way causall, or operative in themselves: because all breeding is causing, or working, i. e. operative.

It was also observed by the Repl. (onely in a parenthesis, by the way) that holiness, eyther by infusion or inbassion, were unreasonablie by the Defend. disjoynd.

This the Rejoynder excepteth against, and saith, in those termes ther is no more disjunction, then in these love or charitie, Magistrates, or Governours.

But he forgotte the proper English note of disjunction, eyther, or.
Where did he ever read such a phrase: either love, or charitie, either Magistrates, or Governours?

It was also replied, that Mr. Hooker attributed operative holiness to the Crosse, in allowing all that the Fathers ascribed to it. The Rejoynder his onely materiall exception is, that the instance was here not of the Crosse, but of the Surplice. Yet the question is of our Ceremonies, which is as well concluded from one, as another, and the Rejoynder himself, even now, spoke of holiness in them, as of many, not in it, as of one Ceremony onely.

Nayther is ther any more holiness in one, then in the other, if both be onely significative.

The Repl. further affirmed, that Mr. Hooker spoke of reverence to be signified towards the Ceremonies. To which is rejoined I know not what. But let Mr. Hookers words, going before those nakedly cited by the Def. and Rejoynder, be considered. The wise man could not mention so muche as the garments of holiness, but with singular reverence, and it will be evident, where he required reverence.

In the last place, Mr. Hookers opinion is flighted, as privas. Wheras all know, that he is in our Ceremoniall controversies, of as publicke note, and approbation, as Bellamine in any Popish.

2. The second reason being stedily propounded by the Def. out of Mr. Hy. his mangled manuscript, was thus by the Repl. distinctly explained: A holy assembly of Spirituall Lords, and their Assistants, if they be truly holy, and spirituall in their authoritie, and in the exercise
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cise of it, will appoint no Ceremonie but holy: and by the observance of the sayd Ceremonies, have some spiritual honor redounding unto themselves: because the vertue which is found in any effect, doth redonde allways to the prayse of the cause. Of this argument, the Rejoynder pronounceth, that it is a powerning out of salescurrielie, to the very lees, a scornefull jest, a scoffing, a spieefull jest, a vagrant thinge, the very noting whereof is answer enough. Now how should a man deal with suche disputers?

The Def. brought this Argument out of unknowne papers, into a publick booke, and answered it with sharp wordes. The Repl. only shewed the force of it: and for that, he is set upon a fresh with new wordes, like swords and daggers. Could they neither suffer this reason to sleep in the darke, nor endure any light of explanation should be set by it?

And what fault can be found with the repeating of those titles, which the Prelats in Convocation take to themselves, or in drawing a conclusion from them?

In the second place, our Rejoynder undertaketh to give a rea? answer to this reason. To which purpose, he denieth that our Ceremonies are of the institution of the Convocation-house. And yet the same Rejoynder in answer to the Repl. his preface, pag. 61. complaineth of us, for infringing the libertie of the Church in her Convocation, touching the appointment of externall rites, or Ceremon. And pag. 71. as in diverse other places, he tell eth us that the Convocation house makesb and establisheth Canons upon & with the Kings Commission, and allowance.

Z 2 3

They
They are the words also of the Parliament, set downe pag. 70. that the Clergie of England made the Canons. Neither can any man doubt of this, that have but looked on the booke of Canons. The ratification of suche thinges by Civill authoritie, doth no more take the institution of them from the Clergie, then the like ratification of any point in true worship, doeth take the institution of it from God and Christ. 2. He denieth the consequence: because a holy assemblie may ordyne them, and yet not make them holy.

But it is manifest, that a holy assemblie, as it is suche, gathered together in the holy name of Christ, as their efficient, and final cause, cannot but putte a holy forme upon their ordinances. Qualis causa, tale effectum.

3. His third answer is that these Ceremonies may be called holy, because they are used in holy actions. Which is just so, as a pesse, hassok, or cushion may be called holy, because it is used to kneel upon, in the holy acte of prayer. But instituted significant Ceremonies are evidently of another holinesse, to all that doe not of purpose that their eyes.

4. The Repl. (after the Def.) goeth about to prove that the Convocation may be called a sacred Synod, and holy in regard of their function. Which is so farre from being denied by us (upon the supposition of the lawfulness of suche a function, as they take upon them) that it is the ground of our reason, to prove their ordinances holy. So that the Rejoynder might (in this place) have spared those sweet words of his: Stomache, without
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without wit, or learning: these men say (in effect) to all other men, stand back, I am holier than thou, they are contentious, and uncharitable. Yet the Repl. could not consent, that our Convocations should be so accounted holy as Churches instituted of Christ, and gathered for true holy worship: because neither of these doe agree to our Convocation. Hereupon the Rejoynder (having nothing to say that was pertinent) speaketh something of right Ecclesiastical Synodes, accuseth the Separatists with Mr. Jacob, and lastly affirmeth our Convocations to be gathered for a speciall dutie of Gods service, though he will not tell us, what it is, and confesseth, that little good is sometimes (he might have sayd at any time) done at their meetings. Which kinde of answering I leave to the judgement of any reader.

3. A third reason, fetched out of M.Hy. his papers, is, that Crosse and Surplice are set apart from civill uses, and appropriated unto the actes of religion in Gods service. To which the Def. answered, by equall comparison of Pulpit-cloth, Communion cup, and place of meeting in like manner appropriated. Whereupon the Repl. was, in generall, that the Def. did well understand what was meant by appropriation. This putte the Rejoynder into a passion, expressed by many wordes: a pretty rig'ts, for that which cannot be defended, by those which are pulstled and tyled, a simile, lent by Mr. Jacob, a mere shift, proceeding out of an haughty desire of defending that which hath been once spoken. And this is all that I finde rejoined to that passage. To which I say nothing.

A reason
A reason was rendred of the former assertion: because a Pulpit-cloth Communion-cup, and Meeting-place are onely civil, being taken from the ordinarie civil customes of men. To which the Rejoynder opposeth, that no civil man will say, that they are onely civil in their application: Whiche is verie true. Nor will any Grammarian say, that good Hebrue, Greek, or Latine, are onely grammaticall in their application, because they are applied to the expressing of all kindes of trueeths and falsehoods: and yet they are onely grammaticall etimologie and syntaxe. No Naturalist will say, that the earth and ayre are onely naturall in application, and yet they are onely naturall beinges.

It was further added, that clothes, cups, meeting places, etc., are of the same use out of Gods service, that they are in it.

This is occasion of admiration, and exclamation to the Rejoynder. But he might have considered, that the immediat ende of a clothe, is to cover, of a cup, to drinke out; of meeting places, to meet in: and then where is the strangeness of this assertion? Is ther not the same immediat use of a mans eyes, in reading one booke, as another, of a mans eares, in hearing one voyce, and another, how soever the subject seen, or heard, may differ in nature or kinde.

A distinction was likewise used, betwixt appropriation of this or that individual, and of the kinde. To this it is rejoined, that the individualls are nevertheless appropriated. Whiche is not so: because approprition of the kinde and individual both, is more then
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of the individual alone. Individuals may be extrinsically, & accidentally appropriated, the kinde remaining intrinsically common, & indifferent. 2. That some individuals (without all their kinde) have been appropriated to bolic uses. Of which no man doubteth: because one individual may be so used, without other. But is therefor no difference, betwixt extrinsical, accidental appropriation of one Levite to the Ministrie, and the whole tribe? 3. Not all kinde of linnen garments, or crosSES are appropriated to religious uses. As if the question were of linnen garments simplicie, though they were used without any suche institution as a Surplice hath, onely for the natural convenience of it, or of crossing the fingers, upon occasion, to drive away flies, that come crosse upon a mans face. Ther was (in the last place) mention made of the significancie of our Ceremonies, which maketh them in their intrinsical nature (as suche) without any further expectation of occasional application, to be proper to religion. But of this our Rej. would not hear, in this place. Let it therefore passe to the next chapter.

4. A fourth confirmation wholly dependeth on Matth. 15. Where the Def. would have it, that our Saviour condemneth not the act of washing (that is sayth the Rej) the monitorie significat signe of washing, used by the Pharisies, but their intention, & opinion, in attriburing legall and operative sanctifie, to that their owne invention. Now concerning monitorie significancie, enough hath been spoken, in the head of Ceremonies, and it remaineth to be disscussed in the following chapter.

For
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For the present, it was first noted by the Repl. that some intention and opinion of holiness cleaveth to our Ceremonies. This is denied by the Reij. and yet in his whole dispute, he maketh them worship, though accidental, arbitrary, and improper. Neither can any man impose a double or treble religious Ceremonie without intention and opinion of some holiness belonging to it, more then to that which is not so religious.

It was in the second place observed, that more holiness was attributed to those washings, than is by many among us to the crosse, cannot be proved out of the text, ther being no one circumstance in it, which may not fitly be applied to our Ceremonies. To which the Reij. saith 1. that those are blinde & superstitious persons, which attribute suche things to the Crosse, not the Church imposing. Just as Pellarime, in the place by and by to be cited, answereth Calv. about the same matter: if there be any more rude among his Catholiques, we hold them worthy to be corrected. But are not our blinde Protestants, and those rude Papists, hardened in their superstition, by the imposing & urging of those things which they superstitiously dote on?

The Pharisees (addeth the Reij.) were so strongly conceited of this washing, that they thought, without it, the very creatures of God should defile them. But that of the very creatures defiling, is not in the text: It is but probable collected out of our Saviours following discourse, that they esteemed some defiling to follow upon the eating of the creature, not as it was a creature, but as it was so used against the tradition of their Elders. And are are
A fresh suite against Ceremonies: there not many to be found in England, that their very baptism is deficient, insufficient, and so defiled: if it want the Cross?

For further answer, it was alleged by the Repl. that not only Calvin in Mat. 15, but also Bellarmine himself (de eff. Sacr. I. 2. cap. 32.) sayth, that the Pharisees washing was condemned as vain, and unprofitable, setting aside, intention, and opinion of legal, operative holiness. The rejoinder answering first for Bellarmine, sayth he is abused: because (forsooth) he speaks that falsely, to defend the Popish Ceremonies. As if it were not the common notion of all Christians, that vain and unprofitable Ceremonies are to be condemned, or as if Bellarmine alone sayd this! or as if this could defend the Popish Ceremonies, which are more easily defended from any other charge, then they can be from this, that they are vain and unprofitable.

Who would have thought, that D. B. would defend vain and unprofitable Ceremonies, in Gods solemn worship? But Chemnitius (sayth he) observeth, that Christ condemned not these washings simply as profane soppieries, nor as simply unlawful, but in respect of religion placed in them. Nor simply profane soppieries, that is, voide of all flux from Scripture, or reason, nor simply unlawful, if the acts in themselves be considered or abstracted from all relations by institution added unto them: but in respect of religion placed in them, i.e. superstition adjoined unto them. Now ther is superstition not only pernicious, but also vain, and superfluous. Filacius, tract. 24. cap. 2. And chemnitius, in the same place affirmeth, the
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The Pharisees washings to have been condemned, for that (notwithstanding their vanities; and want of Divine institution) they were made some part of Gods worship.

As for Calvin, the Rej. doeth not deny, but that passage alleged is found in the place, the inventing of Ceremonies was an idle vanitie, before the high opinion of Religion was added unto it. Yet (sayth he) I. he cleareth out Ceremonies, which was cast upon the Jewish superstition washings. From some of that blame, (it may be granted but not from all. For then those wordes (which the Rejoynder confe申th him to set downe) should have been a contradiction to the other. 2. This thread (added he) falsely alleged as touching the intention. And why so prays?

Because (forsooth) Calvins meaning was, that to devize new washing, to the like ende, and with the like opinion of them, as of those which God had set, was of idle vanitie.

But if this were his meaning, how can that meaning agree with the meaning of these wordes: It was of idle vanitie before the high opinion of Religion was added unto it?

Was there any higher opinion of Religion added unto those washings, the to the washings which God had set? Extremitie drives men to hard shifts.

For the fuller clearing of this reason, that idle and vayne or superfluous worship is condemned by Christ. Mat.15. let these testimonies, and reasons be well considered.
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The Priest had brought in many Novelties, tho' Moses with great terror had threatened them not to add any thing, of which number of additions were those things of washing. There was a double fault for the innovation itself; it was not a sight matter and then this, that they stood more upon those observations of their own then they did on the Commandments of God. 1. That first offence Christ doeth not presently reproove them for doing it, as a frivolous and superfluous thing, lest they should have been inflamed.

Another cause for which he despised these washings was their superstitution. The Pharisees had put in the said washings, not for any natural and civil descensie or descent, but as pertaining to religion, who so did consenme the were judged to offend against God's Worship, and who so did observe them seemed Christ to regard, God's Worship in them. But this was in no wise lawfull for them to do, who were so straitly charged of God, Deut. 4. that they should add nothing. For this Christ rejected these washings as superstitious, which reason Mat. 15. ch. intimates when he saith: Every plant which my heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted out. And Marc. ch. 7. In vain do they worship me teaching the Doctrines, and praeceps of men, &c. Such things as men set up of themselves against any Commandement of God.

quaer ad religionem pertinentes, ut qui comitterent, contra Dei cultum agere ecestorentur, qui vete formarum Dei in sua colore widierentur. Hoc autem erat non licet, quibus prohibetur et sequi aut Deus, Deut. 4. ne quis addere, Obid, quas superstitiose luttones hujusmodi Christus rejecit. Quam causam indicat Matt. 15. cap. 15. Omnes plantatae quies non plantavit. Placent mittite, radicabitur. Similiter Marcus cap. 7. in omnemse auctoritate, descensae doctrinae & praeceps hominum, &c. Qua propriae inventionis constituatur, contra Deis modum.
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In Mat. 15. Marc. 7, the Commandments of men do none such Commandments which conduce nothing at all to piety, as those Superfluous Washings.

5. In the first place, another reason (or charge) was brought out of Mr. Hy. his papers, that the Ceremonies imposed, are (for their use and practice) preferred before principal parts of God's worship: because this is the Prelats Canons: Wear a Surplice, or preache not; Cross, or baptize not. This the Def. accused of dull Sophistry; because by this means, only an orderly discreet preacher is preferred before one that is factious and exorbitant. Of this base Bonnerly speache, the Repl. shewed his just detestation. For which he is censured by the Rejoynder of casting it out of the mouth of his stomach, of malice, intemperate railings, and a furious spirit. All which I leave to the readers judgement. Onely this I observe, that he would excuse all or most of the Prelats, from willing silencing any able and godly ministers for omission of our Ceremonies, and doeth absolutely denie, that the Def. ever silenced any Minister (willingly or unwillingly, for only omission of Ceremonies. Concerning which terms (willingly, and only omission) some light of explication were needfull. For only omission of Cross, or Surplice, by oversight, or other accident, the Pope himself will not silence a Priest, as all Popish Divines tell us, in affirming that to be no mortall sinne. And how those which make Canons for silencing upon purposed continued omission, and execute the same partly by themselves, and partly by their instruments, can be sayd to doe it
A fresh suit against Ceremonies: unwillingly, this requireth interpretation, which will certainly be found tardy. For clearing of this charge, from the imputation of dull Sophistry, the Repl. first propounded it in this manner: an able godly Minister without the use of these Ceremonies, is not suffered in the Ministerie, whereas an unable & ungodly one, with the use of them, is suffered: therefore they are preferred before maine things: Upon this, the Rejoynder observeth, that from hence doeth not follow that conclusion: therefore our Ceremonies are made parts of Gods worship. As if this conclusion were once named by Mr. Hy. or by the Def. in this charge.

If he will make it supposed, he must shew us Mr. Hy. his concealed papers for the proof of that supposition. He addeth, that all Prelats are so be charged with this practice: and that they have no suche power for depriving of bad, as they have for depriving of good Ministers. To which I answer, the question is not here of all, but of that which standeth by our Canons, and Canonically practice. Yet neither any authors, nor any defenders of the Canons, can be excused from partaking in this practice, no not the Rejoynder himself. And as for those Prelats, which have great power to doe evill, and little, or none, to doe good (or which is all one, power effectually to hinder good, and not evill) they have a very dangerous standing, dangerous (I say) as well for others, as for their owne selves. Yet, when our Prelates procured that authoritie of doing evill, they might as easily, and more lawfully have procured the other, of deeing good: not to say, that none of them doe so muche
muche for reforming or removing of bad Ministers, as is
in their power to doe, either by themselves, or by other
means. Nay is it not known, how suche kinde of
cattle are not onely borne with, but borne up by the
Prelates in bad causes?

The third Rej. is of a calumniation, because some incon-
formable Ministers are suffered, and some unable, and un-
godly deprived. But 1. this calumniation concerning
some inconformable suffered for a time, extraordinary,
besides, nay against Canonickall order. 2. He can scarce
name one, that he hath known deprived for that he
was unable. 3. The Turkes and Insidels would caliier
their Preists for some ungodlinesse. What a poor rejoin-
der is this?

A fourth consideration is, that a farre lesse offense de-
defended, is more punishable then a greater confessed;
and that certain evils, in themselves lesse, may doe
more hurt, then others in themselves greater. Whiche
consideration, if it be applied to the purpose, will appear
in the proper colours: If a Minister confess himself unable and ungodly, he is not so punishable, as he that
defendeth the Ceremonies are not to be used. The re-
fusing of our controverted Ceremonies, may doe more
hurt, then an unable and ungodly generation of Minis-
ters conforming. In that which is further added, under
the title of lastly I finde nothing but words & assertions,
without backing reasons. Valeant igitur, quantum valent
possunt.

The same charge was (in the second place) thus fra-
med, by the Repl. Though ther cannot be found able
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and discreet conformable Ministers, enough to supply all the Parishes of England, yet many of godly men are that out of the Ministerie for unconformitie. Therefore Conformitie is preferred before the maine duties of God's worship. Here the Rej. having little to say, setteth notwithstanding two colours on the matter. 1. That the consequence is not simplicie true, but onely that they conceive the non-conformitie may, by consequence, be a greater hurt, then an able and godly Ministrie, in suche places, as want it, would recompence. As if this crying sinne were onely their conceits, not their practishe, or that their conceits could make this sinne no sinne! or that the salvation of many thousandes of soules, could not recompence the hurt that would come upon the refusing of human Ceremonies? What is this other then daubing rotten walls with untempered mortar.

His second colour is, that non-conformistans are no leffe blameable, whoe had rather have no worship, then conformitie. Which is as muche as if he should say, that whosoever will not sinne for Gods glory, doeth as muche offend, as he that will not suffer God to be glorified by those which will not to that ende be content to sinne against his conscience.

Because this reason was accused of dullenesse, it was noted (by the way) that every Plowman, being a good Christian, did usually make it in this blunt manner, against the Praelats proceedinges, and that the Repl. (being, as it seemeth first brought up amonste suche plaine people) had from his childhood tooke it to be unanswerable. Hereupon, the Rej. 1. answered the

The Second part.  

Blunt
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blunt argument, with this sharpness: It is like as if one should say, that God, admitting no man to the Priesthood with bodily blemish, did therefore preserve bodily perfection before spiritual. Wherin, he deceiveth himself, & others much, whether he respecteth the first explication of this reason, or the second. For according to the first, it must be affirmed, that God would suffer men blemished in their bodies to be priests, though they had no spiritual fitness for that office. And according to the second, he should have sayd, that God having otherwise to furnish the Priesthood, according to a superior law, which he might not of his will dispence with, did notwithstanding exclude some of those which that law did allow. But both these assertious are too absurde for the Rejoynder to owne.

His second note is of Plowmen, and Children, that they are not the best Logicians. Whiche though it be true, yet is nothing to the purpose: because many Plowmen have good natural logicke, to reason withall. Otherwise they did very inconsideratly, whose vented so good reasons under the title of the prayer, and complaint of the Ploughman, as in Mr. Foxe is to be seen, Edw. 3. amonge which reasons (a remarkable thinge) this very slighted argument is one. For so are the wordes: O Lord, for breaking of thy law, the Prelates will set men penance, or pardon them, and maintayne them, as oft as they tresseffe. But Lord, if a man once break their laws, or speak against them he may doe penance but once, and after be burnt.

The summe of which, Mr. Foxe, in the margent, thus gathereth: The breaking of the Poppes law is more punished, then
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then the breaking of God's law. And as for children, I am
persuaded, that D. B. himself, had some true things evid-
ent unto him, that by no contrarie shew of logick
they could ever be wrungeth out of him. Sure I am that
Timothie, knowing the Scriptures from a childe, had
many suche.

Nether was ther mention made eyther of plowmen
or children, But onely to shew the evidence of this
truth, not the logickall Demonstration of it.

That which was added, by way of limitation, to the
name of a plowman, namely, that it was understood of
suche a plowman, as is also a good Christian, is very bit-
terly, and yet as very unreasonablie carped at by the Re-
joynder as savouring strongly of that spirit of Separation,
which hath been hasted after in the chuse of inconformitie.
For (sayth the Rejoynder if any will beleive all his conceyess)
this shewes, that with these men the adversaries of Ceremo-
nies and Bishops are the onely good Christians.

Which is a strange streine, to come from D. B. who
both hath been an unconformist, and since he hath
changed that title, cannot but know, that sundrie un-
conformists have caried themselves towards himself,
in all respetcs, as toward a good Christian. And what
strange savour is in this: every plowman that is a good
Christian doeth unsuallie make this Argument. Doeth he
imagine, that onely those plowmen, that are professed
adversaries to Ceremonies and Bishops, doe make it?
Nay he knoweth, that many, and many of those that
could otherwise well digest both, yet doe apprehend
this course of Bishops silencing Ministers for suche Ce-

remo
remonies is ungodly, and Antichristian. If he did not
know so muche, yet he cannot be ignorant, that the
word here interposed by the Repl. for limitation, usu.
ally, doeth except some more ignorant, or less attentive
good Christians. And I doubt not, but the Rejoynder
will affirm, that every good conforming Minister in
England, doth usually account them for scismaticke
that condemn the Ceremonies: yet I would no
thence conclude, that with him, those of that judge
ment are the only good Ministers. For there is as much
sinne against charitie, in rash accusing others of un
charitableness, as ther is in being uncharitiable: on
which fault, the Rejoynder can never clear this affect
passage, which he in opposition let fall from him.

For overthrow of the former reason, an instance
was brought in by the Def. taken from a Chancelor
who may (sayth he) put out of Commission him that
refused to sit in the place appointed, without prefer
ring that place to the Kings service. To this the Repl.
answered, that no wise Chancelour, would, for his
owne pleasure, or for the circumstance of a place easily
change, or put out of Commissiō a grave wise ma, when
another like unto him cannot be found. These last word
another like unto him cannot be found, are caught up by
the Rejoynder and under the shew or sound of them
the Inconformistts are by him tossed (as it were) into
blanknet, as being of a high straine, beyond all other men
in their owne persuasion etc. But he might have con-
dered (if sinister affection had not hidden it from him)
that the case immediately going before this answer
was
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was of shutting out able godly Ministers for inconformity, when they cannot be found able and fit conformable Ministers enough. Wherupon is inferred, that the comparision of the L. Chancelour will not help the Def. in this case.

Now what kind of strain is this then in the Rejoynder to conceal the case, and stretch the wordes as if were with his teeth, unto suche a strange odious meaning of so witlessie a bragge. Yet if ther had been no such dependance of these wordes upon that case, they might be well defended, as understood of an absolute comparison (euyther for abilitie, or pictie) but in relation to this or that people; from whome suche Ministers are sometime plucked away by violence, whose like, in regard of that people (which have been muche edified by them, and more inwardly known, and also (upon good ground) affected unto them, then they can sudainly unto any other) cannot be found.

Otherwise, D. Burges, in his Apologie (towards the conclusion) would not have alleged against the silencing of himself, and others like him, that those (at the least) should succeed the, which were not so wel acquainted with the condition of their sheep. It might be also added, that though another like might be founde, yet it is not in the power of that L. Chancelour, or the Bishop to finde, bringe, & place him in the same Commission, because (for the succession, he must depende upon the Patrons pleasure, not limited to another like the predecessor.

B b b 3

But
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But that this wrestling of the Replyer his words, was affected (in some sort against conscience) it may appear by this, that no man will surmise, the Repl. to thinke, that to no unconformable Minister a Peer may be founde: because it is to be supposed (at the least) that another unconformable one may not onely be equal, but also superior unto him in all absolute perfection.

It was also observed, for answer to this instance of a L. Chancelour, that about the circumstance of place, for Commissioners to meet in, ther can be no conscience pretended, whereas in our Ceremonies, Solemne othes are offered, that no thing but conscience doeth keep us from them. The Rejoynder 1st. opposeth, that this unlikenesse maketh nothing to the question. And yet it sheweth, that a Chancelour may in small matters, where no conscience can be pretended, take more upon him without preferring, or comparing the matters, than a Bishop can, where conscience evidently withstandeth: because conscience is not to be vexed, except the matter be so great, that (in respect of Gods glorye) it cannot be neglected. He 2nd. opposeth, that many more of the Conformitans, are ready to take it for upon their oath, that nothing but conscience makes them conforme.

To which I lay 1st. that he who was immediatly before, so curious in houlding to the question, should not presently have digressed from it: as the Rejoynder here doeth, in turning the comparison, which was made betwixt a L. Chancelour and a Bishop, in respect of a conceyced Commissioner, and a conscionable Minister about
about preferring one thing before another, into a new comparison, betwixt the consciences of Conformists, & of those which refuse to conform. 2. Of that sort, if the same meaning be kept on both sides, I much doubt.

For our Conscience is, that in no place, nor upon any man's command, we may conform: and theirs is, that upon great urgent extremities, they may some time, and in some place conform. I am persuaded, that if it had been free in England to use these Ceremonies, or not to use them, D. B. himself hath no conscience, that would ever have made him conform.

After this, the Repl. added something, about the Def. his Pontificall terms, factious and exorbitant men, opposed to orderly and discreet Preachers. As 1. that the Def. himself in his conscience will not say, that Mr. Middley of Ratfdale, and others like him, were factious and exorbitant men. 2. That this is the language of that evil servant, who beat his fellow-servants, better than himself: Mat. 24. 49. 3. That all those who are placed in the room of silenced Ministers, are not orderly and discreet Preachers. 4. That factious and exorbitance may better be charged upon the Prelats, for breaking many substantiall, ancient, wholesome Canons, than upon us, for breaking a Ceremonious Canon. Now (setting aside the Rejoynder his wandering wordes, with the hony and gall of them) see what he bringeth to the purpose. 1. The first he granteth to be true. But denyeth that the Def. meant so generally. And yet the Def. his words are: whoe saith not, that to deprive
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2. The second he doeth not absolutely gain-say but casteth the like, or rather a farre greater fault in our faces: that wee (forsooth) doe condemn to the pt of darknesse. Bisops, Conformants, and in a manner all that are not of our partie. Whiche is so manifest a slander, that the evill servant spoken of Matth. 24. 49. could hardly vent one more shamelesse.

3. The third he confesseth: But would make it impertinent though it clean overhroweth the Def. his generall assertion, before expressed. He addeth also certayn frothy wordes, conteyning little else, beside manifest Slanders, which if he were put to such an oath, as they call juramentum calumnia, he would not owne.

4. The Prelats willfull, and continuall breaking of many, substantiall, & wholesome Canons, is not denied by the Rej. but yet to save their credit, he addeth, that all suche Canons doe not bind every particular Churche, but her owne. In which wordes there is netherwise, nor reason. The Canons objected, may be seen in Master Parker, part.2. c. 9. sect. 4. to be Canons of our owne Churche. What then hath the Rejoynder sayd to the purpose? His other stuffe hath been sundrie times examined, and found nothing worthe.

5. All these considered, it will appear, that the Rej. had more will, then power, to maintayne, that the silencing of
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of Preachers for our Ceremonies, is the preferring of olderly discreet Preachers, before those that are factionous and exorbitant.

6. After all this, out of Mr. Hy. his papers, it pleased the Def. to bring in some pieces out of the Abrigement: which for substance are such as diverse times have been handled before: and therfore need not muche labor in this place.

The first is, that many people in our land, are known to hold the Sacraments not rightly and sufficiently administered or received without them. For the force of such an opinion in the multitude, many testimonies are alleged in the Abrigement, and applied unto this assertion, not indeed to prove the same simplicie, but to shew what is the consequence of it. All these the Def. left out, and the Rej. had no minde to take them in, but chose rather to rest in this: they are no proofs of the assumption. It was added by the Repl. the opinion even of a few, may make some action unlawful, which the opinion of many other cannot make lawful. 1. Cot. 10. 28. To avoid this, the Rejoynder had nothing materiall to say, before he had changed unlawful into simplicie unlawful.

The just number of those that are so minded, cannot be proved, or disproved, without numbering and examining all the people. It was not therfore any meaning of those that gave the rule to reckon by the pou, as the Def. and Rejoynder would have us.

Nether is this observation brought in to prove imposing and observing, conjunctly, as they would bear the reader.
reader in had, but only for the observing, other proofs being added for the imposing. Yet it was observed by the Repl. that while actions of this kind are supersticiously observed, they that still impose them in those places where they are so observed, may truly be interpreted for impose them. To which the Rejoynder giveth no other proper answer, but onely leaving out the pith of that assertion, may be truly so interpreted, substituteth another; of a purposed ende: and then misinterpreteth actions of this kind, as if they were meant of the speciall kind of things, and not of unnecessarie actions known to be superstitionsly abused.

It was also noted as ridiculous in the Def. that those people which thinke that Sacraments are not rightly administered, or receyved without the Ceremonies, are brought into that conceit by our condemning of the sayd Ceremonies. The Rejoynder answereth, that this condemning of them, must needs make some thinke that they are imposed as parts of religion, and so occasion the simple to thinke that we esteem them so.

In which answer, beside that I know not who are meant by we, and that an occasion of the second or third hand, is made a cause, ther is no mention made of right or unright Sacraments.

For lessening of the number of those which to esteeme of our Ceremonies, the Papists are first removed, as having no great conceit of them. Which I leave to experience. Onely because the Rejoynder requireth testimonie, I can informe him, that Grettler, Apol. pro Greg. 7. p. 8, hath these words: A Lutheran, preaching in
A fresh suite against Ceremonies: garments like the Ape of the preists, celebrates a German Mass. And the Rejoynder himself confesseth in the next wordes, they have a better conceyt of them, then of the contrarie, and that suche as hath been held likely to arow them to our service, and that they have a great disaffectiun to those that will not tollerat the resemblance of their religious Ceremonies. Adde further, that after B. Babington, and B. Andreos, D. Morton himself, in the last words of his Protestants Appeal, hath confirmed the rumor, that Pope Paulus quartus, did offer to confirme our wholle Service and Liturgie. The Papists thersore have no cause whyle they should not have a good conceyt of our Ceremonies, which of all the Service come neerer to, and make most for them.

As for the rest, that so conceyt of the Ceremonies, which are not of your disciplining, (sayth the Rejoynder) and yet are conformable they are not many. As if those of our disciplinating, were so conceyted, or those of Wales, Non-residents, and dumb-residents forlorne charges, who are not disciplined by us, were eyther few or of reformed judgement. Surely D.B. is not like himself, when he upon ingagement defendeth that which cannot be defended.

7. The second thing brought out of the abridge\ment, is about the punishment inflicted for omission of our Ceremonies, greater then for breaking of Gods law, in perjurie and adulterie. Now this hath formerly been handled. In this place therefor, it shall suffize, to let a few notes, upon the Rej. his answers. 1. He di-
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Distinguishing between punishing and punishing as a sin. As if punishment in the internal nature of it, were not of sin. 2. He distinguishes between internal peace of the Church, consisting more in observance of God's commandments, and the peace of her external policy, impeached by the neglect of her constitutions. Whereas he should have made the distinction between one consisting, & another, or between one impeaching, & another.

And yet both the consisting and impeaching of the Churches peace, doth principally depend on the keeping of God's commandments: which is all the Repl. affirmed. 3. He distinguishes between an offence every way lesse, and in its own nature lesse, whereas the question is not, whether the neglect of our Ceremonies, be not onely in its own nature a lesse offence, but also in all the circumstances of it. The Def. and Rejoynder themselves confess, that this neglect, in the nature of it, is no offence at all. 4. Because such answers were termed Sophisticall evasions, the Rejoynder twice crieth out of railing: forgetting (without doubt) how often he had abused the same terme against the Repl. and that in the next former section, he had maintained the Def. his accusing a plain popular argument, not onely of Sophistrie, but even of dull Sophistrie. For the Rejoynder certainly will not confess himself a rayer. The rest is not worth repeating, that paper should be twice blotted with it.

Against the Def. his distinction, between omission, and contempt, the Replie was, that mere omission hath been punished with suspension. Of which the Rejoynder
joynder requireth a continued instance. To which I answer, that one instance may be given in Ipswich, where D. B. was Preacher. For most of the Ministers were suspended upon the complaint of one Web, who professed, that he would not put on the Surplice except others did. D. B. may inquire easily if it was not so. As for continuance, it maketh not to the purpose, except all malefactors be not only put in prison, but also continued in the same, above the Judges pleasure.

The Repl. for affirming, that punishments for mere omission, are provided for by Canon, is accused by the Rejoynder of an untruth in print.

Yet the Rejoynder cannot be ignorant (beside other examples) that every man not kneeling, is to be denied the Sacrament, and that the Minister administering to such, is by the Canon, to be suspended.

So that this was truth in print, ever since the Canons were in print: except suspension from the Sacrament, & from the Ministerie be in his account no punishment.

8. The last thing noted out of the Abridgement is, that non-Conformists are accounted Sisimatikes, Puritanes, and excommunicates, ipso facto, without appeal; which is without example. The Rejoynder here denieth that flatly, without more words, which is plainly cited out of the 6. Canon, let the Canon therefore be looked upon, and that is enough. 2. He saith that the ould anathema sit was as much as to excommunicate ipso facto.

And yet King James himself, in his answer to Perone, doeth shew, that the olde anathema sit, was...
was onely a declaring who ought to be excommunicated, and not an excommunication de facto. 3. He sayth for Appeal, that none is admitted, from the highest Court, suche as the Convocation is. As if euyther the Convocation were the highest court, or any court at all, for ought that I ever heard of the Court of Convocation, as I have of a Court of Parliament, or as if so muche libernie were left unto a poor Minister, now standing at the Bishops barre, as to appeal to the next Convocation. The Rejoynder surely did not well consider what he spake.

4. Whereas the Def. granted, that we have reason perhaps to wish, that some poenalties were released, the Rejoynder interpreteth this reason to be suche as all men that feel the smart of punishment (for whatsoever offende) may have. Which is nothing ells, but to looke on, with laughter, at all the greivous thinges which any Ministers have suffered, for this cause. And yet every foot the Rejoynder puteth on another person, and (as I am perswaded) hath another heart.

After this, the Rejoynder commeth to the slander of Puritamisme, and Schisme. And as for Puritanisme, he sayth the Def. sided by it, as a terme not imposed upon us by him. As if we may not complaine of, or inferre consequence, from any terme, except it be imposed upon us by D. Morton, or D. Burgesse or at the least, they were not bound to answer for any termes, except such as they themselves have imposed!

For Schisme, and Separation, after some sparkling words of rash blasphemos, and fierce Sirs, he telleth us.
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1. that nothing may be established in the Church, which God hath not commanded in his Word, 2. that all forms of worship and all mere Ecclesiastical rises, not prescribed, are will-worship. 3. That the calling of our Bishops, and consequently of our Ministers, is Antichristian. 4. That our Ceremonies are idolatrous,) are the first principles of Separation. Now if it would please the Rejoynder either to declare what is Separation, or what is a principle, this question would be easilie decided. In the mean time, I answer. 1. The first principle is from Moses, if it be understood, as we mean it: thou shalt not add any thing thereto. 2. The second confounding mere rises, with forms of worship, is not ours, but only by the Rej. his fiction. 3. The third supposeth, that which we utterly deny, that the calling of our Ministers doth essentially depende upon the Bishops calling. 4. The fourth is made scismaticall, by a scismaticall concey of the Rej. namely, that every Church is to be utterly condemned, and so separated from, that hath any thing in it, by participation idolatrous. His being of this opinion, may be answered in that fashion which he answered the like phrase withall, pag. 216. He hath not ever been the best Logician. His profession, of separating (this day, ere he sleep) if he did beleive these principles, is nothing else but a rhetorical flourish, which he would twice recall, before he would separate from those that bowe to Altars, or even those which worship an ubiquitous bodie, in the Lords Supper, though these are more palpable idolatrous (in his conscience) then the Ceremonies questioned are in ours.

As
As for the addition, with a yea, that Mr. Bradshaw's very arguments are presented for Separation so as they cannot be denied with any forehead, 

It is not worth a refutation: because Mr. Bradshaw himself, in a book intituled, the unreasonableess of the Separation) hath sufficiently shewed how unreasonably they are pretended, and abused. If the Rejoynder hath any thing to rejoigne thereunto, I would willingly see with what forehead he can doe it.

The other talke of this section, as also the recounting of a confusion in the 15. section, I leave to be counted as it deserveth, by him that will compare what hath been said, with the wordy rejoyneder to it, so vainely opposed, and so often repeated.

Only (in few wordes) let it be noted how in the 15. section, he fliethheth the sentence of D. Covell as not worth any answer) who confuted his Apologie, and in that writing (at the least) was a kinde of publick wrighter, having had as much approbation, as this Rejoynder hath for his rejoyneder as appeareth out of the Rejoynder his Præface pag. 18. namely of the then L.A. D. B. crost, etc. 2. How he maketh the impoters sentence, to be an adequate rule of observance, de facto. 3. How he denieth some divine worship onely to be unholy in the kinde: as if some singular true divine worship may be unholy. 4. What a wilde consequence he buildeth upon if the crosse be no part of the S. crament, then it is no part of worship: because it may not (in the Repl. his opinion) be a part. 5. How unreasonablelie he defendeth this consequence, our Ceremonies are changeable, and therefore not essential.
A fresh suit against Ceremonies: when yet he confesseth the Popish Ceremonies to be changeable, and yet essentiall worship.
6. What science ther is, for a Rejoynder upon suche groundes to charge the Repl. for violating his conscience?

Chapter 3.
The third Argument, taken from the significant nature of our Ceremonies.

Section 1. and 2.
Concerning certain miscelaneall notions and testimonies against humane religious significant Ceremonies.

1. His Argument pleadeth, that no humane Ceremonies, appropriated to Gods service, ordeyned, or instituted, to teache any spirituall dutie, by mysticall signification, are lawfull. About this the Rejoynder threateneth blowes. But we have had now suche experience of his forcelesse indevours in other Arguments, that the fear of his blowes is past.
2. The first proofe of our proposition was taken from the second Commandement: which the Def. The second part. D j d omitted
omitted in this place; and the Rejoynder will not have any man to take exception against the sayd omission; but with what reason, let his reader judge.

3. A second proof was, that Christ is the onely teacher of his Churche, and appointer of all meanes whereby we should be taught and admonished of any holy duty, and all Christ's doctrine, with the meanes therof, is perfectly conteyned in the holy Scripture. Here (sayth the Rejoynder) the Def. forgot to tell, how absurd this collection is, Christ is the onely authentique teacher of his Churche etc. therefore they may be no meanes of teaching or admonishing unto duties, but suche as be ordened as necessarie. As if it were sufficient for the Def. or Rejoynder to tell us any thing as they please, how little ever it be to the purpose.

He maketh shew of a distinction, betwixt an authentique teacher, and another, what do you call him? to which we cannot say muche untyll he remember to tell us the name, style, and office of that other by-teacher?

Onely this by the way, I would learne: how we can acknowledge and receive any meanes of religious teaching with faith, except it appear to be appointed by an authentique teacher and lawgiver? And how our Prelates in oppointing meanes of spirituall teaching whch Christ appointed not, can be accounted (therin) Ministeriall teachers under him as their and our onely authentique teacher? As also, if Christ be our Authentique Teacher in all good that we learne about religion who taught our Prelates suche good manners, as tu
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put seseus of their owne making, into his hand, and so appoint him after what manner, and by what means he shall teache us? P. Mart. (in Reg. 8. thus disputeth. For as much as God is most wise he needs not our devise for instruments to stirre up faith in us which also no tradesman in his kind would indure, but would chuse to himselfe at his own pleasure what he should think most fit. Nay I would be resolved of this doubt: whether this be not a doctrine religious in England: The signe of the crosse doth signify unto us that we shou'd not be ashamed of Christ crucified such. If it be (as no Conformist can deny) then I would know: whether and where Christ, our onely Authentique teacher, doeth teache this doctrine? or if our Prelates may bringe in a new doctrine into the Churche, and cause Ministers to preache it? He leaveh out of our proof, that Christ is the onely appoinser of means, as also that those means are limited to admo- nation of a holy dutie: and in stead of our conclusion, he bringeth in another, of ordeyning as necessarie.

The support also of our collection he omittesth: to acknowledge any other means of teaching and admonishing us of our dutie, then suche as Christ hath appointed, is to receive another teacher into the Churche, beside him, and to confesse some imperfection in the means by him ordained. Yet in the middest of this shuffling, and cutting, he tel-leth us, that our collection is absurd. His reason is not by manifesting the fault of our consequence, but onely by objecting some instances, and those also nothing to purpose. Then (sayth he) it should not be lawfull to use any helpe of Art Memorative, nor to set up a gubbess.
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or a trayers head on a pole, to give men warning against murder, or treason. Had he so soon forgotten, that the question is of Ceremonies, appropriated to Gods service, teaching by ordination, or institution? If he had not, what did he mean, to instance in things that were never called Ceremonies (before this Rejoynder made all things in the world, in some respect, Ceremonies, by his wilde definition of a Ceremonie,) things that have no use in Gods service, muche lesse appropriated therto, things not teaching by vertue of any ordination, or institution, but onely by their naturall relation, nay things not teaching at all any spirituall dutie directly, and immediately? Characters and suche like helps of memorie, doe no otherwise teache true, then error, and heresies no more spirituall duties, then carnall lusts, as experience doeth teache. One of the ancients, and learnedest Schoolme of our Countrie (Alex. Alcius, p. 4q. 1 m. 7,) teacheh us that Letters that signifie sacred sensences do not signifie them as they are sacred, but as they are things. And if it be lawfull to institute significant Ceremonies, for all things, that we may note in characters, for memorie sake the certainly our Convocation may institute Ceremonies properly Sacramentall, even suche as doe signifie and seale the Covenant of grace. For ther is no doubt, but that we may note in characters or writing all that belonge to that Covenant. Gibbes, & trayers heads (besides the former exception out of Alex. Hales) are remembrances of death inflicted upon suche malefactors, but neither to be appointed by any, without that authority, by which death is inflicted, nor in their use im-
imposed upon any, nor determined by institution, to the teaching of any thing, which they would not otherwise teach, not yet such remembrances as may be brought into God's worship. Nay, from them some good Divines do reason against images in Churches, and such like significant Ceremonies. D. Fulke against Sanders of images, hath these words: Images (sayth Sanders) are profitable; because they bring us in remembrance of good things. I deny this argument; because nothing is profitable in religion, but that which is instituted by God. For otherwise we might bring the gallows into the Church, which bringeth us in remembrance of God's justice.

4. To passe by those exceptions of the Repl. against the Def. which the Rej. calleth wrangling (though they be defensible enough) The first proof of our proposition is taken from Mar. 7. and Matt. 15. where (as we alledge) our Saviour by this argument (among others) condemneth the Jewish purifying, and justifieth himself, and his Disciples, in refusing that Ceremonie: because (being the practice of men) it was taught, and used, as a doctrine, by way of signification to teach what inward purificatiō should be in them, and how they ought to be cleansed from heathen pollutions. To this the Rej. (supplying againe that which the Def. had forgotten) answereth, that this reason (among others) of signification, is our fiction. Now (though these places of Scripture have formerly been handled, in the second chapter) let any man consider this observation: wee indeed in our Saviours answer, three reasons of reprehending the Pharisees: 1. That their washing was preferred before
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before the Commandements of God. 2. That it was hypocriticall. 3. That it was a vaine worship, & therefore sinne. If any say, it was not vayne, as significant, wee replie, it could be no outward worship, but as religiously significant. For washing, without signification had been meer civill. And Marc. 7. 4. The Pharisees are reproved, for meer undertaking to observe washings, no mention being made of any other reason, but onely that observance, which must needs be understood of all observance, which was not civill, but (by institution & intention) religious.

5. For this interpretation, and collation, many good Divines were cited as fathering the same. They are all abused, saith the Rej. Now of Chrysostome, enough hath been sayd, in the former chapter. D. Whiraker his approbation of the same sentence is shifted of, with binding of conscience, and holiness placed in them. But these shiftes are sufficiently discussed in the former part of this book. To the Confession of Witenberge it is answered. 1. That it doeth not so muche as give anie glance at Marc. 7. Which how true it is, may appear by these their words: Nor is it lawful to restore either the old rules of the law, or to devise new in their place to signifie the truth of the gospel now come to light, as for example, to use banniers and Crosse to signe Ch. sts vs & vorte on the Crosse: of which kind ofoly devised representations, is the whole furniture of Masse accourement, which they say doeth set forth the whole passion of Christ, and many such like things. Of which sacred ceremonies Christ preacheth out of Isajah 3. In vaine they worship.
worship me teaching for doctrines the precepts of men.

Witch the last wordes are (in every syllable of them) founde Marc. 7. 7. Is not this so muche as a glance at Marc 7? Surerly hear the Rej. had more affection to his cause, then attentation to the place in question.

6. Of Calvin, see the former chapter. Yet heere also let these wordes of his be rememberd: In these words *omnes* thes are evident, that all will worshipes are condemned. Christ pronounced them erroneous, which for Doctrine obstrude men's accept. Let this stand firme, all devised worshipes are most vaine before God. Under which censur and sentence, that he includeth suche signifiant Ceremonies as ours are, it appeareth, as out of his condemning them in the Lutherans, against Westphalus, so out of his owne praction in Geneva and France, where all suche are abolisht: for he professeth (de n. cest. ref. Ecol.) We have touched nothing, no not with the leas finger to remove it except that which Christ accounts nothing, being he pronounced God is vaineely worshipes by humane traditions.

7. Virel (in Catechism, in praecip. 2.) extendeth the second Commandement, unto the forbidding of every humane religious likevess. The Rej. also confesseth, that the same Virel, there condendeth all superstition: to which he if he had added his definition of superstition, viz: that it is a worshiping of God by rites and Ceremonies devised of man, all would have been plaine. Neyther is
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it materiall, that Virel pointeth not to Marc. 7. (as the Rej. noteth) seing he groundeth his doctrine upon Marth. 15. 9. where the same words are found, which in Marc. 7. 7. are repeated. The Rej. therefor had no shew of reason to say, that Virel was abused, in that he was cited as interpreting Marke, because (by his owne confession) he doeth interpret the same wordes which are found in Marke.

8. Zepperus his testimonie (which was not his alone, but the common sentence of diverse Protestant Synodes, as appeareth out of his præface) is so full, that the Rejoynder in him forbare his common accusation, that he was abused. His words are these, de Pol. Eccl. lib. I. cap. 10. reg. 3. With God is worshipped in vaine by humane traditions Mar. 15. 9. Nor will be of any efficacie such things in the hearts of men, and being meere will-worship, carrying but an opinion of wisdome through which God will never stir up devotion, prayer, faith, and repentance in us &c. And againe, the ceremonies Cobled or bosch b. mint: the administration of the sacraments are so many seminaries and nurseries of error, idolatre and superstition such ceremonies are to be abolished Mar. 15. 7. Where as it is manifest that about Baptisme oyle, salt, holy water, supers, to signe of the crosse &c. are to be abrogated.

If these words be not to the purpose, in the Rejoynder his owne conscience, then I despare of satisfying him about any testimonie that maketh against the
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That which he is resolved to mainteyne (as they say) by hooke or crooke.

9. D. Fulke (saysthe Rejoynder) did not thinke humane Ceremonies to be condemned for being significates, when no religion, or service of God is placed in them. Which is as much as if he had sayd: D. F. did not think humane Ceremonies to be condemned for being significates, when they are not significates. For (as hath been shewed in the former part) all religious Ceremonies instituted, by their significations to raise up the heart unto the honoring of God, have some religion and service of God placed in them. And that D. Fulke did mean by placing of religion, or Gods service in them, the using of them unto religious use, it appeareth by a like place in Act. 17. sect. 5. Though is be not simele unlawfull, to expresse in painting the visable shapes shewed in visions to the Prophets, yet to make those shapes for any use of religion, is abominable idolatrie.

10. For D. Raynolds, the Rejoynder answereth: 1. that he giveth no hint touching the interpretation of this place. 2. that he onely inveigheth against the multitude and burthen of Symbolical rites, shewing their use in Poperie to be lewished. 3. that D. R. judged our significates Ceremonies lawful to be used in case of silencing and deprivation. Now for the first, I answer, that as ther are hints of interpretation for many places of the olde Testament, in the new, which yet are not cited there, so may it be that D. R. gave a hint, without quoting. About the third point, I r. observe, that by the Rejoynder his owne relation, D. Rain. was not of his and D. Mortons judgemen. For

The second part.

E e e he
he judged our Ceremonies onely tollerable in case of extremity: but they allow the very institution of them, as good and profitable for order, decencie, and adification. 2. D. R. never manifested to the world in publick any reasons for that judgement, but rather for the contrarie, as by and by we shall hear. 3. There is a kinde of suspensive judgement (suche as Cyrill, Peter Lombard, as Estius in 2. d. 21. alledged and interpreteth them, say Eve had, about the Serpents speaking) to which the iniquitie of times doe draw many godly and learned men, not onely about Ceremonies violently urged by & with greivous poenalties, but also about greater matters, as experience in all ages hath shewed. But that is nothing to others as being destitute or forsaken of certaine groundes or supportes.

Concerning the second and mayne poynt, the best way is, to let downe D. R. his owne wordes, which are these: Were it so, that the Popsish Vnitio[n] had another eyth. or worke, or meaning, with the Papsits, then with the Iewes, as after a sort, it hath. Yet might the Ceremonie be Iewish notwithstanding, as sacrificing of a lambe, so signifie Christ already come. At the leaft S. Peter did constraine the Gentiles to Judaize (Gal. 2. 12.) though he, and those Gentiles had another meaning, then that wherein that chosen people was prescribed to the Iews. Adv. Hart. chap. I. sect. 4.

Thus farre I had in my notes, out of the English editio[n] but ther is this more in the book, as I now finde in the Latine copie, not having the English at hand: you
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rites in the very kind are Jewish or as the Jewish were. Now out of these last words I argue thus: 1. If all amphibious call rites be Judaical, and therefore unlawful, then all religious significant Ceremonies are Jewish and unlawful.

But D. R. saith the first: therefor he teacheth also the latter. 2. Out of the former I conclude thus: if a Jewish rite may be without a Jewish opinion, then our Ceremonies may be Jewish, or Popish, without a Jewish, or Popish opinion, or doctrine.

But the first is affirmed by D. R. therefore the latter also. Which if it be true, then both the Defend. and rejoinder have taken a false ground of their ceremonial doctrine, in affirming so confidently upon all occasions, that it is the opinion and doctrine only which maketh a Ceremonie Jewish, Popish, or any way unlawful.

All this notwithstanding, the rejoinder could not forbear to accuse the Authors of the Abridgement, his olde reverend friends, of shameful abusing the world, with false allegations of these Divines, nor to triumph in his discovering of this shame.

But I could wish, from my heart, that he, and his best friends living, had no more cause to be ashamed of his rejoinder, then they had of these allegations, which none of the Authors, if they were on earth alive would disavow.

Eee 2

11. In
In the last place, upon occasion of our disliking all the significant Ceremonies, brought in by the Pharisees, it pleased the Def. to taxe us for being too like the Saduces, in refusing suche Ceremonies. Now of this accusation the Repliocr only desired the Def. to consider, if it did not touche our blessed Saviour himself, who by his example, and doctrine opposed the same Ceremonies? Hereupon the Rejoynder answereth, that our Saviour walked a middle path, between the excess of the Pharisees, and the præcisenesse of the Saduces, in Ceremonies, observing many humane significant Ceremonies in religion, as the Feast of Dedication, embalmimg at burialls, sitting at burialls, sitting at the Passover, and the Synagogues, with their formalities. In which answer, the Rejoynder hath shewed, that upon occasion, he dare goe as far, and say as muche for humane Ceremonies, as any that went before him, if not more, and that with suche confidence as is not abated with reverence of our Saviour himself, whom this passage doeth concern. But beside this audaciousnesse, I finde no trueth in these words. For, that which he sayth of the Saduces præcisenesse in flying all human Ceremonies, is not true. The Saduces (sayth Epiphanius lib. c. 14.) omnia aequabilia cum Samaritis observant, i.e. they observe all that the Samaritans observe: and who can doubt but the observations and Ceremonies proper to the Samaritans, were all inventions of men, with the Divels helpe. The Saduces also were sometime high Priests at Jerusalem, as for example, Annas is noted by Iosephus (l. 20. c. 13.), and by like historians, to have been a Saducen. Now i
is not credible, that any high Preist in those times, did absteyne from all humane Ceremonies, used commonly by all the Iews Mar. 7. 3. At the least the high Preist did observe the feast of Dedication, sitting at the Passover, and suche like (in the Rejoynder his accout) humane Ceremonies. 2. The Saduces were prophane beasts, not hoping for Heaven, nor fearing Hell, and so were allways ready to observe any Ceremonies that made for their temporall advantage, of what kinde soever they were. 3. It appeareth out of the premisses, that our blessed Saviour (in favour of our patric base Ceremonies) is wronged in his holy name, as if he had been more observant of humane mysticall constitutions in religion, then many of the worst Iews, whome yet he reproved for following traditions of men. 4. Because the Rejoynder speaketh of a midle path, between the excess of the Pharisies, and preciseness of the Saduces, observed by our Saviour, it would be known, whether that midle were medium participationis, or medium abnegationis? i.e. Whether it was only a third way partaking of neyther extreme? or had in it part of the Pharisies excess, and part of the Saduces precisence? The former sense we may (upon the Rejoynder his supposition acknowledge: and that maketh nothing to the purpose.

If the later meaning be the Rejoynders, then he must shew us, how farre our Saviour did agree in practice with the Pharisies? And to clear that, he must prove that the Pharisies had lawfull authoritie, for appointing or instituting mysticall Ceremonies, and whiche of them were
A fresh suits against Ceremonies.

were allowed by our Saviour? 3. The examples here given, pertaine nothing to the question. The feast of Dedication commeth after to be handled. Embalming at burials, was no significant religious Ceremonie, but a civil rite common to the Israelites with the Egyptians, and other Heathens. If it were, yet being from the time of the Patriarches, how will the Rejoynde prove that it was instituted without Divine direction Siting at the Passover can neyther be proved to be mystical, nor yet instituted by man. Synagoges were no more significant Ceremonies, then was the Schoole of Tyrannus, Act. 19. 9. The opening, closing, and delivering of the Book; Luc. 14. 17. 20. was no more mystical a Ceremonie, then the opening of a mans mouth when he speaketh, and the shutting of it againe, when he hath no more to say. Are not these worthy groundes, for to conclude upon, that our Saviour was an observer of humane religious mystical Ceremonies?

S E C T. 3.

Concerning S. Augustine.

1. Augustine, in the Abridgement, was among other Divines cited, asallowing of one proof belonging to this Argument, taken from significance. This the Def. catched holde of before the time or place of it, as matter of a section by it self, distinct from the testimonies of other Divines. Which dealing
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dealing we must not speak of: because the Rejoynder
sayth, it was order'y done. But if their Printer-hath
failed in right noting the numbers, he will needs have
that a very slippery tricke. If also the Def. brought in
this testimonie out of place, that was (in the Rejoynder
his language) because he would not seacher us up too
straight. All this we may let passe, as formalitie of
wordes, sutable to his Ceremonies, which he seeketh
to mainteyne.

2. But (sayth the Rejoynder) if in stead of lib. 3. c.
33. he put in lib. 2. cap. 7. as the Repl. would have it, yet
nothing is found to the purpose. Now (though it
skilleth not muche: because this place was but conjec-
turally pointed at, in stead of another misticed yet) in
that place, this is to be found, so muche to the purpose,
that I knew not how the Rej. will avoyde the weight
of it: that S. Aug. distinguishing between natural, and
instituted signes, sayth presently after, that there is no use
or caufe of instituted signes, nisi ad expromendum, et
trajiciendum in alerens animum, id quod in animo gerit
qui dat, i.e. but to declare and make intelligible, what the in-
situer meanseth. From whence, we gather, that our Pre-
lates instituting significant Ceremonies, can signifie no
more than what they would have, and not what God
would have.

3. Another place of Augustine was allledged.
out of Ep. 5. Signes when they belon to divine things are
called Sacraments. Of these wordes, the Rej. (differing
from the Def. sayth) that his meaning was to shew, that the
name of Sacraments belongeth properly to divine thinges, and
not to all signes of holy thinges.
But it is plain, that his meaning was, to shew, that all things instituted imbuendo virtutibus animo, i.e. to stir up the mind to virtue, as he speaketh immediately before, are Sacraments. In defense of the Def. he answereth, with the Def. that in Augustines language, all signs of holy things, are familiarly called Sacraments, and that we have but a small acquaintance with Augustines language.

Where (because both the Defend. and Rej. would seeme so familiarly acquainted with Augustines language) I would desire only, that they would interpret unto us (strangers from it) the meaning of these words of his, Epist. 119. Dies natalis Domini, non in Sacramento celebratur, sed tantum in memoriam revocatur, quod gestum est. Pascha sic agimus, ut Sacramenti significationem non omissamus. Sacramentum est in celebration quum res gesta sita commemoratio sit ut aliquid eisiam significatione intelligatur quod sancte accipiendum est, i.e.

The celebration of Christ's nativitie is no Sacrament: but the celebration of Easter is a Sacrament. Here we must have a new distinction, never head of since Augustines time, or else it cannot stand (whiche yet they, who seeme so versed in Augustines phrazes, will needs dictate unto us) that all signs of holy things, are, Augustines phrazes, Sacraments: except perhaps (again their often professed teares) they will say, that holy-daies not that which is appointed for memorie of Christ owne nativitie, is a signe of a holy thinge. Neyther can it be (according to Augustines phrazes) but suche significant Ceremonies as Easter was, must ha more then the mere name of Sacraments.
And this was that, for whiche Augustines testimonie was onely brough in for, viz. to shew that religious significant Ceremonies participate part of the Sacraments nature. To this (after some wordes of course) it is rejoined, that the name Sacrament improperly given to other things, doth not prove them to participate the propertie and nature of Sacraments, no more than the Swanne in Toulborne, or the Idols of the Gentiles, doe participate the nature of a Swanne, and God: suche denominations not being reall, and proper, lust logical, or relative. And if it were so, then the taking away of that name from our Ceremonies, doth discharge them from partaking the nature of Sacraments. To whiche I have this to say i, that our Argument is not taken from the meer name: for we know that some names are common to thinges quite differing in nature, so falling (as they say) by chaunce. But this communitie of the name Sacrament, was not so: it was communicated to Mystical Ceremonies upon certeine counsell and reason. And that reason was not meer similitude outward, suche as is betwixt the picture of a Swanne and a living Swanne: Because ther is no suche outward likenesse betwixt the Crosse, and any proper Sacrament: but fro some proportion of inward nature, eyther in mens estecme, as an Idols was called God, or in deed wholly so farre as mans institution can effect, as the Popish five Sacramentes are so called, or else in part, as this kinde of significant Ceremonies, which are in question. Now that this last was the reason, Augustine himselfe teacheth in the for-alleged sentence, concerning Easter: and Chemnitius, out of him,
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doeth largely declare, in the beginning of his 2. tome, de Sacramentorum numero. Bellarmin also (de effect. Sacrament. 1. 2. T. 24.) giveth the same rule, and reason: All are called Sacraments which have a mystical sense, and are types or figures of other things. 2. From the former answer, the Rej. his Hoste in Holborne can gather, that not the picture of a Swanne, but a living Goose, hath that proportion to a living Swanne, which is betwixt other mystical Ceremonies, and proper Sacraments.

3. It is but a picture of a reason, whiche the Rejoynder maketh, from giving of the name Sacrament, to the taking of it away. For no man will say, that a name taken from the nature of a thing doeth argue more the nature of it, then the taking away the name alone, doeth argue the taking away of the nature. The ancient naming of suche Images as the Papists are, did argue then to have an idolatrous nature: but the removing of the name from them, by the Papists, doeth not argue they are now of idolatrous nature.

5. From the name sacrament, which first was given to this kinde of Ceremonies, it came that afterward they were called Sacramentalls. For so sayth Suarez de Relig. Vol. 1. tract. 3. lib. 4. cap. 14.) They use to be styled sacramentalls, or more generally all Ceremonies & holy blessings done in the Church. To this observation of the Replie the Rejoynder answereth, that the name Sacramenta taken properly, is given out of relation to Sacraments, not of participation or resemblance of their nature. And that analogically suche Ceremonies as are consecrated to signify a Wrox supernatural effects are called Sacramentals.
first of which interpretations we do not deny: saving only, we see not why the Rejoynder should say in that sense only that name is taken properly.

In the second, he confesseth as much as we desire: saving that he musteth in two terms unsitting: consecrated to worke. For many Mystical Ceremonies were not consecrated at all among the Papists (as the aecall signe of the Crosse etc.) and some were consecrated in Augustines time, (the practice wherof is here defended by the Rejoynder) nor can be condemned by those that consecrate Churches, Churche-yarders, Altars etc.

And as for working, if it be understood of morall working by admonition, then it cannot be denied unto mysticall signes by institution admonitorie. Howsoever a principall Iesuit may profess as muche at Rome, of Popish Ceremonies, as the Rejoynder doeth here of ours. So Vasquez (in 3. D.iSp. 128. cap. 5. ar. 4. sacramentals do not work remission of venial sins nor are insisted so that end, but to stir up the mind to desist them.

6. It was in the conclusion of this passage, granted by the Repl, that neyther Augustine, nor other fathers, did constantly in doctrine, and practice, reject humane mysticall Ceremonies. Whereupon the Rejoynder infirrith, and wherein Augustine therefore is wronged, and we are more Natalists. But here he forget, that all our Divines, and also our English Articles of confession with our Apologie, doe reject divers things (as prayer to, & for the dead, mens falling from grace etc.) which those Fathers
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Fathers did not constantly in doctrine and practice, reject, and yet are neither to be esteemed mere Novatists, not yet accused of wronging those Fathers, when they cite some testimonies out of their writings, against those errors. Concerning Ceremonies, it is the commone sentence of our Divines, which Beza expresseth (ad Baldwinum) as is not to be doubted but that most of your ancients Bishops were somewhat too busy in devising rites, etc., but unhappy was the Counsel.

7. To make an end of this one testimonie, which it pleased the Defend. to take into so large consideration, for advantage. Augustine Epist. 119. ad Lan. is cited by all, as condemning the multitude of humane Ceremonies which were then crept into the Church and worship of God: and therein (without all doubt) he sayd that out, which many other godly men did inwardly conceive: yet neither he, nor they, did constantly reject that multitude, nor he declare his minde, but when he was urged by 

The fear of the times, bearing toward Poperie, made him (with others despairing of reformation) yeeld too much unto suche abuses. Yet in that famous place (Epist. 119.) not only the number, but even the nature of suche Ceremonies is condemned. 7. For the manifesting wherof, I note these passages: 7. He noteoth these Ceremonies, that they were instituted, ut quasi observatio Sacramenti sint, i.e. so that they partaked the nature of Sacrament. For as quasi contractus, and quasi peculium castrense, done in the
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the Civill law note participation of the nature of suche things to which they are quasi; so doeth, quasi Sacramentum. 2. He professeth, that by reason of times, he durst not speake against suche Ceremonies so freely as his judgement did lead him: liberius improbire non amico. 3. He calleth them servilia onera, and humanas presumptiones; servil burdens, and humane presumptions. 4. He accounteth the Church, in regard of them, to be troubled with muche chaffe, & tares: inter multam palcam, multisque zizania considusam. 5. He sayth, that suche Ceremonies, though they were tolerated, yet they were not to be allowed of, but upon the first opportunitie to be casbiered rescanda, yea though it were not discerned, how they made against faith or good manners.

Let any man now judge, if Augustine did in this his clear sentence about Ceremonies, agree with our Def.and Rejoyner.

S 6 C T.
Sect. 4.

The judgement of Protestant Divines concerning significant Ceremonies.

1. The Rejoynder was not so large in the former section, about one Divine, but he is brief, in this, about many. For first in generall, he would persuade us with wordes, that the Def. in answering tower testimonies, had answered all, in one word: that no Protestant Divine (except Beza) hath spoken absolutely against signs symbolical and merely significant.

Which kinde of rejoynng, had had some sente, if mere denying of a conclusion, were a sufficient answer to an argument drawn from diverse testimonies alleged for the proof of it. But yet not trullng to this kinde of answering, he adventureth, to clear the particular allegations: which was more then the Def. would undertake. One would have expected, that here he should have answered, that which is so pertinent to the purpose found in the Abridgement, pag. 32. because he put it of before (pag. 247.) with a sale of a by, and promised after to shew, that it is nothing to the purpose. The allegation is this: To them that say Images may stand in Churches, as helps to stirre up devotion, and to put men in remembrance of good things (with which the Def. and Rejoynder consent) it is answered (by P Martyr, Gwalter, Lavater, Ursine, Polanus, and others:) that the Lord himself hath appointed means
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meane enough to doe that: and that no meane may be used to that ende, but such as he hath ordyned. This certayne was to the Rejoynder as it were a note me tangere: that no meane must be used to stirre up devotion, and to put men in remembrance of good thinges, but onely those which God hath ordeyned. He was therfore contented to passe it over without medling with it. And he that with his answers to the other allegations, may thinke that the better way for him, had been, to deal in like manner with all. This will appear in the examining of them, one by one.

2. In the first place, therfore, we exspect his answer to that which is founde in the Harmonie of Protestant Confessions, generally approved, by Reformed Churches. About which he is very brief, as his cause required. The Divines of Wittenburke (sayth he) and those of France, and the Lowe Contrees: viz. that they speake onely of those significant Ceremonies, which serve to shadow out the Mysteries of the Gospel, or to supplie the office of true Sacramentes. Now (for the present) we will not stand muche upon those phraies. Shadows of the Mysteries of the Gospel, supplying of the true Sacraments office. It shall be sufficient, to recite the wordes which he hath so easily and often answered. The Wittenburge Confession (lect. 17.) sayth thus: It is not l. wful, other to restore the olde Ceremonies of the lawe, or devise new, to shadow forth the truth already layd open, and brought to light, by the Gospel: as in the daylight to set up candel, to signifie the light of the Gospel, or to carie banners and crosse, to signifie the victorie of Christ, through his Crosse. Of which sorte, is all...
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that Massing attire, which (they say) doeth shadow out the whole passion of Christ, and many other things of that kinde etc. The other wordes are these: No Mysticall rites (that is, which carry some mysterie, or signification, in them) though not otherwise impious (as namely suche as should be partes of Gods doctrine, or kindes of Sacraments) but only suche lawes as pertaine to order and decence are lawfull. Let any man that understandeth English, and reason, judge, if those wordes ought, or can be interpreted, onely of (I knowe not what) mysteries of the Gospell, or Ceremonies supplying the office of true Sacramentes, further then our Argument doeth importe. If not, then the Rejoynder granting the premisles, denieth the conclusion as he did before.

The Confession condemneth banners by name and Crosses, signifying the victorie of Christ through his Cross: Our men defende the signe of the Cross, signifying that Christians shall not be ashamed, to fight manfully against Satan under Christ's Banner. The Divines of France and the Low Countries, (with the Confession) reject all Ceremonies, that carry some mysterie or signification in them: Our question is, whether humane Ceremonies of mystical signification, be lawfull? If these testimonies be not plaine enough, I knowe not what is plaine.

3. Peter Martyr (on 1. King. 8) is the next witnesse of whom the Rejoynder sayth, that he speaketh of Exorcisme, oyle, spittle, and exsuffation, to all which the Papists ascribe operation, and to that ende doe consecrate some of them by prayer. Beside (sayth he) Martyr did approve these
our Ceremonies as lawful, and bowing of the knee at the
name of Jesus: so that he wondereth Martyr should be alleged
in this cause. Now therefore let us hear P. Martyr himself speak: The most wise God needeth none of our help to de-
vote means to excite faith, nor would the meanest Mechanic
endure to &c. See before how bold then are these men who
will prescribe to God wherewithall to help forward our sal-
vation.

They multiplie signes which they will leave to be sacred as
ylle, spittle, exsufflations etc. & that one Sacrament of Bapt.
is much degenerate. Nor are they to be heard when to abuse the
simple they use to distinguish betweene Sacrament and Sacra-
mentals meer Sophistrie. As for operation, we have
ofte shewed, that many Papists ascribe no more of that,
nor no other wise, to many of their Ceremonies, then
the Def. and Rejoynder doe allow of in ours. Consecra-
tion by prayer, may as well be used about a Surplis, as
about a Churcheyard. It is playne by the wordes,
that P. M. doeth condemme all meanes instituted by man,
for the stirring up of our faith: which are in the Def.
and Rejoynder his language, mysticall morall ceremonys, ser-
vying for adification: saying that no Carpenter, or Mason
would be so dealt with in his occupation, as the insti-
tutors of suche mysticall Ceremonies doe deal with
God. He accounteth humane sacred signes in Reli-
gion, to be humane Sacraments: and will not admitte
of suche distinctions, as the Rejoynder hath multiplied:
Sacred properly, and deductively, rightly, or abusively sacred,
simple or double sacred. Sacramentall, or morall, reductive,
or analogicall Sacramentals, etc.

The second part.
Yet we deny not, but the same P.M. being sometime perplexed in the case of England, did suffer his affection to carry him so far, that he seemeth to make some of our Ceremonies, in some case, tolerable. But then any man may perceives waver in his wordes: as when (in his epist. to Hooper) he requireth five conditions in suche Ceremonies, 1. that the Churche habe libertie to ordeyne them: 2. that the worship of God be not placed in them: 3. That they be few: 4. Not burdensome, 5. Not a hinderance to better things.

The two first of which conditions are the very question: viz: whether the Churche hath any suche libertie, and whether all suche Ceremonies be not part of worship: and for the two last, experience teacheth, how burdensome our Ceremonies have been, and are still, to many good mens conscientes, and how much good hath been hindered, by the urging, and practizing of them.

4. Sadecel is put of, with the like shift, of consecration, necessitie, efficacie Sacramentalia. Now these terms have been sufficiently unmasked before, in the first part. Let Sadecel here onely be heard, and he will tell his owne meaning. The exorcisme holy water, tauer, salt spittle, white garment, the litle bells, &c. Whist good do they do in Baptisme? Do they indeed being added to Baptisme ad as all to its ornament? but what are these devices of such things wiser then Christ Jesus who instituted Bapt. With such simplicity and purity as knowing better then all men besides what ornaments suite best with his owne ordi-nances? what arrogance is this to ad thus to Christ's institution

Quid profane
in Baptismo
in exorcismate,
consecratione
quaerente sal,
sanctatam, oculum,
vestis candida,
nota, &c. Nunc
ad Baptismum
ostendens, addi-
samentum in
pertinentiam
suum fuisse prae-
dictum, quo
Christus, quem
apostolus Baptis-
sum, singulare
simplicitia, intacto,
pueritate, quaeque melius
novus quum
omnes simul
hominum, qua-
stis convenientem
ornamentum?
Loquela haec
arrogans, adji-
cente simplicitate
Iesu Christi
Gal.
false against Ceremonies.

Gal. 3. she motion added to Bapt. we allow no more sich that of Confirmation. Bec. it belongs to God onely to appoint Sacraments. The old pastors of the Chri"tian church did more then was mete accomodate themselves to Jews and Gentiles whence many cers: crept into the Church but Experience shewes God blessed not such Counsel. In these wordes 1. all humane addition to Gods institutions are absolutely condene. 2. Those that undertake to adde suche Cerem. are cenfured of intolerable arrogan"c;e, as presuming to be wiser then Christ. 3. Lights, and white garments, are by name con"demned; which onely offend, in theyr mysticall signification upon mans will. 4. Chri"tme or oyle in Baptisme is esteemed a Sacrament, though the Papi"ts denie it conferreth grace, as the Sacraments. 5. The first bringers in of Ceremonies (onely significant) into the Churche, are taxed for departing from the simplicitie of Gods word, as therin finding rather the curse, then the blessing of God upon their presumptions.

5. Danes is the next (whoe makest it blasphemie, to thinke, and see, that any outward things (of humane institution, may be made a signe, in the Churche, of spirituall things) the first answer is, that this was spoken in opposi"tion to Belleramines conce"rating of creatures to signify, and worke supernaturall effects. Whiche is very true: but this must be added: that in this secte, he toucheth only the signification, not the operation of those Cere. as any that readeth his wordes, may obverse. The second answer is that Danes (elsewhere) alloweth some significant Cere. But the Rej should have doen well, to name the place or places, which he meant by elsewhere. For we cannot by conjecture finde it.
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This
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This I am sure of, that it is not Paganism, p. 3.1.3.11, where he saith, that the teaching under the law was by signs, & earthly figures, as a Schoolmaister speaks to young children: but under the Gospel, open, and manifest, as one dealeth with grown men. They then that thrust in significant Ceremonies, what doe they but confound the most wise dispensation of God, and make a mingling-mangle of those things, which he hath separated alunder?

6. Polanus (misprinted, or uncertainly printed in the Abridgement) is sayd to allow some significant Ceremonies, as feasts, Fastes, Gestures: and his definition of Superstition, is thought to make onely against Ceremonies Sacramentall, not Morally significant. The onely way therefore is, to set down his wordes, out of which his judgement about this pointe may appear of superstition, he saith thus (Syntag. I.9.c.3.) Superstition standeth in abusing worship to God, or exceeds measure therein. True religion worships the true God in a manner prescribed by the Word: false, (that is to say Superstition) worships God otherwise than he wills or enjoys. In another place whatsoever persones to Gods worship must by him be required. Against is a foolish ill zeal of the popish clergy to use such apparel in Divine service and by apparel to be distinguished from laicks, that difference and variety was in the old Testament typical, but the substance being come, what meanes they to require types any more?

7. In Coenecorum Papistarum, qui vestitum theatris in sacris sumitur, vestitum laicos distinguere voluit. Zilladis in & versus, schol. in U. Typica: vestitum vestitus, quid amplius, quid recognitum?
The next witness is Mr. Perkinse, on Gal. 3, but (by variety of editions) uncertain what verse of the Chapter was designed.

The Rejoynder therefor guesses, that the wordes upon v. 2. or rather 1. were intended, where Mr. P. condemne the setting up of Images, to be lay-mens booke. To which he answereth. 1. That he also doeth blame the same. 2. that Mr. P. in some persons and places, preferreth dipping, before sprinkling, in Baptisme. Now for the first of these, if the Rejoynder when he writ these wordes condemn (with Mr. P.) suche images or pictures as are lay-mens booke, it is wonder, he forgot, or changed this judgement, before he came to the seventh section of this very Chapter, where he doeth defende them. And this is plaine, that if images be to be condemned, as they are lay-mens booke, or teachers, then all humane signes, ordered to be lay-mens teachers, in religion, are also to be condemned with them.

The second is an affected flam-flam. For dipping (upon just occasion) rather than sprinkling, is no more a humane Ceremonie, in Baptisme, then drinking a convenient draft of wine rather then slight tasting is an humane significant institution.

But yet (howsoever the Rejoynder upon conscience of the consanguinitie, betwixt Images, and significant Ceremonies did suppose this first verse of the Chapter to be meant by the Authors of the Abr.) I thinke rather that they intended the foure and twentieth verse, where M.P. doeth distinguish betwixt Ceremonies significant, and those of Order, and sayth that the former fort were absolute.
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absolutely abolished, but the other only in respect of their speciall determination.

8. Master Methune was cited (out of a Manuscript, (as it seemeth) as giving the same judgement of signi-
sificant Ceremonies. But in his later time, he crossed
not to muche others, as himself in blotting out this sen-
tence I leave therefore his name under that blotte, and
other like, wherewith he soiled himself in his later
times.

9. D. Wigtist him selfe, is brought in (by Abr.) dis-
liking any præscript apparell, should be used in Gods
service, for signifi:ston. Def. pag. 291. To this the Re-
joynder answereth that in the same place, P. Martyr is
alledged, as approving white apparell, for Ministes (who are
compared to Angels) to use in signification of their office, be-
cause Angel apparreth in white: Which should have put him
(at the least) out of our Bill. But it followeth not, that
therefore all testimonies of Martyrs, must be put out of
our Bill, because he varieth from them, in this. In the
other places, he speakeoth from good groundes of Di-
vinitie: but this reason of his, hath no more force
in it, then if from the picture and apparation of An-
gels, it should be gathered, that no Minister shoul-
d wear a black nigh cap, a black tippet, or a blacke hood,
which our Canons doe commande: or that every
Minister should have five winges fastened to his body,
with certain, vizard faces, like unto the faces of Lions,
Eagles, and open, because Angels have so appeared, Is.
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It is answered, that we should believe the said D. Whitgift in this, that our Surplices are not appointed for any moral signification. But we cannot believe, whatsoever one Prelate saith of our Ceremonies, (for to avoid the dint of Argument, though it be against the common profession of our Church, in the very Service-book,) is present to be believed.

The answer is, that D. Whitgift did use, defend, and urge, significant Ceremonies, which is true, with shame and all: but many a man, upon the racke of an Argument is brought to confess that, which other while he is wont to deny. Finally this consequence is denied: D. W. did not approve of the Surplice for signification: ergo of no significant Ceremonie: the reason of which consequence is given in the Abridgement (p. 35.) because no good reason can be given, why the Church may not impose a preseript apparel for signification, as well as any other Ceremonie.

Thus the Rejoynder hath tried what he could say to those testimonies, which the Def. had omitted, in this place: and doeth so please himself therein, that he beginneth a plaudite to himself, saying that he hath openly whipp'd the Repliers friends: he meaneth the Authors of the Abr. who were wont to be his reverend friends also. But this whipping of his, is just as if a man should whippe thornes, and prickes, with his bare handes, getting more gashes thereby, then he dealeth or giveth blowes. It is not safe so muche as to handle sharp edges muchel ess to whippe them, with naked fingers.

10. Now
10. Now we must hear, how the Rejoynder doth lay for the defence of those answers which the Def. gave to our Divines, chosen out by himselfe to answer, of whome, Calvin is the first. Of whome it is said, that he condemneth onely suche Ceremonies, as are sub. stituted to the very office of Sacraments. Where if the meaneth part of the office of Sacraments, he and we content about Calvin: but if he meaneth the whole complete office of Sacrament, then he wrongeth Calvin. For upon Lev. 4. 21. his meaning cannot be, that all the olde Ceremonies of the Iews, had suche a complete Sacramentall office, as Circumcision, and the Passover had. Vpon Isa. 20. 2. speaking of Isays going barefoot for a signe of future captivitie (which was not the full office of a Sacrament) he sayth: If Is. s.c. had done this of himselfe he might well have been laughed at. Those rites are of no worth which have not God for their author, which we are carefully to note, against the papists who obtrude upon us empty ceremonies for true Sacraments. This rule is for them: if they come from God we are to embrace them, if not, to scorn them, nay they cannot be received without dishonour to God, when therein mortal men take upon them the authority of God. And upon Mat. 21. 25. he hath this doctrine: no sacred signe ought to be admitted among the godly, unless it be shewn to be of God, nor is it in mens choyse to mint any thing. But the Rejoynder affirmeth, that Calvin doeth expressly allow Symbolicall signes, as exercices, and incitements of pietie. The Place he meaneth is Inst. lib. 4.c.10. sect. 14. where ther is no expresse allowance at all, of mere humane Symbolical signes, but onely of some Ceremonies.
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monies, to help the wretched sort of people in their distress.

Now this kind of Ceremonies Calvin himself in the 28.29. sect. of the same chapter, doeth manifestly declare, to be matters of mere and necessary decency.

The end of decency is, that while such things are used which purchase respect to holy things we be served up in public. That is a Decorum which so makes for the reverence of holy things that in that it is a fit exercise of good manners.

This being considered, and with all, that the Rejoynder in his great charter (cap. r. sect. 2.) doeth not build his mystical Ceremonies upon that decency, which Paul doeth appoint, and Calvin only admits, it is plain, that Cassines exercises and incitements of piety, are not his mere humane mystical Ceremonies.

The second witness of whom it pleased the Deo to take notice of is Zepperus, or rather, sundrie Protestant Synodes, by Zepperus divulged, as he sheweth in his preface. Now his words are set down before in the 18. and 2. section of this chapter: so that here we are only to consider what the Rejoynder hath to say against, or upon them. And first he crieth to his olde muse of Ceremonies effectu of grace, in Poperie. But this muse-hole hath beene formerly stopped. And if it were open in other assaults, yet Zepper hath sufficiently provided for it here. For beside that he directed his censure of Ceremonies (in a great part) against the Lutherans, who deny all efficacie that the Rejoynder doeth, he sayth plainely, that by these humane mystical Ceremonies, God will not stirre up devotion, faith, and reverence, in the hearts of Christiane people, blinder croste.

The second part. H h h
our Def. and Rejoynder, his tenet. For the relieving of that weak shift, the Rejoynder (in the second place) affirmeth, that Zepper (cap. 16), doth allow of dipping, and thrice dipping, in Baptism, as an humane Ceremonie

plased in God's worship to signifie the Trinity, and our Lord's resurrection on the third day. Now in the 16. chapter, ther is no one word of these matters (which kind of misprinting or misprinting the Rejoynder useth to make a great matter of in others) but in the 12. chapter, I finde suche a fonde allegoric of thrice-dipping meerly related out of Augustine, but no allowance of the same. Nay, if the matter be well considered, I thinke the Rejoynder himself will scarce allow of it. For ther can be no better reason given for placing of a mysterie in thrice-dipping for Baptisme, than in dividing of the bread to be receyved in the Supper, into three partes, as the Papists doe for a mysterie, among other of their malling toys. 2. This thrice-dipping for mysterie, is so mingled with the true Mysterie of Baptisme, that (to all appearance) it is made a part of that Holy Sacrament.

3. For man to institute an outward representation (as an Image) of the Holy Trinity, is a very great presumption, against the Second Commandement. Christ himself never appointed any such mystical reall signe. neyther can that incomprehensible mysterie be fitly represented by any suche triplicitie as is of mans making.

4. To invoke the name of the Father, the Sonne, and the Holy Ghost over the baptized, and then by thrice redipping, or sprinkling, upon mans pleasure, to signifie they are three Persons, is as if one should light a candle
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Candle, for the manifesting of something, and then put a bushel over it, for signifying of the same thing. How can the same three at one and the same time, signify three Persons, & three days? Can men give manifold disparate senses to one and the same Ceremonies, as literal, allegorical, tropological, and analogical? Why may not as well three Crosses be made upon the Baptized, for the same mysteries? It could not be of any moment, for those auncient Bishops, sometime to dip thrice, for signifying of the Trinitie, and sometime once, for signifying of the Unitie. Seing Trinitie and Unitie are not to be separated in the solemne signification of them, and Heretikes are not confuted with humane signes.

12. Iewel is the next in order. But for so muche as neyther his wordes are quoted, nor the place where they may be founde noted, (on eyther side) but onely according to one English Edition, which I have not, I cannot say muche of them: Yet this I may truly say, that the Rejoynder is put to hard shift, in opposing of the Repliers answer, when he distinguisheth betwixt graces, and duties, actually performed. For these two are expressed by the same name, of the Apostle Paul, 2.Cor.8.1. I doe you to wit of the grace of God, bestowed on the Churches of Macedonia etc. But it seemeth that humane mysticall Ceremonies are of like nature unto those olde legall Ceremonies, which onely signified what men ought to doe, but gave not grace to doe it: so that they are to be referred unto the killing letter.

In searching also for the place, in my latine copie of ✀
LucI, I found these words Acts iv. pag. 23. The Popists have blurred the true Sacraments with a number of Superfluous and Childish Ceremonies, and have added such like Sanctions to them. Now if by the Superfluousness and childishness, which is found in the Popish Cere. before their multitude, and before their Sanctions binding consciences to them, he did not mean their mystical Signification, upon humane institution, I would willingly learne of the Rejoynder what his meaning was.

13. Beza was by the Def. granted to speak for us. But the Rejoynder (having now exercised himself unto confidence in suche elucious) will needs have it, that Bezas phrase onely, not his meaning doeth make for us. Let us therefor hear his reasons. 1. Beza (sayth he) condemneth all Symbolical rites, which he calleth Sacramentall, that is signifying Spirituall graces, not duties. Now Bezas wordes (ep. 8.) are these: I affirme that so often as the ancients brought into the Churcham Sacramentals, i.e. Significative ceremonies of Spirituall things so oft they gravely were offended. Well I think that all Symbolical rites should be once profligated out of the church whereinto by no right they could ever enter as long as they remaine can the Church have her native beauty restored. Here is no mention at all of graces, but only of spirituall things: and yet the Rejoynder would persuade his reader, that he sayth not spirituall duties, but graces. His gloss is naught. Spirituall things comprehend so well spirituall duties, as graces. How this reason will be excused, I cannot guess: except perhaps it be...
be answered, that humane Ceremonies doe signify duties as they are carnall, and not as they are spirituall. It is further to be marked, that Beza there speaketh of of suche humane significant Ceremonies, as were in common use amongst the ancient Fathers. Now the Rejoynder will not say that they had in common use, so many humane Sacraments, as Beza noteth them to have had significant Ceremonies. 2. The second reason, by which the Rejoynd. would prove that Beza meant not simplic to condemne all significant Ceremonies, is,because he allowseth some Feast-days, confesseth the Surplice and kneeling to be in their nature indifferent, and sayeth that the Cross might sometime of olde have had lawfulluse. For the former of which, if the wordes of Beza, had been noted, more might be sayd. In the meantime, let this suffice: If Beza did allow of some humane Feast-days, it may better from this place he gathered, that he did not account them significant of spirituall things; then it can from them be gathered, that in this place he did not condemne all suche significants of mans making. Neyther doeth he affirm a significant Surplice to be indifferent. And as for kneeling, that is more excepted against for other causes, then for instituted signification.

But in the last, ther is oddde dealing. For whereas Beza sayth of the Cross, ut olime aliquis suavit usus ejus etc. which is as muche as to say though this were granted, that there was some use of it of olde, the Rejoynder maketh him to say that ther was of olde a lawfull use of it.
It is enough for any man, to read over Beza his eight and twelfth Epistle, for understanding not only of his meaning, but also of his reasons.

14. Because the Def. made Beza a singular man, in opposing all humane mystical Ceremonies, the Replier added out of Bellarmines observation (De effectu Sacram. I. 2. c. 30.) that at least Calvin, Barentius, and Chemnitz were of the same minde. Now concerning Calvin, enough hath been said before. For the other, marke what the Rejoynder hath to say.

The question (saith he) in that place of Bellarmines disputed, is of Ceremonies meritorious, and binding the conscience, out of the case of scandal. And is this all? Surely then the Rejoynder had no reason to object unto the Abridgers, and the Replier, abusing the Reader. For (to omit the which in the first part of our Dispute, hath been answered, concerning merit & binding) any one that looketh upon Bellarmines, De effect. Sacr. I. 2. cap. 30. may see, that he divideth the controversy betwixt us and the Papists, into five heads, the fourth is about binding the conscience, and the fifth about merit, but the third is whether the Church may appoint new Ceremonies. The affirmative of this question Bellarmines proveth, from the Feast instituted by Mordachay, and that of Dedication, instituted in the Machabees time, etc. which are the Def. and Rejoyners chief arguments for significant Ceremonies. And proffeth plainly (as our men doe) Our Proposition is no more but this: against heresies, that the Church may appoint new Ceremonies, not indeed to justify us from mortal sins, but to other ends.
the Negative part, Bellarmine nameth Calvin, Brentius, and Chemnitius. Now the Rejoynder to darken all, confoundeth the third, & first question into one hoche-poche. Who then doeth abuse the Reader? Of Calvin, enough hath been sayd before as also of Brentius, under the title of Wittenberge Confession, Chemnitius only (being altogether passed over by the Rejoinder though he was not only propounded by the Replier, out of Bellarmine but also in the Abridgement, pag. 32, is here to be represented, in his owne wordes. Yet concerning Brentius first, a few wordes may be needfyll. The words of Wittenburge Confession (before cited) are plaine. it is not lawfull, to devise new Ceremonies, to shadow forth the trueth already layd open, and brought to light by the Gospel: as in the day light to set up Candles, to signifie the light of the Gospel, or to carry banners & crosses, to signifie the victorie of Christ, thorough his Crosse. Of which sort is all the mas-fying attire. Of this Confessio Brentius was the penman: and therefore Bellarm. citeth the same as Brentius his sentence about Ceremonies. The Rejoynder answereth that Bellarm. sayth onely that Brentius reprehendeth the hallowing of water, cyle, &c. consecrated to signifie and worke supernaturall effects: because the mysteries of faith should not now be shadowed out. De cultu Sanct. 1. 3. c. 7. Whiche tobe nothing so, the very words of Bellarm. will shew. for neyther out of Brentins, nor against him, doeth Bell make any mention of consecrating suche things to worke, but onely to signifie spirituall effects. First they are blessed to signifie spirituall operations. For the sprinkling of the ashes signifieth penance, &c. Nor doeth
A fresh suit against Ceremonies.

doth the reason of Brevis is adumbration binder, for those
significations are not properly adumbrations, but outward
representations of present invisible things, and of things spiri-
tuall. Or else of things past, most useful to stir up the affec-
tion. Hence it is plain, that Brentius is opposed by Bellarm.
for houlding the Proposition of this our third Argument,
that his reason is ours: and that Bellarm, his an-
swer, so well as his tenet, is that which the Def. and Re-
joynd. doe maintayne against us. 2. A second answer,
or rather objection, is used by the Rej. that Brentius al-
lowed Lusheian Crosses, and Images, as being a Lutheran.
Now it is well known, that Brentius at the first did
write as became a grave Divine: but after broke out
into the Ubiquitary faction, siding against those whom he
called Zwinglians and Calvinists. That which we
allege, was written in the name of the Church of Wit-
tenburge, & so presented unto the Counsell of Trent,
out of his and others best judgement. If cyther out of
securitie, or out of faction, he did, and wrote otherwise,
after, it ought not to be put in ballance against this
Confeccion. It is no great merwawll, if a Lutheran doth
crosse his owne Doctrine, even about Ceremonies.

For in the same kinde they have Luther himself for
their example: No man did more hardly inveigh agains:
those trifles then Luther did, and yet retained them for the
times sake. That when occasion required, he was so vehem-
ent we commend him, but that while he contended against
them, he submitted to the them, we pardon in him.

Rimae (layth
Calvinis, Dei,
de Sacram,
entium quae
Lutherus
vocavit et in
eius negoti,
quae facta
sunt tum
et alia, ut
saequare
soostr. et
praecedent
et sequi.

Quod tamen vehemens et sorum, laudabile ut, quam eis exigere noluit et,
quod non velut iuxta
et sequenti.
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Something like was the case of Chemnitius, whose words the Rejoynder thought good to passe over in silence. They are these (De ritibus. Sacra. et Can. 13.) When Christ himself so instituted the Sacraments that he required them to be used with such and such rites, it is a very hard question whether it be lawfull for men to add other and that so many over and above. As of what rites Christ himself prescribed were either not enough, or not fit enough. In divine institutions as we must take nothing from, so we must add nothing to them. But whereas they say by such rites many things are profitably signified, we answer that belonged to the State of the Old Testament, but what Christ in the New Testament would have learned, must be sought with the light of the word, not by shadowes. And we have a promise of the force of the word; but not of the efficacy of shadowes devised by men. And what rites he would have used by the word, those he himselfe appointed, etc.

Ther was some cause, why the Rejoynder did not care to insist on these wordes. For Chemnitius maketh it a very hard thing to justifie humane significant Ceremonies in Gods worship. The Rejoynder sayth, it is as easy as to justifie writing by characters. Chemnitius maketh them additions to Gods Institution. Nothing lesse (sayth the Rej.) no more then a Cabinet, wherein a jewel is kept, is an addition to it. Chemnitius judged them re-

The second part.
pugnant to the New Testament. The Rej. sayth, that there is manifest allowance for them, and authority left unto men for instituting of them: (as forsooth) in those words of Order, Decency, and Adification.

15. The Replicer added unto the witnesses afore sayd, Iunius & Danecus. But concerning Danecus, we have already considered what the Rej. had to except. Iunius onely remayneth: whose words were quoted out of his animadversions upon Bell. de cultu Sanctorum, lib. 3. cap. 7. an. 12. Heer the Rej. rouseth up himself, as if he had gotten a great advantage, putting on suche confidence, or rather forth suche shews of it, as if it had been meer folly in the Repl. to make mention of Iunius. His rejoinder theryfore is to be considered in all the parts of it. 1. First, he conclude畅销 that the Repl. is no wise man, in not telling them, to what objection, or assertion Iunius doeth there answer: because (forsooth) the Repl. himself had sayd, it was no wisdome for any man, to take up an answer made to an objection, before he considereth the assertion against which the objection is made. As if it were all one to consider the assertion, and to tell them what it is. Is not this a fine consequence? 2. He attributeth unto the Repl. a Sophisticall wit, in concealing, that the assertion of Bell. by Iunius opposed, was, that the Church may of her power, consiricate creatures, to signifie, and worke supernatural effects, &c. But from hence nothing can be gathered, for the advantage of the Def. and Rej. except it appear, that Iunius did onely speake of the working, and not distinctiely of the signifiynge, which Bell. would have given unto those Ceremonies: whiche how false it is, shall present-
ly appear. 3. He noteth a shamefull falsification of Iunius his wordes, in the translation of them. Iunius his wordes are: Homo non potest creaturas ad significationem.adhibere. The Translation is: Humane Ceremonies cannot be lawfully used for signification. Where is that great falsification, which drew from the Rej. Are you not ashamed? or can you not blush? The Rej. his owne translation of the same wordes, is: No man can lawfully applie things to signification. He must discover the mystical difference betwixt using for signification, & applying to signification, before he can call suche shame upon the Repl. & none upon the Rej. 4. To shew Iunius in his owne posture, and the mis-reporting Repl. in his owne coloures. The Rejoynder translateth that wholle passages of Iunius, and noteth upon it, first, that Iunius speaketh of consecrating ceremonies. To which I answer, that in the wordes, as they are by the Rej. translated, he expressly condemneth all applying to signification. And if consecration were included therein, I hope the Rej. will not disavow consecrating of Churches, Church-yards, Altars, &c. Secondly, he observeth, that Iunius doth professedly sever the point of signification, from that of efficacie. As if the Repl. had confounded them, and not rather distinctly insisted upon signification onely which Iunius doth as distinctly and professedly condemn, as efficacie. Nay it is the Rej. his common fault, that where the Papists speake of efficacie and signification, and our Divines distinctly answer of both, he will have no answer, no not those of Calvin, Brentius, Chemnitius, Dancus, nor this of Iunius, to belonge unto signification distinctly.
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and by it self. In the third place, he tellleth us, that
Junius in the two next annotations, deoth allow voluntarie
significat Ceremonies. Let it therefore be considered,
that Junius in the thirteenth annotation, insinuated
at the least his doubt, whether any voluntarie significat
ions can proceed from good: a bono, si forte. 2. He
sayth they proceeded from simplicitie, and turned to
superstition. Which phrases of his, he so interpreteth
other where, that it may easily appear, he did not allow
that which here he calleth simplicitie. For cap. 3.
annot. 15. he calleth it vanitie, in opposition to the sim.
plicitie of Christ. And in the second booke, de religuis et
imaginibus, cap. 27. annot. 29. he calleth it plainely sim.
ple superstition. In the fourteenth annotation, he main.
teyneth this assertion: In divine things no shadowes are
rightly used in the Church but what God hath instituted.
But (sayth the Rej.) he doeth by name allow standing in
prayer, on the Lordes dayes, as a significant Ceremonie, as also
holy bread: annot. 30. Wheras Junius testifieth plainly,
in the 9. note, immediately before, how he did onely
excuse, as comparatively tolerable, suche ancient Ceremo.
monies of the Fathers. Primum suius tolerabile: Patrum
simplicitatem piam excusamus. So that Junius being
seen in his owne posture, and the reporters in their co-
lours, let the Reader judge, where is the cause of shame
and blushing?

Sect.
S E C T. 5.

Concerning the wronge, that is done to Gods Sacraments, by humane signification Ceremonies.

1. The Argument dependeth on this: that humane Ceremonies appropriated to Gods worship, if they be ordyned to teach any spirituall dutie, by their mystical signification, usurpe a chief part of the nature of Sacraments. This was in the Abr. backed with many testimonies: which the Rej. having before eluded (so well as he could) here contenteth himself to say, they are counterfeit, forced, or forged stuffe: The contrarie wherof hath been declared. Now for the naked Arg. he affirmeth it to have nosigns which must be tried by the answers, & defence of them.

The Def. first answereth, by a distinction, betwixt the signification of grace conferred, and the signification of mans dutie, the former whereof he maketh Sacraments, but not the later. To the which was replied, that Sacr. also doe signifie the dutie of man towards God. This (sayth the Rej.) is not true: bec. Sacr. doe onely impie that dutie. But I would knowe of him, 1. how the Sacr. as signes, doe impie that which they doe not signifie, all so well as our signe of a croff doth signifie any dutie? The scrall croff doth (though very untowardly) reprefet the woodde croff, wheron our Saviour was cru- cified, & so by a trope, Christ crucified: & then impie the our dutie to Christ. And doe not Sacraments signifie Christ, & our dutie toward him so well as this? 2. I aske,
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If Baptisme doe not signifie our whole mortification, vivification, and putting on of Christ? 3. If the Sacraments doe onely by themselves, impie these duties, yet that implication being explicated in their administration, what use is there of putting that explicated duty under a bushel, or bed of man's making?

2. The Rejoynder not trusting to that deniall, saith further, that if the Sacraments did signifie mans dutie, yet that is not a chiefe part of their nature. To which I may replie, that if it were not a chiefe part of their nature, but a part onely, yet it is presumption for men to take any part of the Sacraments, and let it upon other things, at their owne pleasure. But seeing by the nature of the Sacraments, is meant their office, and use, and that be many offices and uses of them, some of which come not so neer their chiefe office as this signification doeth, it may with good reason be termed a chiefe part.

Calvin (Consens. de re Sacram.) saith thus: Sacraments are notes and badges of our Christian profession and incitements to thankfulness, Exercises of piety, & bonds under our hands to ye us to God's service, but their chiefe end is to signifie and figure the grace of God to us.

Now though this last be the chiefe office, yet amongst the former one is more chiefe then another, and which of them more chiefe, then this of signifying spiritual duties with obligation to the performance of them?

3. To prove that the Sacraments signifie morall duties (which first the Def. and in defence of him, the Rejoynder denieth) it was alleged, by the Repl. that the whole Covenant is in them signed and sealed, betwixt God
God and man in which Covenant mans dutie, thorough grace is there professed, and represented. Whereupon the Rejoynder i. conclueth, that suche signes as doe me-

ther signe nor seal the covenant of grace, cannot passe the office, or speciall nature of Sacraments. Wherby he gaineth nothing but his owne ideal shadow. 2. He gathereth, that unlesse signifying, without sealing, be a more principall part of the nature of Sacraments, then sealing, suche signes as communicat with them onely in signifying, doe not participat any cheif part of their nature. Which is as mere nonsense, as if one should say, that unlesse teaching, without sealing be a more principall part of Sacraments, then the sealing, then the preaching of the doctrine which in Sacraments is signified and sealed, doeth not participat any cheif part of their nature. 3. He answereth, that the Sacraments doe confirm our obligation unto sanctimonie, in generall, but not signifie any moral dutie in particular. Here then is the mysterie: the Sacra-

ments to confirme (by signification) all our dutie, but not this, or that dutie.

If our Convocation had been of the Counsel, when Sacraments were appointed they would (as it seemeth) have made them more perfect. But this is certain, our Saviour meant to put a difference, betwixt the olde A.B.C. and the new maner of a thing fitting for ripper yeares: and therefore did not fulfille every letter concerning our dutie, in signes, as of oluide, but give us the summe in a few signes. Whosoever therefore goeth about to multiply significant signes, crosteth the very intention which was respected, in the institu-

tion.
tion of two Sacraments onely. Beside, the Cross it self, doeth not signifie our dutie of constant fighting under Christ, in particular, against this or that temptation of sinne, the world, or the Devil, but onely in generall, so that by this reason, we should, or may have as many insignificant Ceremonies, as there be particular temptations to be resisted. Whither shall we come, at length, by walking in this Ceremoniall way?

4. The second Argument, to the same purpose, by the Repl. alleged, was, that the name Sacrament, as it signifies an oath, or obligation, doeth import, that the Sacraments signifie our dutie to God. To this the Rejoynder answered, that the Sacraments doe in deed implying, but not represent any moral dutie. Now let any reasonable man judge, whether dipping under the water, and rising up againe, or taking of food for strength, and growth, doeth not more represent spiritual duties, then making a Cross with ones finger, in the ayer?

5. The third reason mentioned, was taken from the name Eucharist, notifying thankfulness, and the taking of the same, in remembrance of Christ. The Rejoynder his answer is, that the word Eucharist is no Sacrament, but a terme brought in by men to put them in minde of their dutie on receiving it. But that word doeth notifie the nature of the Sacrament, at least in the judgment of all Divines, that have in this meaning used the terme, though it be not a Sacrament. And they are more then that the Rej. his judgement can counter-ballance. Yet if significant Ceremonies be like unto wordes and characters, as the Rejoynder formerly maintained, that very word must needs
needs be a Sacrament, or a signifie signe of a Sacra-
ment: because it was brought in to put men in minde of
their duty in receyving, as the Rej. speakeath. He addeth
that ther is no element, nor action of that Sacrament,
so particularly reperesenting thankfullness, as kneeling
doth reverence, or humilitie. Where first, he maketh
kneeling a significant Ceremonie, whiche hitherto he
hath seeme to denie. 2. I answer, that the very action
of receyving so great a gift, in a cheerfull humble man-
ner, doth represent both thankfullness, and humilitie,
so far as Christ would have it representated by signes.
The very celebration of a great benefit receyved, is a
signe of thankfullness. Otherwise, let the Rejoynder
tell us, what representation of thankfullnesse was in the
Passover, for that benefit of passing over the Israelites
houses, when the first-borne of the Egyptians were
slaine?

6. Instance was given (by the Replier) that both
sanctitie, and constante, which are the things signified
by Surplice, and Crose, are signified in Baptisme. The Rej.
his answer is, that they are not barely or onely signified in
Baptisme, as duties, nor by any distinct signe representated. As
if this were the question, and not this: if Sacraments
doe signifie morall duties! Certainly, if Sacraments doe
signifie these vertues as graces and duties (as is proved,
and also confessed) no Christian need desire to have
them signified over againe barely and onely as duties, no
more then after an instrument made betwixt the Lord
of Manner, and his Tenent, conteyning the conditions of
both partes, the tenent should seek for a new instrumet,

K k k signifying
signifying his conditions a part: and not only so, but after that his conditions had been expressed generally, that he should keep all the land in good culture, according as he found it, he should seek for one instrument about the woods, another for the arable land, another for the meadows, another for the pastures, and another for the broome fields, or for every acre one, & that not from the Lord of the manner, but from some justice of peace, or high constable of the Hundred. Neither is it a thing profitable, for Christians to remember their duty, without remembrance of God's grace thereto apperteyning.

7. Against mystical-morall Ceremonies, of humane institution, the Repl. brought this Arg. in Mr. Baines his wordes: To be a teacher of my understanding, and an exciter of my devotion, are such effects, as require virtue, inherent, or assistant, to these things which should be causes of them. But no signe of mans divizing, hath any suchc virtue, in it, or with it. For then it must come either from the word of creation, or from Gods ather institution.

But from neither of these, have the signes of mans divizing any suchc virtue. Therefore no signe, of mans divizing, can be a teacher of mine understanding, or an exciter of my devotion.

This the Rejoynder confuteith first, with some full wordes, as a sickly childish, and longsome objection. After, he answereth, that our monitory Ceremonies, are onely external occasions, and objects, whereby the minde of
man worketh upon it self, not causes working by some vertue in them.

Where observe, how he mangleth and marreth the Argument, that he may maister it: the wordes are, that suche effects require vertue inherent, or assistant: he interpretereth them onely of vertue in them, i.e. inherent, leaving out assistant: and yet dareth affirm, that upon this fiction of vertue in them (which is his owne fiction) the whole objection is builded. 2. He maketh our Ceremonies to be onely occasionall objects, and no causes: whereas every instituted signe is a meanes, and so a cause of that effect for which it is appointed, as Logick teacheth. And if they were mere occasions of conceiving that which they signifie, then a white Surplice would not prove half so significant a Ceremonie of Ministers sanctitie, as a white Cocke, especially when it croweth, nor an aeriall Crosse, so significant, as a Gallowes. Beside, if our Ceremonies be occasionall objects onely, then no man is tied to regard the whitenesse of his Ministers Surplice, therby to thinke of his sanctitie, any more then he is bounde to regard the fowlnesse and soile of it, when for a longe time, it is unwashed, and he also useth it in stead of a handkerchief, about his nose, therby to thinke of the imperfection, spots, and blots, which are founde in Ministers disposition, and conversation. Concerning, Letters, Characters, and Cibliss, mentioned here againe by the Rejoynder, answer was made before, in the first section of this Chapter.
8. To like purpose, the Repl. used this reason: If humane inventions be suche morall admonishers, in spiritual duties, then our consciences are bound to subject themselves to their admonitions, and so to those mortall men, who made them admonishers. The Rejoynder his answer is like his former: humane significant Ceremonies have no virtue of teaching the understanding, or exciting the devotions of men: but only external objects tending by their signification to those uses, to the use of which, the consciences of men are not bounde simplie but onely collaterally, and for another thing. In which answer, ther is a strange mystrie confessed: that humane Ceremonies are appointed to doe that, whiche they have nyther antecedently, nor consequently, any vertue to doe. 2. External objects are made opposite unto admonishers with vertue to admonish: as if no external objects (as Baptisme administered to a childe, before mine eyes, had any vertue of admonishing. 3. As strange a distinction is made betwixt simplie, and collaterally, and betwixt simplie, and for another thing: which are suche sustian stuffe, that ther is no fear, they should satisfie any but suche as take termes without reason, or right reason.

9. Another reason of the Repliers, was, that every teaching signe, of publicke use in the Churche, ought often to be interpreted, in preaching, and also defended if they be called in question, in the same preachings, which kinde of preaching, upon Crosse and Surplice, were very absurd, especially in those Parishes, that scarce have Quarter-Sermons. The Rejoynder answered, that the Crosse having interpretation with it, need not be inter-
A fresh suit against Ceremonies: and that the Surplice signifies, he doeth not well know what, but such a shinge as may be soon taught. Now that which he sayth of Cross, he may as well say of the Sacraments, that because in their administration, they have the interpretation going along with them, therefore no Minister need much preaching of them. But indeed, there is speciall need, that the very interpretation which goeth along with the use of the Cross, should be well interpreted: because few or none, either of the people, or of the Crossers themselves doe understand, how it hath that signification which the Convocation hath laid upon it, any more, then any other toy, which may easily be devised by the same Convocation: as if they should put a straw into the child's hand, in stead of a spear, to signify, that he should manfully fight, against all enemies of Christianitie. And of the Surplices signification, being the Rejoynder himself is not yet certainly informed, what it is, ther must needs be great use of much preaching about it, first to declare certainly (if it may be founde) what it signifies, secondly to shew the ground of that signification, or authoritie from whence it commeth, lawfull, and thirdly to urge it upon the consciences of those that are to make use of that signification. His second answer is a bundle of phrases: and so let it passe. Onely let it be noted, 1. that he calleth it sune, to charge our Ceremonies of superstition and yet in sobriety, maintained before, that those which count them unlawfull, are superstitious brethren. 2. that he determineth absolutely, upon his refuted groundes, that we have stop-
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Fed our own mouths, from preaching the Gospel, by calum-

nies. Whereas all England knoweth, that those

which never preached, or writ against the Ceremo-
nies, have their mouths stopped by his Prelates,

though they onely professe, they cannot use them

by reason of scandal, of which number, Doctor Burge

himself hath been one. 3. He would perswade the

world, that some of us place all religion in opposing Cer-

emonies by speaking and writing: which is greater ca-

lumnie, then any he charged us with, or then he can

prove of any one. 4. He affirmeth us to be of all men

he ever knew, the most impatient of opposition, and

so most partial, and Pharisaically proud as if his Prelate

were very patient toward those that oppose their

Ceremonies, no way so partial, nor drew any thing

from the Pharises, or as if himself in this Rejoy-

nder, had not shewed more of these virtues, then

any other. 5. He sheweth where the store lieth in root-

ing of them out of the hearts of their people, by cal-

mours, and calumnies. We cannot then defend our prac-

tise, but with clamours and calumnies, nor an-

swer for our hearts, without rooting them out of

peoples hearts.

10. For the further manifestinge of the uselesse

signification of our significant Ceremonies, the Rep.
appealed to the consciences of the best conforming

Christians in England, whether ever they founde them

selves truly stirred up to holynesse, by the Surplice, or
to constancie in sayth, by the Crosse? The Re-

joynder
joynder answereth, that no man is stirred up by them, as by causes, but onely as by the sight of the creatures, or other memorials: of which use if men deprive themselves, it is their prejudice or negligence. Now of causes ther was no mention in the queare. And the question being made of the best conforming Christians (amonge whome the Rejoynder himself is one) prejudice, and negligence of some, make up no answer. The trueth is, that he himself could not say, out of his conscience, that ever he felt suche motions within him, by occasion of a Surplice, or Crosse, and thersfore baulked the question. Yet this is here to be observed: that by the Rejoynder his confession, our sacred Ceremonies are no more admonishers unto spirituall duties, than any creature of God, i.e. then any butterfly is. And are not then our Ceremonies very sacred, or religious. Or is our representative Churches institution, of any more force, or worth, then any childes, that catcheth butterflyes?

11. It was added also which by experience, it is founde, that in some one Congregation, where these Ceremonies have not been used, more holinesse, and constancie of faith hath appeared, then in many Cathedrall Churches, where they were never omitted. The Rejoynder his answer is, that where other helps stand equall, there is no difference, save only in a Pharisticall opinion of these, who counte their very opposition of Ceremonies as high points of devotion, and stiffenesse in their constancie in the faith.

Behold
Behold the man, that even now complayned of clamours, and calumnyes. The reasonable part of this answer is, that in Cathedrall Churches, other helps (as diligent preaching, catechizing, admonishing, directing in Christian duties) are not equal or answerable to that which is found in divers Congregations where the Ceremonies have not been used: otherwise ther were no difference. Now heerin, 1. he confesseth himself, in confessing that his Prelates, even those whose admirable wisdome he extolleth, though they have power enough, do not provide the chief helps of edification, for their Churches, equal to those that are found in poore Congregations, which receive not their Ceremoniall helps, and yet will not suffer those poor Congregations to enjoy their helps. For do they not by this, place a high poynpt of devotion in their Ceremoniall helps? 2. How can this stand with reason where other helps are equal, ther is no difference? Certainly, if our Ceremonies be helps to Edification (as the Def. and Rejoynder mainteine) then where other helps are equal, the Cathedrall Churches have a great advantage in helps, above other, that want those Ceremonies. Nay one Cathedrall Church exceedeth another in this kinde: as Durham, for Ceremonie doth Chester, and Lichfield.

12. Because the Def. (to make way for an injurion accusation) changed the phrase used in the Abrigeme, a chief part of the Sacraments nature, into another more obnoxious unto exception, the chief part, the Rep. justly noted this, as no plaine dealing. The Rejoin
joyned (being loath to leave any of the Def. his words un-mainteyned) answereth, that the Sacraments have but two parts, signification, and observation: and therefore if signification be a principal part, it is also the principall part: so that the Defend (sayth he) dealt herein fairly, and pressed us with suche words as our Argument requires.

But 1. whoe authorized the Defend, to change the terms of our Argument, and then press us with his changelinges? Let him reserue suche faire dealing for other occasions, when it may passe with lesse notice taken of it. 2. What doeth the Rejoynder mean, to imitate the Defend, in attributing unto us, that we make mere signification, without any qualification or limitation, eyther the or a chief part of the Sacrament? The Abrigement sayth onely, that suche signification as is ordeyned mystically to teache and admonish us of spirituall duties, is a chief part of the Sacrament. 3. Mr. Hooker, (lib.5. pag. 3. 10.) sayth that there are great store of properties belonging to the Sacraments: as that they are boundes of our obedience, obligations to mutuall charitie, provokation to godlinesse, preservations from sinne, memorials of great benefices, markes of distinction from strangers etc. How then can the Rejoynder so resolutely determine of two onely offices, which belonge to them? 4. If all essentiall parts of the Sacrament may be reduced to these two, yet the lesser of these may be called a principall part, without any prejudice to the other, in respect of those me, which make accidental, circumstantial, improper parts of Gods wor-
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And so of his Sacraments, as the Def. and Rejoynder upon every occasion do shift off Arguments with those termes. The rest of this section (beside words of no weight) conteyneth nothing which hath not been in the former passages, sufficiently cleared.

SECT. 6.

Concerning Jewish Ceremonies.

In the Abridgement, after the former reason, now mainstayed, this was brought in: that in the time of the Lawe (when God saw it good to teach his Churche by significant Ceremonies) none might be brought into, or receyved in the worship of God, but suche only as the Lord himself did institute. Ergo. And after that, this: It is much lesse lawfull, for man to bringe significant Ceremonies into Gods worship now, then it was under the Law. For God hath abrogated his owne (not onely suche as prefigured Christ, but suche also, as served by their signification, to teache morall duties) so as now (without great sinne) none of them can be continued in the Churche, no not for signification. Upon which last grounde, they inferre thus: If those Ceremonies which God himselfe ordyned to teache his Churche by their signification, may not now be used, much lesse may those which man hath devised.

Now the wisdome of the Def. was, to passe over the former groundes, and onely to insist upon this last inference derived from them. But let us see what he, and
A fresh fate against Ceremonies.

and the Rejoynder have to say of that.

2. About this inference, many testimonies of great Divines, were alleged in the Abrigement: all which the Def. passeth by, as not worthy answer; for whiche, he was challenged by the Replier. The Rejoynder answereth that this is wrangling, spoken not out of conscience, but out of a spirit of contradiction, etc. To which I answer nothing. But that which the Def. neglected, the Rejoynder taketh to supply, least we should bragge, as it pleaseth him to phrasifie. See therefore how he dischargeth that which he undertaketh. The Nicen counsel (sayth he) is twice falsified: first, that it is supposed so condemn significant Ceremonies, by man devised, upon this reason, that God had abolished his owne, and secondly, that the Council is affirmed to condemn suche Ceremonies as all.

It seemeth the Rejoynder hath more skill (about this cause) in multiplying falsifies, than in dividing of them from trueths. For the Nicen Councell was brought in as speaking for one proposition: and the Rejoynder maketh two false assertion of that one simple axiome. Beside the words of that Council, or Constantine, speaking for it, are (in the Abrigement) onely brought in as testifying this: that the olde Ceremonies of the law, being abrogated by God, cannot (without some) be now continued in the Church for significacion. Instead of this, the Rejoynder faineth two other propositions, and then sayth, that they are two falsifications: which if they be, let him (who is the coiner of them) see how he can excuse them. The words of Constantine are: It seemed unworthy to celebrate the
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Passover with imitation of the Jewish custom. Let in (suche) things be commune to Christians, with the text. We have receyue another way from our Saviour, a more lawfull and convenient of our holy Religion. This is past to the purpose, for which it was alleged.

2. The testimonie of all the rest (sayth the Rej.) are perverted. 3. Sundrie of the witnesses are knowne to have allowed our, and all, some significants Ceremonies. It is shame therefor for men glorifie of sinceritie, in refusing the Ceremonies, thus to leave all sinceritie, in alleging of authors. In which never any protestant writers abused the world so muche, as the Abridgement, and his cavilling Rej. Now for the perverting of all testimonies, it is affirmed only, but not proved. Onely some generall positions are brought in, to support the accusation, which have formerly been confuted. 2. Among those which he sayth were knowne to allow of our Ceremonies, he nameth D. Humphry, of whome Cambden in his historie of Q. Elizabeth, observeth, that he (though very learned and worthy) never was raisie to Eclesiasticall preferments, because he allowed in our Ceremonies etc. Harding also objecteth him by name, with Mr. Samson, as one that had rather look all, then use our Ceremonies, and Iuei. Apol. c.5. div. 1.) doeth not denie, but defend it: besides how we he allowed of our Ceremonies, let all men judge b a certeine letter of his heere printed, written to th Bishops, the Copic bearing this inscription.

A letter sent to the Bishops from DoE. Laur. Humphrey Pre
do
dant of Magdalen College in Oxford and Reader of Divi
dity lecture there.
Our Lordships letters directed unto us, by our vice-Chancellor, although written in general words, yet hath so hearted our adversaries, that we are now no more copied brethren & friends, but enemies; & by the old masse assyres be so straightly commanded, the masse is false is shortly looked for.

A sword now is put into the enemies hands of these, that under Q. Mary have drawn it for Popery, & under pretence of good order are ready without cause to beewreck their popish anger upon us, who in this wil use extremity, in other laws of more importance paticularly, I would have wished My Lords rather privy admonition then open expulsion, yea I had rather have received wounds of my brother, then kisses of mine enemy, if wee had privily in a Covenant day resigned, then nether should the punisher have ben noted of cruelty, nether the offender of temerity, nether should the pap. have accused (in their seditious book) protestants of contention. Religion requireth naked Christ, to bee preached, professed, glorified that Graemoralis, by the faithfull ministrie of seedinge pastours, should bee furthered, & after that orders tending to edification, & not to destruction, advanced, & finally, the spouses friends should by all means be cherished favourd & defended & not by counterfite & false intruders, condemned & overborne, & defaced. But alas a man qualified with inward gifts for lack of outwarde shews is punished, & a nata only outwardly consonable, inwardly clean unfurnished, is let alone, yea exalted, the painfull preacher for his labour is beaten, the unpreaching Prelate, offending in the greater is shot free, the learned man with.
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out his cappe is afflicted, the capp'd man without learning is not touched. Is not this directly to break God's laws? Is not this the Pharisaes we? It not this to wash the outside of the cup, and leave the inner part uncleaned? Is not this to preferre mint and anise before the ordinance of God? Is not this in the school of Christ, and in the method of the Gospel apply'd in order? hath not this preposterous order a woe? That the Catechisme should be read is the word of God. It is the order of the Church, to preach is a necessary point of a Priest, to make quarterly sermons is law, to see poor men of the poor mens box relieved, vagabonds punished, Parishes Communicate. Roof-lofts pulldowne, monuments of superstition defaced, service done and heard, is scripture, is statute, that the oath to the Q. Majesty should bee offered and taken, is required as well by ordinance of God as of man. These are plaine matters necessary, Christian and profitable. To weare a Surlyss, a Cope, or cornerd cappe is (as you take it) an accidentall thing, a devise onely of man, and as wee say a doubt of question in Divinitie. 

Synth now these substantial points are in all places of this realme almost negleft, the offenders either nothing or little rebuked, and synth the transgressors have no colour of conscience, it is sine and shame to proceede against us first, having also reasonable defence of our doings. Charity My Lord, would first have taught us, equitie would first have spared us, brotherlinefesse would have warned us, pity would
would have pardoned us, if we had been found trespassers.

God is my witness who is the beholder of all faith.

I think of your Lordship, honourably, esteeming you as brethren, reverencing you as Lords and Masters of the congregation: alas why have not you some good opinion of us, why do you trust knowne adversaries and mistrust your brethren? We confess one faith of Jesus, we preach one doctrine, we acknowledge one ruler upon earth, in all things (saving in this) we are of your judgement, shall we bee used thus for a surplus? Shall Brethren persecute Brethren for a forked Cappe, devised singularly of him that is our enemy? Now shall we fight for the Popish Coate, his head and body being banished? Shall the controversy so fall out in conclusion, that for lacke of this necessary furniture (as it is esteemed) labourers shall lacke wages? Churches preaching? Shall we not teach? Shall we not exercise our talents as God hath commanded us. Because we will not wante that which our enemies have desired, and that by the appointment of friends. Oh that ever I saw this day that our adversaries should laugh to see brethren fall together to the ears! Oh that Ephraim should thus eat up Manasses, Manasses Ephraim. My Lords before this take place consider the cause of the Church, the Creks and triumphs of Anti Christ. The laughter of Satan, the sorrow and sighs of a number, the mystery and sequel of the tragedie: I write with zeal without proove of my matter at this time present, but not without knowledge of it, nor without griefe of minde. God move your
272
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"Your spirit at this present to fight against Carnem, Circumcisionem, imo Concisionem, against literam et gem, which principally is now regarded & rewarded. Speak, I humbly beseech you to the Queen's Majesty, to the Chancelour, and to Mr. Secretary and the rest, that these proceedings may sleepe, that England may understande your zealous minde toward the wor-
ship of God, your love toward the poore we-
willers, your hate toward the professed enimes your-
unity in true conformity, the other neither be need-
full now, neither exacted in any good age. So shall
the little flock be bounde to you, so shall the great
shepherd be good to you.

By this we may judge of some others, whom he onely nameth.

3. That all allowed some significant Ceremonies is manyesteel proved false, in the former allegations.

4. We glory no more of syncretie, in refusinge the Ceremo-
nies, then the Rejoynder doeth in using of them; It is no abusing of the world, to allege generall sentence of men condemning that which they seeme to allow in their prattise. If it were, I can name one protestant writer, who hath more abused the world, in this kinde, then any, or all of us: and that is no other, then our Def. D. Morton. For he hath written many booke of good use, against the Papists, the cheif grace where is, that (having a good Librarie, and using it with deli

gence, and discretion) he hath alleged many thousand of their owne testimonies, for the disproofing of those errors and superstitions, which the same Authors, in place
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other places, or at least in their practice, doe apparently eyther allow, or admite of. This is the wordy answer which the Rejoynder giveth unto the testimonies alleged in the Abr. (pag. 33, 34.) for to prevent our bragging: now let us trie if the Argument naked of testimonies, will not stand.

The Argument is this: If those Ceremonies which God himself ordained, to teach his Church, by their signification, may not be used, much less may those which man hath devised. The Def. his first answer is, that the use of some Jewish rite, without any Jewish opinion, as Circumcision, and Easter. In which answer nothing is found, that toucheth any term of the Argument. Yet upon the occasion of it, the Def. was asked how a Jewish Rite, can be used, without some part of a Jewish opinion?

The Rejoynder answered, materially, but not formally, and in use. But he should have remembered that the Argument is of significant rites using, and the Def. his answer is of Jewish significant rites using: so that in his grant, ther must needs be granted some formal use for signification. Beside, in all using of humane mystical rites, upon due consideration, ther is some part of a Jewish opinion. I prove it thus: All they that considerably use carnall, beggerly rudiments, in Gods service, have this opinion, that suche rites as the Jewish (set prefiguration aside which no Christian ever admitted) are good in the Christian Church. But all that so use humane mystical rites, use carnall, beggerly rudiments, in Gods service. Ergo. The assumption I prove thus: All that use mystical rites, where so there

The second part.

M m m
A fresh suite against Ceremonies: is no Spirit annexed by God, as unto the Evangelickall institutions of the new Testament, use carnall beggerly rudiments, in God's service. But they which use humane mysticall rites, use mysticall rites, whereo there is no Spirit annexed by God. Ergo. The Proposition cannot be denied, untility a better definition of suche rites be given: nor the assumption, except an Evangelickall promishe can be shewed of Spiritual blessing upon the use of humane mysticall rites.

Concerning Circumcision.

4. Because the Def. for an example of a Jewish rite, lawfull for Christians to use, named Circumcision, the Repl. concluded, that belike, he houldeth Circumcision, as it is used under Presse John, to be lawfull.

The Rej. therefor resolveth us, that He doth so: and also chalengeth the Repl. for saying nothing to disproof him. Upon this provocacion, it is necessarie to lay some-thing against these patrones of Circumcision. Where it is to be marked, that the question is of Ecclesiastick Ceremonies devised by man for signification of morall duties; whether it be lawfull, for a Church representative, (suche as our Convocation) to appoint, and urge Circumcision, in this kinde, and to this purpose, upon those Christians who are under their power?

5. Now of this question in the formal state of it, I finde not, that scarce any doubt was amongst understanding Christians, before this Def. and Rej. being urged...
urged thereto by direct consequence from their principles, have now found it necessarie, to mainteyne the affirmative part, for defence of our beggerly Ceremonies.

There was some difference betwixt Hierome, & Augustine, about observing of legall Rites, & in speciall about Circumcision (as appareth out of the Epistles which passed betwixt them, yet extant) but both of the agreed on this, that as well to Jew, as Gentile, all religious use of Circumcision, for Ceremonie, &c. is now after due publication of the Gospel, unlawfull or deadly. All that have written since, agree about the same truth, except Cajetan in one place; who is forsaken & opposed therein by all Papists, the Iesuites themselves not excepted. Our Divines are so confident of this, that from the unlawfulness of Circumcision, they usually dispute against other humane Ceremonies: and the Iesuits in answering, are forced to flie unto this (which must be our Def. and Rej. their answer) that the Ceremonies of the olde Testament, are not absolutely abrogated, but onely in regard of their speciall manner, end, & intention. Greg. Valent. tom. 2. disp. 7. quaest. 7. punc. 7. Bellar. de effect. Sacr. l. 2. c. 32. whiche answer is called by D. Fulke (ag. Saund. of images, pag. 672.) a beastly doctrine.

But because it were an infinite and needless labor, to allege the testimonies whiche may be easilly alleged, against Ceremoniall Circumcision, amongeth Christiaus, as unlawfull, I will passe on to reasons against it; that the Rej. may no more say, You say nothing to disprove it.
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6. First,
6. First, The onely place, in the New Testament, by which all Divines (as the Rejoynder speaketh, pag. 75,) prove a power in the Churche to constitute Ceremonies, is 1. Cor. 14. 26. 40. Edification, decencie, order. But the Apostle, in that chapter, doeth no way give leave either unto our, or any other Churche to constitute Circumcision for a Ceremonie. Therefore no Churche hath power to constitute Circumcision for a Ceremonie. For Order, and Decency, no man in his right wit will say that Circumcision commeth under their notion. And as for Edification, it hath been formerly shewed, that it doeth not require new instituted signifie Ceremonies, muche lesse a rejected or abrogated Ceremonie, but onely is the ende of orderly and decent cariage of things instituted by God.

7. Secondly, no part of the partition wall, betwixt Jewes and Gentiles, may by any Convocation-house, or other Churche be reared up againe. But Circumcision is a part, nay a principall corner-stone of that partition-wall, howsoever it be interpreted, so it be ap pointed. Ergo.

8. Thirdly, Circumcision cannot be esteemed more lawfull to be instituted for a signifie Ceremonie, then a Paschall lambe: and they two being brought into the Churche, what shall hinder (if it please our Convocation house) but the greatest part of the olde Ceremonyall law, may in like manner follow? For the Rejoynder cap. 2. sect. 6. acknowledgeth no other limites, or boundes for number of suche Ceremonies, then the judgement of those to whose discretion it belongeth.
9. In the fourth place, it is not lawful for any Churche to impose Ceremoniall burdens upon Christians. But Circumcision is a great burden to them upon whom it is imposed: as our Convocation men would confess, if it were imposed upon them. Ergo.

10. Fifthly, It is not lawful for any Churche, or Convocation-house, to usurpe authoritie over the bodies of men, especially unto blood. But appointing of Circumcision is usurping of authoritie over mens bodies, to the shedding of blood. Ergo. Add unto this, that the Convocation-house may better appointe, that all English men, should have their lippes, or their ears pared, or their eares sayled to theyr Parish-Churche dore, for signification of that dutie, which they are bounde to performe with their ears and lippes, then suche Circumcision as is in use with the Jewes, and Prester-John. These thinges considered, I thinke there is no reasonable man, but will sooner reject our Ceremonies, for bringing suche a foule tayle after them, (as that our Convocatiyon may cause all English men to be Circumcized) then admitte of Circumcision, for love of our paultrrie Ceremonies.

11. Presently after the Def. had excused Jewish Rites, if they were used without Jewish opinion, he confesseth (without distinction) that all Jewish Rites are abolisshed. Wherin the Repl. noted a contradiction. But the Rejoynder(to helpe at a dead lift) distinguishes betwixt Jewish Ceremonies, as they were typical or signi-
A fresh suite against Ceremonies.

rative, and necessarie, and Jewish Ceremonies; as they are morally significant, and free. Now for necessity and freedome, enough hath been spoken in the first part. In the other distinction, he disliketh nothing but typicall signification: so that (in his imagination) any Jewish Ceremony may be now used, and by our Convocation-house imposed upon us, if typicall signification of Christ to come be taken from it. And is not this a Christian doctrine of Ceremonies, that sacrificing of a lamb to signify Christ already come (as D. Reinolds ag. Hart. ep. 8. div. 4. doeth conclude from the like answer of Hart. is now lawfull? It may be he will answer, that he doth not allow of Ceremonies signifying Christ at all.

But it hath been formerly shewed, that our signet: the Cross doeth immediately and directly signify Christ's death upon the Cross.

But let all this be as the Rej. would have it: what this for the defense of the Def. whose sayd even now that a Jewish Rite, without a Jewish opinion, is not unlawful; and then addeth, that yet it is more safe to invent new Ceremonies, then those Jewish rites now abolished? Is Jewish Rite used without a Jewish opinion, typical? Or is it only lesse safe, to use abolished types, then new invented Ceremonies? This is nothing else but to make ropes of sande.

12. Upon the former grante (that all those Jewish rites, which were once Gods institutions, are now abolished) the Repl. concluded, in the wordes of D. Whitakers: *Num verò visceris figura subiata sunt, ut loc.
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The Rej. heerupon complaineth of manifest abusing and perverting D. Whitaker his wordes. And why so, I pray? 1. D. Whitaker spake of Divine figures, and the Rep., by corrupt translation maketh him to speak of Divine Ceremonies. As if D. Whitakers did understand by figures typicall prafigurations of thinges to come onely, in his dispute against the Papists, whose by Bellarmine in that place confesse, the Ceremonies of the old Testament were figures of the new Testament, and therefore when the thing itselfe is come should cease.

And what else could he understand, but significat Ceremonies? Doeth not the Rej. rather pervert D. Whitakers meaning, in making him to conclude against typicall prafigurations, which Bellarmine did as well disclame, as himselfe?

2. He cuts off by the waft, D. Whitakers his sense, saith the Rej. Let us therfore take in the next wordes, according to the Rej. his owne translation: Therefore if the Ceremonies of Moses were removed because they were typicall, why should not the Popish Ceremonies be removed which are not lesse typicall? Is not this above the waft, against significat Ceremonies? Certainly It was not the meaning of D. Whitaker to charge the Papists with typicall prafigurations of Christ yet to come: and therefore he must needs understand, by typicall, significant Ceremonies.

3. The
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3. The whole intention (sayth he) was, to condemn the Papish Ceremonies, as necessary, or Sacramentall. But this could not be so: because Bellarmin in that place, first answereth about their figurative nature, and then after addeth: to that which is objected of the number and weight of papish taxes. 4. D. Wh. (addeth he) did all of humane significant Rites: as certain Feasts. Now if D. Wh. yeelding something to the streame of time, and custome, did account some suche humane institutions tolerable, that is nothing to the purpose. For we urge here his generall rule onely: of Feasts we shall after answer. In the mean time, concerning D. Wh. his generall sentence of humane significant Ceremonies, let these his words be considered: Bellarmin saith, the Ceremonies are instituted of the Church to help the ruder sort. I answer: rude are not to be instraffed with Ceremonies, God hath give Scripture that out of them the rude may draw instruction. And it is to be obersver, that D. Wh. in that place confuteth the one and thirtie Chapter of Bell. his second booke, de effectu Sacram. But the confusion of the two and thirtie Chapter is wholly wanting: in which this Argument was to be handled, in defence of Ca vins, Chemnitis, and Brentius his reason: God wouh ave this difference betweene us and the Iews, teach us childern by sensible signes, as men more simple wishe, whoe signes. Now that D. Wh. in his Lectures palle over that Chapter with silence, It is not credible: but it seemeth rather, that honest Mr. Allen found his sentence there so crosse to our English tenents about Ceremonies, that he durst not set forth his wordes.
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printe. For of D. Wardes fidelity, in setting forth what Mr. Allenson had prepared for the press (ne verbalo immutato) cannot without wronge be doubted of.

13. For the backinge of the former consequence, this reason was added, by the Repl. If it had been the will of God, that we should be taught, by other signes, then those which are appointed in the N. Testament: He could easily, and would surely, eyther have chosen some of the olde, for that use, or appointed some new in their places. The Rej. his answer is, that God willeth humane significant teaching Ceremonies, one ly permisibly, not preceptively. Of which distinction I know not well what to make: as being uncertain wheth he meaneth, that God hath onely permitted in generall, that Christians may be taught (if men shall thinke fitting) by humane signes; or that he hath commanded that in generall, and onely permitted the particulars to mens discretion! Howsoever, those whoe usurpe this authority, must shew good evidence of this permisive will of God, before we can finde our selves, eyther preceptively, or permisively willed of God, to subject our selves unto their institutions. But that evidence we have hitherto exspected in vayne. The Rej. to darken the cause objecteth, that It is Gods will, that we should worship him constandy in one set place, as suche an houre, in suche an order; and yet these are not prescribed by God. Where it is not true that it is Gods will, to have us bound constandy to one place, time, and order of worship. 2. So far as we can discern Gods will for to have us use any one place, time, and order, we di-

The second part.
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Scene that will to be præceptive, and not meerly permis-

te.  

For all knowe, that God hath commanded most con-

venient place, time, and order, for to be observed in his

service: When therefore (all circumstances considered)

we finde this place, time, and order, most convenient,

we observe it as commanded of God. The like cannot

be sayd of our Ceremonies: except first it be shewed,

that God hath commanded humane signifìcant Cere-

monies in generall: and after it be made apparant, that

our signifìcant Ceremonies are more convenient for us,

then others.

14. The Def. having given a reason, why it is safer
to invent new Ceremonies, then to use those olde
ones of the Iewes: because they might ingender an opini-
on of necessitie: and so might bringe in all the Levi-
call law: was answered by the Repl. 1. that though
more danger may be in some respect, on the one side,
yet more may be absolutely on the other. To this
(though it be evident) the Rej. answereth with a ban-
denial. 2. The Repl. observed, that the inventing
of new humane Ceremonies have ingendred an opini-
on of necessitie in them: and have brought in all the
Popish law of Rites: so that the comparision, even in
these respects, may be questioned.

The Rej. heer first observeth, that it was formerly
alleged out of Calv. Ep. 259. that the originall of all hu-
mane Ceremonies was, that men would needes forge new wor-
ships of God. In whiche wordes, he findeth more then
any other man can: opinion of necessitie: and upon that
A fresh suit against Ceremonies! accuses the Repl. of I know not what varying uncertainty, without any reason at all. Afterward, he observeth, that Jewish Ceremonies have more colour of necessity, because of their first Divine institution.

Now let that be so: yet if preaching, or the Churches sentence declared in a Convocation, be sufficient to remove from Ceremonies all false opinion (as the Def. and Rej. would persuade us) that maketh no such difference, but that the comparison may still be questioned.

S E C T. 7.

Concerning Images, &c.

1. A third reason brought against significant Ceremonies, was, that they open a gap to Images, &c. where the Reader must remember, or consider, that the meaning is: Images instituted for signification of moral duties, may as well be set up in Churches, as Cross and Surplice. The Def. his answer was (to passe over superfluitie of wordes) that Images are not to be accounted Popish, or unlawfull, but onely in regard of superstitions adoration. Wherunto it was replied, that then Cassanders Images (not for adoration, but for information & incitements) are not Popish: whiche the Rej. doeth not onely grante, but also proveth it, by the consent of Calvin himselfe, Instit. lib. i. cap. 11. sect. 12. where he sayth, that Historical Images, or Pictures, may have
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some
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Some use, in teaching, and putting, in remembrance.

Now for this, let it be considered, that Calvin in that
section, speaketh onely of ordinarie pictures, for
Teaching and putting in remembrance of that which
they represent of themselves, without any Ecclesiastical
Institution, as certayne words written doe signify
A certayne meaning, without any speciall institution.
Suche (it may be) would be the picture of Ananias in
a white Surplise, signifying with other pictures agreeable
to the storie, that Paul esteemed and called him a whitewall, Act. 23. 3. But in the very next section, which
the thirteenth, Calvin, disputing against setting up
any Images in Churches, doeth sufficiently declare, that
he allowed of no Ceremoniall religious use of Images
Suche as is of our Crosse, and Surplise.

2. The Replier alleged against this defense of Ceremoniall religious use of Images, especially in Churches, the common consent of our Divines. Against this, the Rej. first opposeth Luther and the Luthrians and then asketh if they be none of our Divines? To which I answer, that they are in most maine pounte our Divines: but about this businessse they are no more.

Our, then about Viuositie, Consuphashantiation, &c. for which they disclaime us, even the wholle Church of England, as no part of the Catholike Church, but sectaries, Sacramentarians, &c. Secondly, the historie of Luther about Images is well known: how in opposition to Carolashadus, whoe brake downe Images with our his consent, he would have them to be tolerated, onely for a tyme, untill men were more fully instructed. But
But that he allowed them for good Ceremonies of religion, that cannot be shewed. Mr. Foxe, in the storie of Luther, hath this: Luther misliked the rashness of Carolus Lutatius, in stirring up the people, to throw down Images, without authoritie, and before the people were taught, that Images serve to no purpose. Not that he would mainteyne Images (as he said) to stand, or to be suffered: but that this ought to be done by the Magistrate &c. This was Luther enforced on, by the slanderers, that accused Protestants of sedition and tumults, &c. This is no argument, for the Magistrate to let Images stand; who may and should remove them, and will not. The cause why Luther did so stand with the standing of Images, was time, and not his owne judgement. He wished them away. Nay (as Zuinglius relateth) he turned them, some with their feet upward, and some with their faces toward the wall, & their backes to the people, for to make them not religious, but ridiculous. Thirdly, the Lutherans make this one of their controversies, against Calvin, Beza, &c. whether Images may be tolleated in Churches, or in religious use. Fourthly, Polanus (who was borne amongst the Lutherans in Silesia) in Ezech. cap. 11. testifieth, that the Lutheran Images, are worshipped of most Lutherans, &c. and therefore are Idoles to be avoided. And will the Rej. then defende the Lutheran use of Images?

3. In the next place, the Rej. asketh, in mumminge fashion, if Pytinus, Innicius, & Mr. Perkins be not of our Divines? or if they do not acknowledge an historicaall use of Images lawfull? To whiche he answer, that they are in our consenting Divines.
For Vr sine, his wordes are plaine (parte 2. pag. 45: they must needs have large consciences, who blush not in, reckon a thing of the worst example, and from heathensbreu, and custome brought into the Church, not without the great disgrace and hars thereof, among indiffernt things. Where it must be observed, that he disputed against Flaccius Iliricus, about Images, even in the Lutheran use, which our Def. and Rej. maintaine. Imnius also is ours. His words are these (adv. Bell. de Imagin. lib. 2. cap. 12. v. 30. It is Gods cause and ours (as is plaine, out of the word, that neyther his Image nor Christis nor any of the Saints for a religious end, be sett up in any place (speicaly that is appointed for Gods worship) or at any time without his order. Verily these Images are to be reckened not onely among things Superthous, but Scathie and Forbidden things. Mr. Perkins (being in every mans handes) may be easily consulted with, upon the second Commandement, and in his treatise of Idolatrie.

4. Beza, with his fellow Ministers of Geneva, are next brought in, whoe allowed many pictures, to be set forth in the Frenche Bible. Beza his judgement (even of Lutheran Images) is plaine in his answer to Westphalus, a Lutheran, capit. 36. The placing of Images in Churches we thinke a 1000. times stilly forbidden by the word of God. Whosoever would see Bezass resolue judgement, about the Lutheran use of Images, which the Def. approveth of, let him looke upon his Antithesis ad th. 1. 4. Wittbergensium, in Colloquio Mompelgardensi: & ad Colloquium Mompelgardensi, parte 2. And he shall finde enough to satisfy him, not onely about Bezass judgement, but (if he bea
be a good Protestant) concerning the cause, or question it selfe. For no answer of moment could ever be brought forth, by any eyther rigid, or gentle Lutheran, from that time, unto this day.

As for those pictures in the Frenche Bible, they are not significant Ceremonies of religious use by speciall institution; but suche signes as Characters or letters, concerning whiche, answer is given, in the first section of this Chapter, out of Alexander Hales: They signify holy things not as they are holy, but as they are things.

The Rej. thence for-sseeing what would be answer'd, goeth about to prevent it, by saying, that the Def. condemneth all religious use of Images, properly so called, i.e. whose determination must be to Godward, as Polanus in 2. Præcep. expresseth the meaning. Whiche expression I cannot finde in Polanus, but this to our purpose: Images are not to be allowed in Churches for laymens books.

Nyet her can the Def. or Rej. deny all religious use of Images, properly so called; except they deny significant Images, appointed for commonesfation and institution of men in religious duties, to be a religious use. Whiche if they could have doen, they needed not have admitted Images into the same ranke with their income significant Ceremonies, accidentall parts of religious worship. By this also is answered that which he addeth of simple historicall use of Images, as separated from all religious use.

5. Of having Images for religious use, the negative is defended by Calvin, and the affirmative by Bellarmine, de Imag. lib. 2. cap. 9. in which question, it was observed
observed by the Replier, that the Def, taketh Bell. his part.

The Rejoynder heere first maketh a kinde of doubt, whether Calvin did not therein contradict himself! But not tru sting to that, he addeth, that the question was, whether Images may be well (recte) placed in Churches; because things lawfull in them selves, are not lawfull in all times & places to be used. Now the meer looking upon that Chapter of Bell. will praetently manifest, that Calvin, calling Images in Temples, Idolatrous signes set up, wherewith the Churches are defiled, never meant so to mine the matter, as to make them lawfull, but not expedient. And in deed, if Images may be used for commonfa ction, and institution, as Ecclesiasticall significant Cer emonies, ther can be no reason given, why they should be shutte out of the Churche, where Ecclesiasticall signif icant Ceremonies have their chiefest use.

This is certayn, that the Def. expressly denieth the bringing in of Images into Churches, for some such uses as Bellarmin speaks of, cap. 10. For instruction, and erudition, for stirring upp unto imitation, and for preserv ing of the memorese of Christ, and Saints, he denieth, say, this to be any part of Popish use or abuse about Images, when he sayth, that Onely in regard of superstition adoration, the use of Images is to be called Popish.

6. It was added by the Repl. that the Def. his affection is directly against the Remonlie against the peril of hol liarie, unto which we are bounde to subscribe. If this be true (sayth the Rejoynder) the Bishop deserveth to be suspen ded: the Replier, if it be untrue. Now I doe not desire that
that he alone, (separated from the rest euyther partaker of
the same or guiltie of equal faults,) should be suspended:
but I dare adventure my suspension, against his, that
neither he nor the Repl. can clear his assertion, from di-
rect contradiction unto that Homilie. I will take no
other wordes for proof of that which the Repl. sayth,
then that founde in a booke written against Mr. Richard
Mountague, about the like sentence, called A dangerous
Plot, &c. pag.94. and 95. where these wordes are quo-
ted out of that Homilie: The words Idol and Image, be
words of divers tongues, and soundes: yet used in the Scrip-
ture indifferently, for one thinge allways. To bringe Images
into the Churches, is a foul abuse, and great enormitie. They
be forbidden, and unlawfull. They are not thinges indiffe-
rent, nor tolerable. If the Def. will say, that his affes-
tion is not contrarie to these wordes, then I am conten-
ted, that his suspension should be deferred longer then
Mr. Montaguues promotion was, after he had written
this, and suche like scandalous doctrines, tending di-
rectly to the overthrow of our religion. And this rea-
son may be alleged for him: that Mr. Mountague in
some poyntes went so farre beyonde D.Morton, that
he recketh him amonge the Puritan Bishops.

7. The Repl. noted also, that the Def. his asser-
tion confirmeth Bellarmines foul wordes, whoe sayth,
that the Apologie of the Churche of England lyeth, in
affirminge the Councell of Franckford to have decreed
the abolishing of Images: de Concil. lib.2. cap.3. because
the onely answer is that which Iunius (in his notes upon
that chapter) giveth: He that forbiddeth Images to be wor-
shiped,
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Shiped, doth forbid having of Images worshipable, especially in Churches: Which answer this Def. doth flatly deny.

The Rej. answereth, that the meaning of B. Inel, in that place of the Apologie, was, not that the Council did simply take away Images, but contrarie to the Council of Nice, which required the adoration of them. But 1. If these wordes doe not shew Inel's meaning, yet certainly they declare Inel in his minde and judgement, plainly. How then dare the Rej. avouch Inel's to have allowed Images worshipable? 2. Inel his words are: Charles the Great had a Councell at Franckford, contrarie to the 2. Nice Council, concerning the taking away of Images: where the taking away is not limited by contrarietie to the Nice Council, but manifestly explaineth the sentence wherein that contrarietie did mainly consist. 3. Learned Inel knew, how to write plainly, so that his wordes and meaning may be understood. Now what his judgement was of Images for religious use, (adoration set a part) appeareth evidently, as in his 14. Article, so especially in that notable and Propheticall sentence of his, concerning the Image of the Cross of Christ, as it was in some place or places of England: Sibi illam a Cruce fiet, nos cadimus. If that evil Cross should, wee (or our religion) must fall.

This is related by D. Humphrie, in the historie of B. Inel's life and death, a little before the ende. And in very deed, except those which write against the Papists, doe refute all Images instituted for religious signification, they doe not make any difference between us, and a great part of Popish Doctors. For (as Bilson, against the Jesuites Apologie, pag. 572. well observeth) this is the
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she doubts, betwixt us and the Papists, whether we should not content ourselves with such means as God hath devised for us, and commended unto us, thereby daily to renew the memory of our Redemption; or else invent others of our own heads? Nay if we admit of significant Images, as religious Ceremonies, I would fain know how we in England can condемne, those that worship before them, or them commemoratively, or recordatively, as Petrus de Crabrera (in 3 q. 25. a 3. disp. 2. n. 35.) speaketh, and Vasquez defendeth to be the common tenet of the Romish Doctors. For that is nothing else, but at the beholding of a Crucifix, or such like Image, and calling to minde Christ, and our dutie to him, upon the same to worship him whiche (upon the supposition of their religious signification lawful) can hardly be condemned by those which would kneeling at the Communion good.

Concerning Oyle, Lighte, Spitle, Creame and H. Water.

8. In the Abridgement, unto Images were joyned Oyle, Lighte, Spitle, Creame, and Holy Water. But it pleased the Def. to passe over Lighte, and Creame, untouched. And concerning Oyle and Spitle, by the Rejoynder his owne correction of the Repliers collection, his answer is: that they, having their birth and being from an Apish imitation of a miraculous impoyment of them, are therefore to be kept out of doores, though some significant Ceremonies be let in. Now this is no answer (as the Replier observed) except the miraculous using of any thing doeth forbid, that it should at any time after be used for signification.
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Whiche
Whiche the Rej. would neyther affirme, nor denie, but onely calleth it a flous. But it is suche a flout, as being granted, it causeth the Crosse, as being above all other Ceremonies for fame of miracles wrought by it, and the Surplice also, as being, in part, an Apish imitation of the Angels miraculous apparitions in white. But the trueth is: our Prelats doe place it in the Churches power, to retayne, as Ceremonies of Baptisme, Chriisme, Salt, Candles, Exorcismes, Ephata, and the Consecration of the Water, so well as the Crosse. These are the very wordes of Lancelot Andraeus, the late famous B. of Winchester, in his answer to the 18. Chapter of Cardinall Perrons Replie, pag.12. or sect.17. For Holy Water, his most distinct answere was, that their (i.e. Papsists) sprinkling of water upon the People, for remembrance of their Baptisme, if it were applied one by one to make them often mindful, and careful to keep their vow of Christianitie, made once to God in Baptisme, it might be called a moral Ceremonie and Christian. But as it is used in Romish Churches, as operactive, to the purging of veniall sines, and driving away of Devils, it is Popish and execrable. I am constrained to repeat the Def. his wordes, that they may discover the vanity of the Rej. his exceptions against the replie to them opposed: which was, that Calvin Instit. lib.4. cap.19.s.20. And Iunius in Bellarine de Cultu Sanctorum, libr.3. cap.7. n.8. were of another minde: &c.

The Rejoynder: 1. blameth the Replier for making shew, as if the Def. were fairely inclined to let in the use of Holy Water. But without any cause, except he will denie the Def. to be fairely inclined, to let in the use of a moral
As a guide against Ceremonies.

A moral Christian Ceremonie, as the Defender calleth it.

2. He observeth, that the Def. named not II. Water, but sprinkling of Water upon the People. Now the Rej. sayth expressly thus: We come to that which they (the Papists) call II. Water their (i.e. the Papists) sprinkling of Water upon the People, &c. confounding plainly these two terms.

3. He noteth, that the Defender did not say it may be, but it might be called Christian: that is (by the Rejoynder his interpretation) if superstition had not stayed it. Now I cannot see any difference betwixt that which the Replier sayth, it may be accounted Christian, were it not for this or that; and this of the Rejoynders: It might be so accounted, if it were not for this or that. But if a slaine of superstition, doth hinder, that a humane Ceremonie cannot be after called Christian, though that superstition be taken from it, by doctrine & profession, what will become of our Ceremonies, which the Rejoynder doeth so labour to mainteyne as Christian, that he hath scarce one shred left about him dry, or free from his sweating?

4. He denieth the Defender to have sayd, that were it not for the operative power which is ascribed unto it, it might be accounted Christian.

Wherin whosoever will but look upon the Defender his owne wordes, even now quoted, must needs wonder, what subtill difference the Rejoynder can conceyve betwixt his formall wordes as onely making mindful, it is Christian, but not as operative: and that fence which he denieth. 5. Because both the Defender and Rejoynder doe make so muche of operative vertue ascribed by the Popish Doctors unto Holy Water, for cleansing.
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cleansing from venial sins, as that therein they place all
the Poperie and fault of it: let them knowe, that diverse
of the best learned amongst them doe flatly dene it. As
Ellins in 4. pag. 14. Some speake improbably, that Holy Water
Conserves remision of venial sinne, only by the deed done.
Vasquez in 3. disp. 128. cap. 5. ar. 4. Sacramentals do no
work remission of venial sinne, nor were instituted for any such
end, but to stirre up the mind to abandon them. Now as for
necessitie, wherewith the Rejoynder would put off Cal-
vin : Bellarmin himselfe (de Pompif. 14. c. 18.) answere-
th: It is an admonition or holy institution only without
any obligation to a fault if it be omitted. They can not
(without contempt) do no sprinkle themselves with Holy
Water, when they enter the Church. Junius his wordes are
to full and plaine, that they admette no answer: no hu-
mane ordination can make it good. 6. The Rep. conclu-
sion: that such sprinkling of water as the Def. alloweth
may perhaps be called Christian: but not Christian, without
taking Christes name in vayne; cannot be cluded by the
Rejoynder his comparatively Christian, no more than
some uncleanness may be called Christian, in compari-
of filthinesse contrary to nature.

9. In the following passages, concerning abuses
imposing humane Ceremonies, and P. Martyrs, judg-
ment, nothing is worth the anwiering, which hath not
been formerly cleared. Onely about that which the
Def. affirmeth, concerning the shewing up of the e:
which was sayd to be opened by this doctrine of hu-
mane signifieant Ceremonies, in Gods worship, some
thing must be anwiered unto the Rejoynder his here
acerti
accusations. 1. The Rejoynder asketh, If any more significant Ceremonies have been brought in this threescore yeares? To whiche I answer, first that ther have been of late more bringing in of Altars, with bowing unto the, then was before: and at Durham, the third Seat of our Def. more superstitious observations are now sayd to be urg'd, then in threescore yeares before. Secondly, it is well known, that in threescore yeares, ther have scarce any generall significant Ceremonies been newly brought into the Churche of Rome: yet Chamier (tom. 2. pag.1299.) answereth to the like evaision: We are to regard not onely what is brought in, but what may be brought in. For whilst such authority is challenged, the sake is not certaine, but waver'. 2. Because the Repliker sayd, that the gap is every day made wider and wider by suche defences as this is, which allow of Images themselves, for some religious use; because by this meanes any Crucifix may come in, that is not greater then the Churche doore: the Rejoynder accuseth him of a steeled conscience, if he doth not bide for suche an injurious jest of self-hate, tending to bring them into suspicion, and barred: to that in his charitie, we can no longer be accounted sincere men. And I pray you why? Forsooth the Def. doeth not allow all Images, and in Churches too, and for religious use. Now (if his heat be over) let him consider the Def. his wordes, cited, allowed, and maintayned by himselfe, pag.291. the use of Images, onely in regard of superstitious adoration, is to be call'd Popish, and not true. What distinction is here but wixt Images? though he was not by the Repliker accused, as favouring all Images, but onely a Cruc-i-
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a Crucifix. And let him tell us, if he doeth (or can) by his groundes disallow of all Crucifixes? or if ther be no use of suche Images, in Churches, but onely for Superstitious adoration? or if ther be no religious use of a significant Image beside adoration? The case is so plaine, that every man may see the Rejoynder in this place, breaking out into an intemperat passion, for want of a reasonable answer to that which he was ashamed to confesse.

3. The Rejoynder confessing that our Prelates can when they please, open the gap, to many other Ceremonies like to these which now they urge upon us, addeth notwithstanding, that the Replier his spirit in saying so, transported him, to involve his Maiestie, and the State, by an uncharitable surmise. And that this gap shall never be opened, unless our janglings, and our sinnes bring Gods displeasure upon our land. Now alas, what involving is this of Civil powers, to say, that the Prelats, by their permission, may bring in three Cereonies, as well as three. And what humane religious Ceremonies can be brought into England, without our sinnes desert? As for his intermixing of our janglings, as a possible cause it is not worth any jangling.

Concerning the second Commandement.

10. One Argument is yet to be handled, either omitted, or (as the Rejoynder sayth) put off unto a later place, by the Defendant. The Argument standeth thus.

The second Commandement forbiddeth to make unto ourselves, the image of any things whatsoever.
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For religious use: as Bucer, Iuel, Fulke, Andrews and Bilton doe interpret it. Therfore to make, appoint, or use significant Ceremonies, of mans devizing, is unlawful.

The Rejoynder answereth, in general, that Religious use, by these fore-named Authors, is taken. 1. For Worship to the Image: 2. Worship to God, by the Image: and not simply, that which he may any ways conferre to the furtherance of Religion. Wherin, he sayth nothing but trueth, and yet no trueth at all to the purpose: except he understandeth in the that which he affirmeth, onely, i.e. that they meant no more, but worshiping to, and by: and in that he denieth, by simply, no difference, betwixt any of those things that help forthor further Religion: as if civill circumstances, and instituted religious Ceremonies, were all one. And if this be his meaning, it requireth more then his simple testimonie, to confirme it.

II. For the backing of this Argument, it was first observed by the Replier, that the word likeness, used in the second Commandement, is generall, and comprehendeth under it, all religious similitudes: because they are homogeneall to images, there expressly forbidden. To this the Rejoynder answereth nothing: but onely sayth, that our Ceremonies are not religious similitudes in suche a sense as the Commandement intendereth, and Divines understand. And that the Replier speaketh ignorantly: because the Commandement doeth as expressly forbid suche similitudes, as any grauen Images.

Now the first of these sayings, we cannot understand, untill the Rejoynder explaineth him selfe, what that sense.
sense is, in which the Commandement intendeth to forbid all religious similitudes? As for the second, to leave the Repliers ignorance unto the readers judgment, more in it is granted, then was demanded: viz: that all religious similitudes are expressly forbidden in the second Commandement.

12. It was secondly added by the Replier, that significant Ceremonies are externall acts of religious worship, even as they are used to further devotion. Suarez, in 3. q.65. ar.4. Bell. de Eff. Sacr. lib.2, cap.29, and 31. and therefore being invented by man, of the same nature with Images, by which, and at which, God is worshiped. The Rejoynder here (for want of a better answer) flieth to his olde Sanctuarie, of meritorious, necessarie, and immediate worship grossly held by Papists of their Ceremonies, whether sh. be significant, or not significant. But he hath in the former part of this writing, been so beaten out of this burrow, that we need not again spend time in digging about it. Let any man looke upon the places quoted, and he shall finde, that (men necessarie, and immediate)esse let a part, significant Ceremonies are externall acts of religious worship: which was all that this argument required. And I dare leave it (though not to the Rejoynder yet) to D. Burgesse: judgement, if merit, necessarie, be things eyther charity, or at all, forbidden in the second Commandement, more then in any other? Certainly, meritorious conceits are generally forbidden: but in no one Commandement specially: and necessarie binding of Conscience by man, belongeth to the first. The Replier looking for an answer
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I swer something like this, of essentiaall and accidentall wor-
ship, for preventing of it, sayd that suche a distinction
would help no more heer, then that of the Papists, be-
twixt δόξα, and λατρεία.

For this the Rejoynder accuseth him of an uncharita-
ble heart, and an unlearned head. But I see no cause: as
hath been fully shewed in the confusion of that distinc-
tion, both in the first part of this writing, and also in
the second Argument, or Chapter, of this part. Yet
because the Rejoynder is so impatient, of hearing his
distinction of essentiaall and accidentall worship, compared
with the Papists vaine distinctions: let any man consi-
der a little the Popish distinctions, which Rives hath
well noted and expressed in his Cases, on the second
Commandement: Worship religious is either of its selfe,
or by accident proper or improper of its selfe, or some other
thing, for its selfe, or in regard of another. Primarie or se-
condarie, proper or Analogical. Absolute or respective,
simple or according to some respect. Direct, or reducive,
perfect or imperfect. And compare with them the Rej.
his distinctions of Ceremonies, and worship, in the first
part examined. I doubt not, but he will say, they come
neerer together, in the very terms, then one would
have expected.

33. The Replier in the next place, argued from the
affirmative part of the second Commandement, unto
the negative, thus: This Commandement injoigneth
obedience to all the worship appointed by God, all
which was significative, Heb. 8.5. and 10.1. therfor it
forbiddeth any significative Ceremonies to be brought
into
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into the worship of God, devised by man: &c. The Rejoynder answereth out of Mr. Cartwright, that the affirmative part injoineth us, to use such as himself doth approve in his word. Now though in that edition of Mr. Cartwright his Treatise printed an. 1611, the affirmative part is thus expressed: Doe that which I command thee, and do no more; Yet that which he quoteth, out of another edition, is enough to call her all humane significant Ceremonies. For what can be more plainly spoken against them, then that only such outward means must be used in God's worship as himself hath allowed. But (sayth the Rejoynder) Mr. Cartwright reckoneth there verend gestures of the body, amongst those outward means. What then? Then bodily gestures in religious actions are either determined by God, or may be lawfully appointed, for signification, by man. A strange consequence: as if, when God allowed for an offering either a pair of Pigeons, or two Turtle doves, without particular determination the Priests might have appointed for signification, there only two Turtle doves should have offered!

His second answer is, that all worship of God and the Jews, was not significant in his sense of significant. What his sense is, I know not: but the sense and words of the Replier in his argument, was of worship appointed, constituted, beyond that which is natural, or necessary without any institution, except the law written in every man's heart, be an institution; which bee seemeth not have conceived.

14. The last consideration by the Replier proceeded was, that significant Ceremonies, which are by
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Institution, must needs belong unto the second Commandment; as he that maketh an accurate distinction of the Commandments, will presently see: but to man the second Commandment is, in regard of making, wholly negative. Ergo. The Rej. answereth first, that significant Ceremonies may belong rather to the third Commandment, as D. Ames referreth them; or accidentally to the fourth. Now as for accidental belonging to this or that Commandment, it is not in question. To the third Commandment they cannot be directly referreth, according to that distinction of the Commandments, which the Rej. himself produceth, in the next words as accurate. As for D. Ames, let any man looke upon his Medulla, lib. 2. cap. 13. ib. 34. 35. 36. and he shall see how the Rej. mistook him.

His second answer consisteth in distinguishing the Commandments of the first Table: Wherein (to let other things passe) he maketh the second to provide, that from Codd we take the prescription of all that, by use of which we may really worship him, and esteeme him to be truly and properly honoured of vs: and the Third to provide, that in all acts of his worship, we carry our lives sincerely and reverently, from this hee concludes, that the right use of Ceremonies, belong rather to the third Commandment, then to the second, as touching their end. Of this I know not well what to make: 1. The argument was of significant Ceremonies, in regard of their institution and making, the Rej. answereth, touching their end. 2. Touching their end, I cannot understand (nor I thinke any man else) how the proper end of the
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Crosse in Baptisme, should be sincerity and reverence; except mixture of humane inventions with Gods ordinances be sincerity; and presumption of doing so, benverence. 3. If the second Commandement doth provide that we take from God the prescription of all real worship; then also of significant Ceremonies, except they be phantastical worship: and yet even sigmenta cerebri, cordisve humani, the very phantasies, or images of the minde, not prescribed by God, are (by the most interpreters) held as well forbidden, as outward real images. If the same Commandement doth binde us to Gods prescription, in all true worship; then humane significant Ceremonies, being not prescribed by God, are false worship. If also in proper true worship; then they are only metaphorical worship, like unto true worship, or at least tropical, which hath beene sufficiently confuted in the first part, and in the second Chapter of this.

The third answer given by the Rej. is, that in the second Commandement, nothing is forbidden, as touching making, but the instituting, or fancying of our owne meere devises, as an immediate meanes of worshipping God thereby. The force lieth in those two termes, meere devises, and immediate meanes of worship. Now for the distinction betwixt immediate and mediate worship, it hath beene sufficiently canvized in the first part. The other evasion, of meere humane devises, is the common refuge of Jesuites, when they are pressed with this argument. So Bellarmine (de effectu Sacram. lib. 2. cap.32.) to Calvin, alleging that all humane will-worship is condemned in Scripture, answereth: That is called humane...
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and will worship which is morely humane, &c. but what the Church teacheth is of another nature. Beside, lay these two terms together, and then this is Pse compussi: mans devi
viles may be an immediate means of worship, if they be not morely mans.

19 In vie of those grounds, laid by the Repl. against humane significant Ceremonies, out of the second Commandement, the Rej. by way of Reconvention saih, th: two grounds to the contrary: the first whereof is taken from supossed true worship, & means necessarily indu-
cing therto, as onely forbidden in the second Commandement: and the second, from our placing the worship of God, in forbearing those Ceremonies, which he hath not commanded us to forbear. Now to both these earthy dead grounds (or Capita mortus) answer hath been given in the first part, partly in the chapter of Superbi
un, and partly in that of Difference betwixt our and Popish Ceremonies. So that nothing need heer be added.

Yet in few wordes, 1. He forregeth himselfe muche, in distinguishing significant Ceremonies (which he con-
fieth to be some kinde of worship) from true worship; except he will confesse them to be false worship. 2. He
considered not what he write, when he speakeoth of means necessarily inducing to true worship. For no Papist
ever conceyed, that their Ceremonies, were eyther ne-
cessarie to true worship, as if no true worship could be
without them: or necessarily inferring true worship, as
if he that used them, howsoever he did it, must needes
performe true worship: and yet one of these senses must
needes be the meaning of that phrase, if it hath any
meaninge
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meaning at all. 3. He taketh the whole question for wonne, or granted, when he speaketh of our forbearance of that, which God hath not commanded us to forbear; and therupon concludes thus: God hath not commanded us to forbear humane significant Ceremonies. Ergo.

S E C T. 7.

Concerning the Oath-gesture of Abrahams Servant.

In this section, the Def. beginneth a confutation of the fore-proved Proposition: All humane Ceremonies, being appropriated to Gods service, if they be ordained to teach any spiritual duty, by their mystical signification, are unlawful. His Scripture confutation (to want of rule or precept) is onely by Examples.

Now to omit wordes of no wyght, his first example is Abrahams directing his servant, to put his hand under his thigh, when he did swear. Gen. 24.2. Against this the Replier first excepted, that in probabilitie, Abraham was not the appoineter of this Ceremonie. The Rea
cswereth, that this is not materiall to the point, what man appointed it, so that it was not of Divine appointment. So that their first proofe of Ceremonie appointed by man from an example appointed they know not by whom, onely begging of us to grant, that it was not appointed by God, whiche they ought to have proved. Yet th
Replier for citing Calvin and Iunius, as leaving it most probable, that is, was an ancient custome before Abraham (which any man looking upon their interpretations, may see to be true) is called by the Rej. a false man in all his allegations. But let that goe.

2. Because the Def. for magnifying of this example, sayd, that ther is not a more Divine service of God, then the taking of an oath; the Replier denied this: affirming the proper, and principal ende of swearing is (not to worship God, but) to confirm a truth. To this the Rejoynder answereth 1. that so the proper ende of Preaching, Sacraments, Petitioning, is edification of men, confirmation of faith, and obtaining of mercies. Where if he had repeated the Repliers other terme, proper and principal ende, his exception had been at an ende: because the principal ende of these meanes, is to honor God. Beside those very endes which he mentioneth, edification, confirmation of faith, and obtaining of mercie, are ill-favoredly distinguished from Gods worship, as no more appertaining to it, then the fideliitie which a Vassall, or Copi-houlder, doeth by oath confirmes ordinarily unto his Lord. The Rejoynder his second answer is, the Replier before placed worship in the nature of the action it selfe. and yet now places it in the end of the action. As if the nature of an action, may not be gathered from the proper or natural ende of it! Nay the Replier before declared, that the ende of an instituted meanes, is part of the nature thereof, and hath a place in the definition of it.

D. Jackson (in his Originall of unbelief, pag. 327. and 328.) by the difference given of the Replier, doeth well answer
answer the Popish Proctors for Images, who allege like, the Ceremonie used in an oath: Particular oaths, given onely for satisfaction of men, are not suche proper acts of God's service, as supplications, thanksgivings, and solemn vows are. The honor of God would be no whit lesse, if the use or necessitie of oaths among men, were none. In supplications, and thanksgivings, it is far otherwise, the more often solemnly we praise God, or pray unto him, the more we honor him; because these are direct and immediate acts of his service, &c.

3. Because the Def. proved nothing to the purpose about this Gesture, he was required to prove it significative of some spirituall dutie: For it was in probability onely a common signe of subjection, as well out of an oath, as in it, without any respect unto Christ. The Rejoynder in stead of a proof, sayth, that some Ancient and Later Writers does so conceit. And if the Def. and he alio do conceit it so, we doe not strive with them, about that: but mens conceits are no great proofs. He added also, that if it were a signe of subjection yet might it be significant of a spirituall dutie. But may be, and might be, is no proof.

He subjoigneth 3. that it was a common signe used in solemnitie of that kinde, as well out of an oath, as in it; this (sayth he) is barely and boldly affirmed, & implies a contradiction, as importing other solemnitie without an oath, of the same kinde with this, wherein was an oath. Now for barenesse, or boldnesse, of a probable conjecture, by way of answer, it should not be objected by him that bringeth meer conceits and might bees, for proving Arguments.
ments. - And as for contradiction, if he had repeated the word subjection, then he might have discerned signs of that kind, as well without, as with an oath. By the noting of this also he may see how the Replier herein agreed with Calvin. For no gesture of subjection to a superior man, is wonte to be proper unto subjection signified in time of swearing.

Norther is the Repliers observation (that as imposition of hands, in those parts, did alway signify some superiority: so this underposition of hands was, by proportion, in to signify inferiority, or subjection) this I say was not a meer fiction, as the Rejoynder would have it. Nor, beside that the meaning was, of the usuall imposition of hands in blessing, where the lesser is blessed of the greater, as Scripture teacheth: the Rejoynder hath brought but two examples, to infringe the generalitie of it Act. 13. 2. Lev. 14. and in both of these it houldeth. For they that laid hands on Paul and Silas, did it not only in the name of the whole society, which in such cases hath some dispensative superiority over particular members; but also by Commission from God, which gave them in that business superiority. And he that brought a beast to be sacrificed, Lev. 1. had certainly power over it. If the Rejoynder could have shewed us, where, and when, a servant imposed his hand upon his Masters head, or a sonne upon his fathers, that had been to the purpose. Wee on the contrary lay with Tostatus on Gen. 47. that the putting under of the hand, was never used, but by an inferior, to his superior.

4. Yet the Rej. hath more to say: namely, that the signe
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Signes of a servants dutie to which bee is bound by oath, is a
mysticall signe of some spirituall dutie: because all the laws
spirituall; and obedience to maisters, for conscience sake, is a
service of God. Whereto I answere, that I never heard
the Hang-mans office, which is servile, called a spirituall
dutie; no though he bee bound to it by oath. 2. The
oath maketh the thing sworn to, no more spirituall,
then a carnall obligation unto it (which may concur
with the obligation of an oath) maketh it carnall.

3. The Law is all spirituall, in the manner; but yet all the
workes required by it are not spirituall, nor so esteemed. The Apostle (1. Cor. 6.) distinguishes the common morall duties
practised by light of nature, from such as are spirituall.

4. Obedience to maisters for conscience sake, is a service
or obedience to God, as it commeth from conscience
toward God: but every signe of subjection, is not a signe
of it as it commeth from conscience toward God.

5. In the last place, the Replier, supposing all true
that hitherto the Def. and Rej. have striven for, yet de
nieheth that any thing could bee concluded from thence
for our Convocation power in appointing such Cere
monies: because such Prophets as Abraham might do
more then our Convocation.

The Rej. heere, would have us shew that this wa
done by Prophetical inspiration: and because this is not
done, he calleth this answer a boulting hole, fit for a de
stressed and wilfull disputee, whose cause cannot bee defended
and yet his stomach will not yeild. But if he had well con
considered
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ferred, that it belongeth not properly to the answere, but to the Opponent, to produce reasons; and how unreasonable it is, for to require a reason proving a thing to be done, of him that judgeth it false, and only for disputation sake granteth his adversarie to suppose and take it as true, hee would never have abused so many words by misplacing of them. All these things considered, I doubt not (as the Replier said) but Abrahams servant, if he were heere present, and need required, would sweare, that his example maketh nothing for our Ceremonies.

S E C T. 10.

Concerning Suarez the Jesuite, his stating of the Controversie, betwixt Protestants, and Papists.

1. In this section an obiection of ours is brought in, without ranke or file, in the midle of Examples, forgotten (as the Rej. saith) in the proper place. But nothing of moment is answered thereto, either by the Def. or Rej. which is not sufficently cleared in the first part of this Writing, Chapter the sixt; except the state which Suarez maketh of the question betwixt us and Papists. This therefore (as being very observabile) remaineth heere to be declared.

2. The place quoted is in 3. tom. 3. Disp. 15. Sect. 2. The words (as the Replier hath them) are these: *The first* Q q q 3
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...error is, that onely those signes which are written, ought to be retained and used in the Church. The second, that no outward worship of God is lawfull, but onely that which is appointed by God. The third, that the Church hath not power of commanding, and ordeyning those things, (be meaneth mysticall Ceremonies) which are necessary for convenient celebration of the sacraments. Of which three points, there is none, wherein Suarez and the Def. doe not jumpe. To this the Rej. first answeareth, that Suarez doth not pro-
pounded these three points as three errors of the Protestants: because hee mentioneth not Protestants, but Heretickes, which reason is not worth the answearing: because hee mentioneth Heretickes of this time, which phrase is of noer in the Jesuites writings, understood of Protestants, then of any other, as all know that have looked upn them. By the same reason, one may argue, that hee understood no speciall Sect, or persons: because hee mentioneth not any by name. But it shall appeare, that his meaning could be of no other then Protestants.

3. He addeth in the second place, the wordes going before those quoted, he spake of Suenkileians. And this is true: but nothing to the purpose. For hee leaving them as desperate phantastrickes, putteth on to others, that is, Protestants, as by and by shall appeare.

4. In the next place (faith the Rej.) Suarez speaketh of such as allow some externall worship of God, but refuse Ecclesiastical Ceremonies in his worship, as the inventions of men; and hold nothing to be lawfull in Gods service, but what is commanded in holy Scriptures, which is the ground of those three errours mentioned by the Replier. This may be called truest.
truth: but it is not all the truth, which belongeth to our present purpose. For Suarez his words are these: Othres reprove Ecclesiasticall Ceremonies as humane inventions without authority or precept in Scripture: For they thinke it unlawfull to worship God with any other worship then is in Scripture enjoyned. In which ground three errors are contained. Here may a great difference be observed betwixt the Rej. his translation, and Suarez his wordes; especially in that for those words: Th. think it unlawfull to worship God with any other worship than is in Scripture prescribed, the Rej. giveth these: they hold nothing to be lawfull in Gods service, but what is commanded in Scripture. For many things are lawfull in Gods service, which are not worship: as civil circumstances, &c.

5. After those three errors, the Rej. observeth Suarez to speake of some that disallow not Ceremonies in general, but impugne the Ceremonies of the Church of Rome, as vaine and superstitious. These no doubt (addeth the Rej) are the Protestants: to whom he imputeth there no other error, but their opposition against Romish Ceremonies, as vaine and superstitious, as the Defender doth. Concerning this,

1. This therefore was not mentioned by the Replier, because Suarez himself testifieth, that it is concluded in the former: Which erroore cannot be founded, but upon one of the three above reject.ed errores. 2. Suarez also addeth that these men of whom he in these wordes speaketh, say nothing against all their Ceremonies, but onely, that they are used with intention of worship, as pertaining to the virtue of Religion: that they are done by us with intention of worship and as pertaining to the virtue of Religion. 

This
This they hold Superstitious: For though in the Sacraments we are to observe a measure and due circumstances, yet will they not only have as a certaine humane politicke, nor out of intention of worship and religion: for this they say is Superstitions.

Out of these two observations, I make these two conclusions: 1. If this error be necessarily grounded on those three mentioned, (as Suarez sayth, and sheweth) then suche Protestants as hold this (among whom the Rejoynder professeth the Defender, and his owne name, holde also those. 2. If Protestants holde this tenet, that it is Superstition, for to intend worship in humane Ceremonies (as Suarez sayth) then our Defender and Rejoynder in this point are by Protestants found guilty of Superstition. For they place speciall immediate, though improper, accidental, and secondarie worship in humane Ceremonies, as is to be seen in this Rejoynder pag. 127, &c.

Here they cannot escape, by alleging (as they use to do) that the Papists place proper essential worship in their Ceremonies. For Suarez in the same place confoundeth the Popish tenet, concerning worship, justly they doe theirs. Sacramental Cerimonies belong to secondarie worship: not onely because they conteine External worship, but also in the very external worship it selfe, they are as it were accidents of other more noble actions.

6. Hitherto we have had noting directly answer concerning the three errors, which the replier lay Suarez imputed to Protestants, about Ceremonies generall. Nor is any other given but this: that suau
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I charge those errors, not on Protestants, but on Anabaptists: who hold this negative argument: whatsoever is not commanded in the Word, is unlawful. This the Anabaptists, and not the Protestants, boulde, fanatically even about rites, and formalities, &c. To which I reply, that if Suarez's words be taken as before they were recited, & not the Rejoynder doeth ill-translate them, then no man's convertant in the Protestant writings, or have read over that which is formerly cited out of them in these general Arguments, but must needs confess, the very same sense is to be found in most of our principal Divines: and the same words in many: It is not lawful to worship God with other external worship save with that which is in Scripture prescribed us. And humane inventions without warrant from God in Scripture, are to be reprehended.

2. If all things be Ceremonies, which are circumstances of order, and decency (as the Defender and Rejoynder do not only affirm, but make their chief Anchor) then (whatsoever Gui de Prés discourseth of one furious companion of them) muche injurie is done to the Anabaptists, in making them to holde, that all Ceremonies are unlawful, which are not contained in the Word.

For it is well known, that they have certain times, and places of meeting for worship; certain order of preaching & praying; nay in Baptizing of men-grown: more formalities then many Protestant Churches; and even Bishops over divers Congregations, for order sake (as they say.) D. B. having lived in Holland, can scarce be ignorant of these things.

3. To put it out of doubt, that Suarez, under the name of He-
A fresh suite against Ceremonies.

of Heretickes, in this place, meant Protestants, let any man look upon his book de Religione, Volume 1. treatise 3. lib. 2. cap. 1. and there he shall finde these wordes, to the same purpose: The Heretiques of these times say every cer-
monicie, and all worship not prescribed of God, or not conten-
in the Gospel is Superstition, yea and Idolatrie. They stand much upon Deut. 12. Now this cannot be understood of the Anabaptists: because they make no suche account of Deutromonie, or the olde Testament, as that they found any doctrine chiefly on that. 2. Suarez himself in the same Chapter, sheweth plainly that he ther meant Protestants. For he sendeth the Reader, for con-

duction of these Heretickes, to Gregorius de Valenti-
tom. 3. disp. 6. q. 11. p. 1. where he disputeth against Herbrandus, a Protestant, not an Anabaptist: & to Le-

fius de injust. & jure, 1. 2. cap. 43. dub. 4. where he disputeth about this question, against Calvin. And (left any me-

should thinke, he meant one kind of Heretickes ther and another in this place questioned, he there referre his reader, for further satisfaction about that question unto this very place, in 3. tom. 3. disp. 15. What can more clear? When as therefore the Rejoynder up suche sandie groundes, conclude, that we are somwhat encamped in the Trenches of Anabaptists; because we do not jumpe with Suarez, in condemning these the Errors; we may better conclude, that he and the D by rash undermining of us have, unawares, broken in the workes of Papis, because they doe condemn us with Suarez, those three Protestant truths. And with (Scing so great a School-Papist as Suarez, in stating
S E C T. 11.

Concerning the Feast of Purim. Estor. 9.

His example was, seven hundred yeer since, objected by Papists, unto the Waldenses, for humane Ceremonies: & since, by all Papists that have written against Protestants about Ceremonies, as Gregorius de Valentina, Bellarmine, Suarez, in the places before noted. And we need not seeke for new answers about it, seing that which our Divines have answered is sufficient. Our first answer is that of Iunius to Bellarmine, de Cultu Sanct. lib. 3. cap. 10. Preceptum sui politicum: whiche words because they were translated, a precept of order, the Rejoynd. catcheth occasion to conclude from thence, that order doth require institution of new things. But therin he misleth, except he can prove
prove some new religious thing instituted, beside a circumstance of time, which the Replier (whom he seeketh to involve in a contradiction) doeth expressly distinguish from things. His answer is, that though this precept were Politically, yet by Iunius himself, annot.11, it was also significant. Wherein he mistaketh Iunius his meaning, which is expounded annot.28. It signifies no days, nor represents mysteries, but is a commemoration that day instituted.

2. It was added by the Replier that some of our owne writers at home, say that it was appointed for civill rejoyning day. Hear the Rejoynder (naming M. Jacob for suche a writer) accuseth him of making it Outside: As if no Civill day of rejoyning could be without Cutting. Yet ther bee men reverend for learning and picrie, which say some suche thing as the Rejoynder detorteth M. Jacobs words to. For Pellican us upon that place of Easter, sayth thus: The Hebrewes soliced themselves with feasts. We read of a festival Solemnity instituted and that for two days, wherein they please themselves with meates and drinks, &c. But the Jews took up that rite voluntarily as being more prone to the Contentments of the body then to the Confidence of the Spirit toward God, whereas those times they seeme to have been little Careful. And too this sentence, it seemeth to make, that the Jews are fay to have made suche feasts, before and without any publick institution: and that nothing is mentioned in the text: Whiche two observations doe not agree to the Feast of Tabernacles, Neh.8. which the Rejoynder would make like unto this. Addde herunto, that, if Ioseph may
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be credited, the heathen King, Artaxerxes, was the instigator of this Fcæt, among the Heathen, and the Jews at Suse, following his order, it came to be propagated by Mordecai, and Hester, unto all other Jews. Josephus, lib. 11, cap. 6.

3. Another answer is, upon supposition of a religious Ceremony instituted by Mordecai, that it was by Divine direction. The Rejounder to this returneth, 1. that no man ever so defined before. But he might (when he was a Student in Cambridge) have heard D. Whitakers thus defining. For in his printed Lectures, de Sacramentis, pag. 206. it standeth so: I answer that both Mordecai did this, God inspiring him, and peradventure by order from some Prophet. And however we do not read that either God, or any Prophet did require this, yet for as much as it stands approved in Scripture, there is no doubt but it was done by Divine authority. As for the several Holy-days instituted 2. Chr. 30, cast in here by the way of the Rejounder as a President for the Feast of Purim; they agree not. For they were not yearly Holy-days; nor Holy-days at all, of institution properly so called: but an occasional continuation of free-will offerings, (which might be offered any day in the year, without new Holy-days) for that one time. If it had been by men appointed, that every year, 14 days should be observed for the Passover Feast, it had suited to the purpose. But that had been no less presumption, then if they should have decreed, that every year after, the Passover should be celebrated in the second moneth, as it was then, by occasion.

Rrr 3 S E C T.
Sect. 12.

Concerning the Feast of Dedication. John. 10. 22, 23.

1. A Feast of Dedication is brought-in as an instance of a humane Ceremonie appropriated unto Gods service, out of John 10. Now whether this Feast of Dedication this was, & whether it were meerly of humane institution; this hath allways been, and still in great question. Nonnus taketh it for that which Salomon appointed: Chrysostome, Theophilus, Euthymius Cajetan, Calvin, &c. interpret it of that which began in the time of Ezra: Others of that instituted by the Macchabees 1. Mac. 4. This last the Defender took for granted, and therupon buildeth his Argument: and yet neyther the former, nor this can easly be so evidently proved meerly humane, as it may be made a foundation for humane Ceremonies now. Junius de cult. Sancl. lib. 3. cap. 5. thus answereth Bellarmine, affirming that God did not appoint this Ceremonie: It is fallacy. Solomon, Ezra, the Machabees, followed the Analoge of the place Ex. 4. Lev. 8. the right of which law, if it had not been yet we must needs say that as Prophets they were led by extraordinary & singular revelation, not to be Exemplarische thereunto.

2. The Replier first observed, that this example much alleged by Papists, against Protestants for their Ceremo
Ceremonies: and so indeed it hath beeene alwayes, from the time of Waldenses, as was noted, in the 2. Chapter of our first part. Bellarmine hath it twice: once, de Rom. Pont. l. 4. c. 17. and againe, de Cultu Sanct. l. 3. c. 1. To this the Rej. answereth, that this example serveth not Bellarmines turre, for imposition of Ceremonies upon the conscience as of necessity to be observed, as Gods lawes; but it serveth the Defender his turre: because as luminis, and it was not injoynd by way of authority, but taken up by consent. He would make us (as it seemeth) beleive, that our Ceremonies are not injoynd by way of authority: and if he can doe this, he may also perswade us, that we are for refusing them, excluded, suspended, deprived, excluded, imprisoned, without any way (lawfull or unlawful) of authority. Concerning necessity in conscience, see the first part, chap. 6.

Another answere of the Rejoynders is notorious: Bellarmine (saith he) allegeth this feast of Dedication, to prove the Dedication, or Consecration of Churches: which is nothing to our question of significant Rites. Now surely if Dedication and Consecration of Churches bee nothing to our question of significant Rites; the Def. and Rej. say nothing to the purpose, when they prove this question of signifying Rites, by the Maccabees Feast of Dedication. And if that Feast of Dedication, doeth not prove humane Dedication lawfull, much lesse doeth it prove the lawfulness of other significant Ceremonies, such as ours are.

3. The Defendant for backing of this instance, added, that our Saviour seemeth to approve that humane Feast
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Feast, by his presence, Joh. 10. To which it was replied, that he seemeth only: because we only read, that he walked in Solomon's Porch, at that Feast: which he might doe, without observing or approoving of it. This is amiss, his answer to Bellarmine, alleging that Christ by his presence honoured that Feast: Christ did not properly honour the Feast, but the Congregation of the faithful at the Feast: For Christ took the such occasions then, to wit, before those solemnities were abolished, of sowing the seed of his Gospel: Nor did Christ ought that we were read at those times, to preach in the Temple. And sure I am, that neither walking in the Porch, nor declaring that he was that Christ, belonged properly unto the solemnity of that Feast. If he had preached of Dedications and Consecrations, withholding, that had beene something.

The Rej. objecteth 1. That we plead Christ's approbation of marriage, by his presence. This indeed added unto evident grounds, addeth some honour unto that state especially, in thatal a miracle was wrought to the furtherance of a marriage feast: if wee had no other plea for lawfulness of marriage, but that mere presence; I, for my part, would as soone separate from my wife, as the rejoyned faith he would from the Church of England if he were of our minde, about Ceremonies, that is to say, before to morrow. His 2. objection is, that Christ whipped the buyers and sellers out of the Temple, Joh. 2, Ergo. Which maketh directly to the clearing of this cause: For there were two whippings of these Merchants out of the Temple; the first whereof was this Joh. 2. in the beginning of his preaching; the other toward the end of it.
little before his passion; so that it appeareth plainly, they were not so driven out, but they came in againe, and continued their merchandize there: and yet in the meane space, our Saviour was often present in the Temple, without allowance of that their practise. So had he often condemned the traditions of men, in Gods worship; and yet was present some time, where they were observed. Beside, because the Def. and Re. are wonte to accuse the Jews for placing holiness, necessity, efficacy, and proper essentiall worship in humane traditions, whereby they would avoid the dint of that generall censure which our Saviour giveth of them, Mar. 15. Mar. 7. &c. I would faine learne of them, how it appeareth, or may be conjectured, that they placed not as much holiness, necessity, efficacy, &c. in this and such like humane Feasts, as in washing of hands before meat. If they did (as any man will thinke) then how can they say, that our Saviour condemned the one, and allowed the other?

The following 13. and 14. Sections are spent about some objections taken out of Mr. Cartwritte. But because the slitenesse of this Instance is already sufficiently discovered, I will not cloy, nor deteyne the Reader about them, at this time; but passe on to the next Instance.

Sect.

Sect.
SECT. 15. and 16.

Concerning the Altar of Iordan. Josh. 22.

1. It is the Def. and Rej. their fashion, to produce instances, without proof of their fitness, and so espect from us that they should be disproved: which is all one, as if John a Stiles should in a great traverse, bringe forth against John a Nokes, some instrument for evidence of his cause, which few, or none, beside himself, can read, (at least so as to discerne any thing in it making for him) and plead that in them was evidence enough, except John a Nokes could prove the contrarie. So it is here, about the Altar of Iordan: no demonstration is first made, how it agreeith to the purpose: but we are chaleded to shew how it disagreeith. Yet yeelding them this libertie, we have enough to oppose.

2. And first of all, we answere, that this Altar of the two Tribes, was not in the state, or use, religious, as the Crossceis, by the confession of an English Bishop, Bavington on the 2. Commanndement.

The rejoynder 1. opposeth out of Mr. Parker, par. sect. 34. and 36. that religious in use is that which hath a religious ende: and religious in state, which is Ecclesiasticall, belonging to Gods service. Ergo. But Mr. Parker in those sect. tould him, that religious in a sense common, or mix'ty, all things are, that are done to an holy ende: and religious
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ligions in sense special, or in state, all those things are, that have Order, Obligation, and a kind of Immobility, in God's service. Now the question is not of the former common mixt sense: but of the later special state: according to which, no man can say the Altar of Jordan to have been religious, upon ground of Scripture or reason. Let any man judge then, whether partialitie did put out Mr. Parker's eyes (as the Rej. speaketh) or bleak theirs, that see not the vanitie of this allegation.

3. B. Babington's words on the 2. Commandement are theie: They ered that Altar, not for religion, but in died for a civil use, as you may see, Josh. 22. The Rejoynd. answereth, that he calleth the Altar civil Analogically, because it was ordeyned by consent of fellow-Citizens, which is as meer a shift, as any yet invented by the Rejoynder. For 1. he calleth not the Altar, but the use, civil. 2. He opposeth this civilitie not unto Divine Institution, as the Rejoynder would have him, but unto the same fellow-Citizens erecting of an Altar for Religion. 3. What he meaneth, appeareth plainly, by his third Proposition, there set downe in these terms: It is lawfull to make pictures of things which we have seen, to a civil use, but not to use them in the Church, and for Religion.

4. To passe over circumstantial passages, the Def. (proving this Altar to be appointed unto God's service, because it was a patterne of the Lords Altar, as our Crosse is a resemblance of Christ's Crosse) was 1. reproved by the Replier: because the Crosse, wherof Christ did suffer, was no more holy then Judas: and so not to be compared unto the Lords Altar. To this the Rejoynder in
many wordes, maketh thew of sayling something, but I leave it to the Reader, if he sayth any thinge. I (for my part) cannot discern what it is.

5. The Replier also in the second place alleged, that every resemblance of a holy thing, is not therfor holy: because then every ale-house picture taken from holy thinges mentioned in Scripture, should be holy; and a modell of the Temple, carried by a Tyrian workman, into his countrie for newes, should have been holy.

To this the Rejoynder (after a few wordes of course, answereth, that this is to separate the resemblance of a thing, from the use of it. As if the Def. had not argued limply, & meerly, from the resemblance, making, as yet, no mention of the use! If ther be any Sophistrie in this argument (as the Rejoynder sayth ther is) it is first found in the Defender his uncouth reason.

6. The Defender went about to prove, first, that this Altar did mystically signify a Spirituall dutie, in respect of the Gileadites then living; viz: to teache that the Lord was God.

To this it was replied, that it doeth not appear out of the text, that ther was intended any use for the present age, that then lived: nay the contrarie may be gathered out of the 24. and 25. verses: We have done it for fear of this thing, saying: In time to come, your children might speak unto our children, & c. So shall your children make our children cease from fearing the Lord. The Rejoynder opposeth, that ther is afterward mention made of us, and you. But that is nothing: because it noteth onely, that the generations to come, may denie us, on this side Jordan, not

...
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to have been joint Tribes with you on the other side of that River. Upon this, the Repl. concluded, that this Altar was no direct helpe unto devotion. To which is rejoyned, that it was not a direct (that is immediat) help unto devotion; but immediatly significative, & collaterally for devotion it was. Suche distinctions I never heard, nor read. Any man may see, that a Ceremonie directly and immediatly signifying a spirituall dutie, is a direct & immediat help to devotion. To what other help, this help was collaterall, I would fain know.

A further reason of this conclusion was added: viz: then most of the other Tribes should have had use of it, and also reason, to have set up Altars of devotion at every three-way-leer, as Crosses stand. The Rejoynder is, that the other Tribes (no doubt) had use of it, as of a witnesse that the Lord is God. Now let any man consider, whether they which ordinarily resorted to the Tabernacle, and Altar of God, had need of a humane Altar, farre removed from their sight, to put them in minde, that the L O R D was God? And whether the two Tribes and a halfe, without the consent, or knowledge of the chiefe Priests, the chiefe Magistrates, the farre greater part of people, and power to appoint vnto all Israel a tolerable significant Ceremonie, for their common use? The Rej. addeth in the 2. place, that all are not bound to the same helps to devotion, and the other tribes needed no such monument, or patterne, having the Altar it selfe in possession. Where 1. except he holdeth the two Tribes, and a halfe bound to set up this Altar, hee maketh in that no difference: if hee so holdeth, then it is no instance of a

 mecere
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meere Arbitrarie Ceremonie. 2. The two tribes had the Lords Altar in present possession, as well as diverse of the other: so that by this reason, they also for the present need no such monument and pattern: which is the very point in this place questioned.

7. The Replier affirmed, that (in regard of posterior the immediate ende of this Altar was, to testify, the those Tribes beyond Iordan, belonged to the same people, and so had right to the same worship, with those this side Iordan: which is nothing to a Ceremony state and immediate use, in the speciall solemn worship of God. The Rejoynder asketh if this were not a holy religious ende? I answer, It was so holy and religious, every Land-marke of a Parson's Glebe-land, or every Signe of a Parish-bound is holy and religious: but not for mysticall Ceremonies. B. Andrewes (against Peta p. 18.) giveth some light to this, by the ancient use of Lights, and incense: There were lights (saith he) there incense, used by the Primitive Church, in their service; for any mysticall meaning, but (as it is thought) for this cause that where the Christians in time of persecution, had their meetings most commonly in places darke, and so needing light, and dampish, and so needing good savours, they provided light against one, and incense against the other. After the Church reformed these things, to shew themselves the successors of those ancient Christians, &c. the After-ages desired meanings and significations of their owne, which from the beginning were not so. If this be so (as it is thought) then there may be signes of succession unto religious fore-fathers without any mysticall meaning: which is all that by the
pleaded about this Altar of Jordan.

And for further manifesting, that it was so in this Altar, let it be well considered: what Josephus, one of the learnedest, and most ancient Jews now extant, doth in the Antiq. lib. 5. cap. 4. They placed an Altar on the bank of the river as a memorable signe of the nearesse and affinity of them that dwell beyond Jordan, viz. with them within Canaan: Again, it was not placed for worship, but symbolically and as a memorandum of their relation to you. (σατανά

8. The rejoinder as having sufficiently confuted all other answers, bringeth in one made to himselfe in a conference, (though he hath not found it in print) as a grand absurdity: namely, that the Cileadites did ill, in erecting this Altar; and the rest also in allowing of it. Now as for allowance by the High Priest, Princes, and all the Congregation of Israel, which he speaketh of, I finde it not evident in the Text. About the other, I finde this: that D. Fulke, no absurd Divine, (against Sanders, of Images, pag. 649.) writeth thus in print: The two Tribes made not an Image, but an Altar for a memoriall: and yet their fact was not commendable, though it was, in some sort excusable. 2. I finde also that Calvin, before him, upon Josh. 22. saith thus: Duo tribus, non dimidia, non loquitur peccarunt, &c. The two tribes and a half did very ill: Which is the great absurdity that the rejoinder had heard in conference, but not seen in print, before now.

SECT.
SECT. 17.18.19.20.21.

Concerning the Brazen Altar, built by Salomon.
1. King 8.64.

1. The Defender bringeth for instance, a Brazen Altar, built by Salomon. It was replied, in the Text, 'ther is no mention eyther of ear, or Braze, or Building, but onely of Sanctifying, inner part of the Court. The Rejoyner answertyth, the word Brazen flipt in by oversight; the Court may well be called an Altar, in respect of present use. The Rejo. before, upon sarr leffe occasion, talked of slipping in trickes, &c. but I leave this slipping, in and out, unto Readers censure, so that no advantage be made of it, prosecution of this Instance.

2. Yet because not onely the Defender named Altar, but the Rejoynder also mainteyneth it for good, let us see, what may be answered unto the Replier collection thersfrom; namely, that if man may on owne head appoint an Altar (as they say) then man may appoint not onely accidentall worship, but also suche is greater then some esentiall worship; because the Altar which sanctifieth the Offering is greater, then the Offer. Mat.23.19? The Rejoynder heer accuseth the Replier for want of Judgement, in this allegation: becauseth which our Saviour sayth, is proper to that onely Alt
in the Temple, by reason of the speci
all command of God to
se them, and their superadded mysticall signification: whereas
other Altars were onely permitted, and so helps to the offer-
rings, but not sanctifiers of them; may they were sanctified by
the offeringes; as alsso the Altars of Gods appointment, in the
time of Moses, Salomon, Ezra, and Machabees, were first
sanctified by the gift that was offered on them, and so installed
in their peculiar privilege, of sanctifying the Gifts which were
afterwards offered upon them. For all this, no consent is
shewed of any Divine: Only we are bidden to see
Zanchie hath nothing to the Rejoynder his purpose: he
doeth not distinguish betwixt Altars commanded and Alt-
ers permitted: but sayth of the commanded Altars, that
they were annexed unto the acts of worship. And so he
doeth of the Arke it selfe, and all the principall & most
essentiall meanes appointed by God. What can the
Rejoynder make of this? 2. The speciall command of
God was as well for the Offeringes, as for the Altar: so
that cannot be the reason, why the Altar did sanctifie
the Offering, more then the Offering the Altar.

And the same xqualitie is in the superadded mysticall,
and typical signification. 3. I am sory to hear from D.B. 
that the Altars built by Abraham, Iacob, &c. before
Moses, were onely permitted. He may as well say, that all
the Sacrifices before Moses, were onely permitted. Bel-
larmine himself, de Eff. Sacr. lib.2, cap.31. confesseth,
that they were by inspiration, and impulsion Divine: and
all our Divines, disputing against Papists about will-
worship, make that Divine: instinet, for substance, a Di-
vine
vne command. 4. How could Altars be sanctified by Offerings, when the Offerings themselves were not in state of sanctification actually, and properly, before they came to the Altars? He that left his gift at the Altar, that is ready to lay it thron, and then went to be reconciled with his brother, had not yet actually sanctified them. 3. The Altars of Moses, and Solomon, were not first sanctified by Offerings upon them, but by Moses his Anointing: the manifestation of God's glorious presence in a Cloud, filling the Tabernacle, and Temple: and by that fire which came down from heaven to consume the Sacrifice. Ex. 40. Lev. 8. & 9. 1. Kings 2. Chr. 7. 6. If Solomon's sanctified Court, did not sanctifie the Sacrifices offered there, then by those Sacrifices were lesser holy, then those which were offered on the Altar, and sanctified thereby: or else the had more sanctifying virtue in them, then the other which did not sanctifie their Altar, as those did the Court. The like may be sayd, and more also, of Abrahams Altars, &c. but this is enough.

3. Our first answer is the same that D. Whitaker, D. Sutlive, &c. giveth to Bellarmine (who's de Pontillo 4. cap. 19. hath the same objection against Calvin), quod salomon fecit id Dei authoritate & Spiritus sanctitatis sanctificavit (sayth D. Whitakers) that is, Solomon did this Divine authority, and in strict of the H. Ghost. The Re excepteth 1. that Bellarmine would prove by this example, proper, essentiall worship, by man ordained. But he had looked upon the chapter quoted, he might have seen, that the onely question there, is, whether it was
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ine,  for  men,  by  their  owne  authoritie,  to  erect  a  new  Altar  in  the  Temple?  And  this  the  Def.  and  Rej.  with  Bellarmine  denie,  against  Calvin.  2.  He  addeth,  that  all  our  Divines  doe  not  give  this  answer  alone.  As  if  we  also  did  not  follow  them,  in  adding  other  answers  to  this!

4.  Our  second  answer,  (for  I  will  not  dwell  on  wordes)  is,  that  Salomon  did  this  from  equeitie  of  the  Law.  This  is  tunius  his  answer  to  Bellarmine,  Cont.  3.  lib.  4.  cap.  9.  It  was  done  extraordinarly  and  by  singular  occasion  and  according  to  the  Analogie  of  the  commune  ground,  whereby  they  did  other  things,  and  it  may  be  by  speciall  revelation.  To  this  the  Def.  answered,  that  this  interpretation  overthoweth  the  former.  Nothing  lefse  (sayth  the  Replier,  because  Salomon  might  be  directed,  to  see,  and  authorized  to  follow  that  equeitie.  The  Rej.  heer,  having  little  reason  to  oppose,  putth  th  down,  in  stead  of  it,  great  wordes:  as  this  is  to  confound  ordinarie,  and  Extraordinarie;  speciall,  and  Common;  Scripture-light,  and  immediate  Revelation;  and  so  hath  no  sense  in  it.  And  what  shew  of  wooll  for  this  great  crie?  May  not  one  be  extraordinarie,  specially,  and  immediately  directed,  to  see  that  Scripture-light  which  in  it  self  hath  ordinarie,  &  common  shining?  Surely,  the  Apostles  had  extraordinarie,  speciall,  immediat  direction,  to  see  the  meaning  of  divers  passages  in  the  Ould  Testament,  (as  the  allegorical  meaning  of  Sara  and  Hagar,  Sinai  and  Sion,  &c.)  which  was  before  conteyned  in  the  Scripture.

Yet  (addeth  the  Rejoynder)  Salomon  (by  this  reason)  needed  no  speciall  Authoritie.  Whiche  I  grant,  if  he  be  considered  as  a  perfect  man;  but  if  he  be  conceived  as  T t t  2  Pater,
Peter, who after this was sent unto all Nations, need
after a Vision from Heaven, to send him unto the Ge-
tiles, then this consequence is nothing worth.

4. Passing over the third answer (in pite) the fou-
is, that this sanctification of the Court by Solomo-
was no addition of a divers kinde. This is Danaus his
swer to Bellarmine, Cont. lib. 1. cap. 19. To this
Defender answered nothing, which either the Rep-
thought worthy any answer, or Rejoynder of im-
vving. So that I need not add any thing to it, but on
a sitting explication which I finde in Tostatus (in 3.
cap. 8.) thus expressed: It was lawfull to doe what Solo-
did, because though it were forbid to offer sacrifice else-
then at the Altar of whole burnt-offerings, yet now upo-
osity it might be, when the Altar was not sufficient to
all. Nor did Solomon against the Law, because now sac-
were burnt at the Altar, and on the Altar together, an-
the whole Court of the Priests was in a manner but as one
ar, and the intent of the Law was no other, then that
should not offer in divers places, but here was but one ca-
ned place.

---

S & C T. 22.

Concerning Synagogues.

To this simple instance, the Replier answe-
1. that Synagogues were no significant Co-
monies. 2. That it is most likely, they w
first founded by those Prophets, which brought in School of the Prophets. 3. That in them, there was (of old) no significant humane Ceremonial used. To the first is rejoined, that the Synagogues bare some representation of the Sanctuary. But I ask, How? Was this representation in matter, or form, or use? He seemeth to referre it unto use, in referring to solemn worship. Now let any man consider, whether every place appointed for solemn worship, be a significant Ceremonial? If so, then no Anabaptists ever denied significant Ceremonies of man's appointing, which yet the Rejoynder accused them for. But this sordid conceit is sufficiently confuted in the first part of this writing, Chap. 4. and 5. Yet suppose the Synagogues had been a representation of the Sanctuary, which was a Ceremonial; is every representation of a Ceremonial, a new Ceremonial? then any man may make more Ceremonies, then there are men in his Parish. The second (about the founding of Synagogues by Prophets) which the Repl. sayd, is most likely, the Rejoynder maketh a bold affirmation, without proof. But what boldness is, in conjecturing that to be likely, which no man can give any likely reason against? The third (of no humane significant Ceremonies used in Synagogues) is absolutely pronounced false. But no reason of this sentence is given out of the Scriptures, but only that they used their reverend gestures: as if all reverend gestures were significant Ceremonies of man's invention! The rest that he quoteth out of Purchas his Pilgrimage, are wandring Pilgrimes, without house or home, and therefore worthy no other answer.
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but that which our law hath provided for Vagabondes


Concerning Love-Feasts.

1. The Instances out of the ould Testament were fuche, as we have now shewed them to be.
Out of the new Testament first are brought in the Feasts of love, or charitie. Now concerning these Feasts, no man can certainly informe us, whoe did appoint them! Intervag (sayth the Apostle, according to Erasmus his Paraphrase, on 1. Cor. 11.) Quis ritus illos vos invexerit: whoe brought-in these Love-Feasts? No man can tell us, what religious signification was by institution annexed unto them? Nay it cannot be shewed where they are spoken of, without reproof? Yet the Defend. and Rejoynd. will needs have them signification humane Ceremonies, ordelynd, and used by the Apostles.

2. To this, it was answered by Mr. Nic. that they were of Apostolicall, then they were of Divine institution. Then whiche (sayth the Defender) could not have uttered a more unlearned position. Nay for (it was replied) this censuire is too too Magisteriall: because to say that that which came from the Apostles, as Apostles, came from the Spirit of God, is no unlearned Position. O yes (answereth the Rejoynder) because th
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The Apostles ordained some things, not as Apostles, not by immediate revelation, but by the direction and authority of God's Word. In which kind of rejoyning, I see no more learning than needs must. 1. The question was of Apostolical institutions: the answer is of that which the Apostles did, but not as Apostles, that is not properly Apostolical. 2. That which is manifested by the Holy Ghost shining in the Word (they are the Rejoynder his wordes) is designed to be Divine. 3. No example is, or can be brought, of a new significant Ceremonie instituted by the Apostles, without immediate revelation. The allegations opposed, may fill up paper, but not satisfy any reasonable Reader.

3. For removing of that Magisteriall censure of the great unlearnedness of the fore-said Position, it was noted that some learned men, were authors of it, or partners in it. Junius is one: who (Cont. 1. lib. 4. cap. 2. an. 6) saith, that this distinction between Divine and Apostolical traditions, is almost imaginary and superfluous. Where the Rejoynder hath nothing to catch at, but only that particle almost. Take therefore another place of the same Junius (in his Hidelberg Theses de Traditionibus, th. 24) where without almost, he saith fully thus: The distinction of traditions into Divine and Apostolical is a false distinction, because such traditions are of one sort, for there be no Apostolical traditions but such as are delivered from God.

4. It was added also by the Replier that Dinaus (upon the same place) calleth it a childish distribution. True (saith the Rejoynder,) but he meant (saith the Rejoynder,) things determined by the Apostles, by their ordinary facultie, as牧师
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Pastors, and yet having the same authoritie with their writings: Now let the Reader mark, that the Defender's charge of unlearned rudeness, depended on this, if Apostolical traditions may be called Divine, as being command of God. To take hereof faculty, ordinary, pastors, authority equal to Scripture, &c. it is nothing else, but bring him unto losse. Neither is, or can this limitation be justified by any other proffes than the Rej. his own testimonie.

5. When the Repl. spake of more learned men allowing of the foresaid position, and rejecting the distinction made betwixt Divine and Apostolical traditions; the Rejoynder stayeth him, and confesseth that this distinction is ridiculous, in the Papists sense: yet (in another sense not telling what) it may stand. And is the great charge of a most unlearned position come to this: the contrarie words in some sense may stand? Sparing (my masters) in crying down your poore neighbours, for such extreme want of learning, when you opposite learning can scarce stand in any sense.

6. After these testimonies, the Replier inquired to the Logicke of this distinction betwixt Divine and Apostolical traditions. But the Rejoynder corrects his interpretation, and faith this distinction is taken chiefly from the different Authors, Christ, and the Apostles. Be it so: yet it were not extreme rudeness, to say that whatsoever the Apostles as the Apostles of Christ appointed, that Christ himself appointed. But if the Rejoynder, some things were appointed by Christ himselfe immediately, and others by the Apostles occa
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Which is true: yet 1. this overthroweth that which was even now alleged, that this distinction is chiefly taken from different authors: because this is only a difference of manner, as Polanus (Syntag. lib. 1. cap. 47.) doeth clearly manifest, in his large controversy of this selfe same distinction. 2. By the same or somewhat like reason, a distinction may be made, betwixt the word of God, and the word of the Prophets, 3. It were worth the knowing, upon what occasion these feasts were ordained by the Apostles?

7. It is brought in by the Def. as a second answere of Mr. Nic. That these Love feasts, were abrogated by the Apostles. From which he gathereth, that they were not of divine institution. No say we, nor yet Apostolical. For it was onely said before, that if they were of one, they were also of the other: but not positively that they were of either. So that the Defender forgot, when he inferred: So this second answer confuseth the first.

8. The third answer of the same Mr. Nic. was (as it is reported) that these Love feasts were not of mysticall signification, nor yet meerely ecclesiasticall. And this the Replier undertooke to mainteyne: because no signification was added unto their nature by any institution, so farre as by any certaine evidence can be declared.

The rejoynder opposeth, that the appropriating of their natural signification, to the signifying of Christ in love, might be in that use, by Ordination. Where, First might be, is not a prooe: and we require in an instance objected for an Argument, that it should be prooved sitting. Secondly, Every Ordination doeth not inferre mysticall signification.
A. feast suit against Ceremonies.

If it be ordained (as it is) that Collection of Almes, for the poore, bee used in the Church, hath it therefore a new mysticall signification put upon it, above that which it would have out of the Church?

9. Ecclesiastical the Replier denied these Feasts to have bee, or Religious, because they were used in the same manner, or to the same ende, out of the assemblies, that is, to the reliefe of the poore, and mainte-
nance of brotherly love. The Rejoynder, First, opposeth appropriation: as if all things used in the Church, were appropriated to it! So common salutations used at Church should be appropriations. He secondly con-
cludeth from thence, that (by this reason) Eating of things offered to Idols, in the Idols Temple, should not be reli-
gious. But this doeth not agree, except the meat used in Love-feasts, were first sacrificed to God: which yet hath not bee, prooved: nor then, except the eating of things offered to Idols, were meerely religious; which the Christians of Corinth (ep. 1. cap. 8.) did not thinke, nor the Apostle teach. Yet might those Eatings have such a relation vnto the Idols, as might make them superstitious (even without that superstitious opinion which the De-
fender and Rejo. require unto superstition) though such a relation unto the true God, and his religion, doe not make feasts by man invented, truely and meerely re-
ligious.

10. It was finally replied, that the Ordination of these feasts cannot be shewed, to have bee, Apostoli-
call; and to that purpose P. Martyr was alleged, in 1, Cor.
11. 22. The Rejoynder opposeth 1. that the Argument is
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so much the stronger: because then they were meerely of humane institution, and yet had Apostollicall approbation. Secondly, that P. Martyr confesseth the same feasts to be mentioned everywhere in the fathers, as a thing descended to them, from the Apostles, as their spring-head.

To the first, I answer, First, that the Def. his Argument which was taken from the ordination of the Apostles, cannot possibly be strong at all, if these feasts were not of Apostollicall ordination. Secondly, Apostollical approbation of them hath not yet beene prooved. As for P. Martyr, his testimonie is cleare. Wee see here how dangerous it is to adde to divine institutions, which the Corinthians did, setting up these feasts without warrant from the word. To P. Mattyr, adde Calvin, upon the same place: We may see hence, that their manner of feasting wholly displeased the Apostles, altho' the forementioned abuse were away. It is not well to turne a holy meeting into strange customes. As for the after-continuation of like feasts, which the Rejoynder maketh so much of; Hospinian (Hist, Sacram. lib. i, cap. 6.) answereith fully: This was first to be found fault with in their love feasts, that they did not in simplicitie keepe the institution of Christ, but added somewhat thereto. The Apostle recalled them to the first institution. But it seemes his authority was not such with them that came after, but that as the Corinthians had done, so also they would appoint many things in great zeal, I confesse: but very unadvisedly, which also in some brought in most pestilent superstitions.
S E C T. 27.

Concerning the kisse of Charity.

1. This instance is like the former, in that neither the institution, nor the mysticall signification of it can bee shewed out of Scripture. Our answer also is the same with that before: It is a natural signe of peace and reconciliation; used in those parts, as imbracing, and shaking of hands, with vs. For this Mr. Nic. is accused, as more civill, or rather uncivill, than spiritual. But with whom the civility or uncivility about this matter resteth, neither the Def. nor Rej. are fit Judges. It may prove this charge hath as little ground, as the other of an extreme unlearned Position.

2. The Replier pass'd over allegations mentioned by the Def.: as Oratoriall Phrases: but the Rejoynder will have them Explicatorie; & setteth them downe againe at large. I will therefore take the sayd Allegations into a summarie consideration. He citeth Iustin, Origen, Tertullian, Cyrill, Clemens Al. not noting the places where their wordes are to be found. But Baronius had An. 45 (out of whome he seemeth to have borrowed these quotations) affordeth us some light that way. Where this is by the way to be marked, that Cardinal Baronius himselfe concludest no more out of them then this, The kisses of the Gentiles being tokens of peace and love are no
be quite taken away but with a kindnesse of moderation to be used among Christians; as the Apostles provided when they so often put them in mind of Saluting one another with a holy kiss. Out of the two first, nothing is alleged, but that when Prayers were ended, Christians were wont to salute one another with a kiss. which proveth nothing more then we grant.

Tertullian calleth it Signaculum Orationis, the Seal of Prayer; the words of prayer therein used being Peace be unto thee. Now though Tertullian maketh no words of this forme of Prayer to be used; yet suppose all: 1. this is manifestly an Orautorial phraze (which the Rejoynder denied) not Explicatorie, but needing explication; which yet I will not spend time about. 2. Tertullian according to his hyperbolical fashion, ascribeth so muche to this kiss, as smelleth of Superstition: What prayer is there perfect which is separated from a holy kiss? He sheweth notwithstanding that it was used in privat houses as well as in the Congregation: At home perhaps you may put of sille another time the Salutation of peace. 4. He discovereth a custome of something contradictory to his former alteration: At Easter we do well to lay aside the kiss. 5. There were even in Tertullians time, divers superstitions creeping in among Christians, about prayer, as he that his treatise of Prayer sheweth: Washing, doffing of cloakes, sitting upon beds. What then can be made of this testimonie?

Cyriil is the next whose calleth it Signaculum reconciliacionis, quo in sacris utimur; the Seal of reconciliation used in Divine Service. But 1. we may well question the Author.
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342.  Whether Cyrill was he (as Andrues sayth, in his answer to the 18. chap. of Pense pag. 3.) Whosoever was the Author, he was so prodigall of dealing significations, according to his pleasure, that we may say of him, as Ierom of Origen, his braine were the Churches Sacraments: so that he hath no credit left about suche things. 3. How doe Tertullian and Cyrill agree in their testimonie? One sayth, the Kysse was a Seal of Prayer; the other, that it was a Seal of Reconciliation. 4. The same Cyrill, in the same place, Cat. 9, giveth another mysterie of Kissing: Because Christs body goes thorough our mouth. Just so therefore we kisse the mouth as we do the dores we enter into the Church by. How doth he agree then with him-self?

Clemens is the last: whoe calleth this gesture Mystical (Padag. lib. 3.) But this was a Rhetorica phræze. For it signifieth nothing else (as the fore-going word shew) but that they should not use it, qui non habent inter amicitiam; but as a true signe of good will. In the work also next following that common salutations (dilectum in via salutationes) should be with mysticall grace Mystice, intus, amanter & beneignè alloqui. Now let the Def. and Rejoynd. cast up their accounts, and tell, what they have gained by these Testimonies more then before was given them?

3. But yet (sayth the Defend.) this gesture is calle Holy, and the object of it is Peace: Tis true: But all our civill actions ought to be suche as becommeth Saints, i.e. so farre Holy for manner, that they be free from sinne and to the Glorie of God: many also have Peace for the dire
Furthermore, if this Kisse was holy in the nature of it, I ask whether a representation of it may not be made also for a holy use, as the Altar of Jordan, and the Synagogues were in the Def. and Rejoynders opinion? And if so, why have we not a Pax to Kisse at the Communion? I see not (by these tenets) what should keep out Paxes, more then Altars, with bowing to them, but onely the meer pleasure of our Prelats Regents.

Now we have thus dispached the Defender we need not trouble our selves with his Second, the Rejoynder proceeding another way, against the Replier. Yet I will note what new weapons he useth.

4. The Rejoynder thinketh it strange, that constant application by direction, or custody, should not be Institution. But it is no more strange, then that the common using of one way from Lichfield, to Coventrie, or from thence to Coldseild, may be without Institution; or that the same word which of ould signified Love, is now among Christians commonly applied unto Christian Love; without any new institution.

5. He saith, that natural fitness for signification, doth hinder Institution. True: but fitness, with actual use for signifying of true love, doth prevent an institution of the same signification: as the former signification of the word Love, doth so hinder a new institution of the same word to signifie Christian love, that it would make the Authors of suche an institution, ridiculous, & idle.

6. He affirmeth, that the ordeyned searing of a Minister in an higher place, in way of Reverence to his Function, is as My.
as Mystical a Ceremonie, as the Cross in Baptisme. Then
(say I) a Mothers kissing of her froward childe, in the
Churche to still it, in reverence to Preaching or Pray-
ing; is as Mystical a Ceremonie, as the Kisse of Peace.
And what need any other institution, then constant ap-
lication of suche gestures, by the Rejoynder his rule?

7. He quoteth Calvin, upon the place, as for him,
whome every man that will, may see to be against him,
So Beza, and Parau. Onely he hath a little shew (but no
substance) out of P. Martyr his words, upon 1. Cor. 16.
20. Whoe yet upon Rom. 16. 16. in few words, sheweth
his meaning all one with ours: and his judgement of
humane significant Ceremonies hath been before de-
clared.

8. Notwithstanding all this weaknesse of his pra-
misses, he concludeth strongly, that those which doe not
yeeld unto his proofs, have themselves, above all other
men, in estimation for soundnesse of judgement. To which
will onely say this, we have (by Gods grace) more judg-
ment, then either to accuse others so vainely, or to make
any account of this accusation, as if it would prejudice
us with any man of judgement.

S E C T.
Sect. 28

Concerning Women's Veils. 1. Cor. ii.

The last example of Apostolical Humane, Significant Ceremonies by Institution, and Appropriated unto Gods worship, is a Woman's Veil, such as a Huis or in the Low-Countries, or a French Hood, with a Bon-grace, was wont to bee in England. Now at this it was answered, that the Veile was neither Apostolical, nor meere of humane institution, nor of instituted signification, nor yet appropriated unto Gods worship; but a civill order of decencie, used as well out of Gods worship as in it. And the Rejoynder granteth, that it was a civill custome: but addeth, that it is as absurd, from thence to conclude, that it was in religious worship civill, and not religious, as to affirme this of blowing of Trumpets in the new Moones, &c. Where first, hee should have remembred, that we are here in answering, not in proving, and concluding, which is the Def. his part. Secondly, The Replier said it was a civill order of decencie, expressing the immediate end, which it had as well in, as out of worship, which will well beare this conclusion: that it was no more religious, then Womens proper apparell, long garments, &c. (to which Chrysostome uppon 1. Cor. xi.) compareth the Veile, as one part to another, or their shoes, or flippers are. 3. Concerning Trump...
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petticoats in some use of them, we have their instituted signification, expressly set downe in the Word, Numb. 10. shew the like, for going to Church in shoes, or vaines; and then we will confesse a parcel of reason.

2. The Def. proceeding by interrogatories, maketh this the first: whether the Vaine was not significative of some good thing? To which the Repl. answered, yet, it did declare, or argue a good thing, as indeed all civil apparel of modest fashion doeth. For this hee is check'd, and bidden to stand by, with his answer while his elders speake. As if we were now in the High Commission, and hee as Commissioner, might prescribe us when, and how much we may speake for our selves, though much without ground be spoken against us, and interrogatories propounded to the prejudice of our cause.

3. He asked secondly, what it did signify? Answer was made, that it signified subjection to superior power. Then a moral duty was professed by it, sayth the Rej. just so, as modesty, and shamefastnesse, gravity, and care of not offending, are professed by all apparel of modest honest fashion. And yet I never heard all modest apparel called a mysticall religious Ceremonie. Theophilact (in Con. 11.) maketh a mans beard like and equall unto his uncovering in signification. And will the Def. and Rej. say that Beards are religious mysticall Ceremonies?

4. The Def. added, that it had some relation unto God. To which it was answered, that so there is in an upper Seat, of an Heathen Magistrate, sitting in judgment: which yet is no mysticall Ceremonie of religion. The Rej. (altering first the case, into a throne set up)
that end, to represent the Sovereignty of God, for religious ignorance, and documents) affirmeth the Seat of a Heathen Judge, to be a mystical Ceremony of Religion. Now set aside his changing of the question, and take him as answering, that every Seat, of judgement among all Heathen, is such a Ceremony; and then, let any man consider, if he hath not brought his pigges to a faire market? Seats of Justice, are religious Ceremonies, even among those that know not what religion meaneth what is become of intended immediate, though improper worship, which he is wont to require as necessarie unto a religious Ceremony of mystical signification? He may as well say, that such vailes as Tamar was where-with he deceived Iuda, even unto incest, was religious Ceremonies among the Heathen; because a Vaile (in the nature of it) declareth a morall duty. For many of those Seates (in their nature tending to justice) are but vailes of injustice, as Tamar was of uncleanness. If those High Seates bee religious Ceremonies, then the bowing of Inferiors unto them, kissing of their feet, or foot-stoole, must be such also. Why then did the Def. seke (as with a candle and lant-horne) in every darke corner for instances or examples of religious significant Ceremonies of mans appointing? every civill meeting, every Company of Soldiers, every Schoole of Children can afford examples enough, and more then enough.

5. It was added, by the Repl. that the Def. allegeth nothing out of Divines, which may not as well bee applied to the Judges Bench, as to the Vaile of Women. Yes; this
A fresh suite against Ceremonies.

this (sayth the Rej.) that the one used in civil actions, is religious in use only, not in state: the other used in religious actions, is religious, both in state and use; which is (faith he) Mr. Parkers distinction. Now, 1. there was no such distinction as this, alleged by the Def. out of our Divines: so that this contradiceth not that which the Repl. affirmed. 2. This distinction as it is here explained, was never used by Mr. Parker, or (as I think) by any reasonable man, before now: A circumstance used in civil actions, is religious in use: the like used in religious actions is religious in use and state. Is the Critics Owize Religious in use, because, or as it is used in civil actions? And is the Parasites citation religious in state, because, or as it was used in Spirituall Courts? 3. What judges have a peculiar Seat in the Church, as in divers places, they have? Is that Seat therefore religious in state, as an Altar, a Crosse, the Chaire of Peter, &c? 6. The Repl. also observed, that the Vaile was of the same nature with long haire, such as becommeth women; and therefore, no religious mysterycall Ceremonie. No (faith the Rej.) because long haire is of nature; and the Vaile of institution, which to a Ceremonie is essential. To which I oppose 1. the true observation of P. Martin, the Def. his chief e witnesse, about this instance: A woman ought seeing her haire is given her of God, to follow the his institution, and to imitate her Maker, and cover her head; which if she will not doe, as much as is in her, she throwes of the natural vaile, where he sheweth that it is so natural, that it cannot be imitated without some violation of nature, by any woman, though no new institution impo...
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2. Chrysostome (upon the same place) hath this: That is from nature it selfe, that we women should cover our heads, and we men should uncover our heads. Nature would that women should bee covered; she is taught to be covered even from shence.

3. Paul himselfe saith not only that nature it selfe hath taught women to use a veil; but also, that the disguising of it is all one, with shaving; so that long beare, and a veil, according to the Apostle, is all one, for the ground of it. If therefore speciall institution, above nature, be essentiaall to a Ceremonie, then certainly vailling of women is no Ceremonie; much lesse religious, and mysticall: significant, by institution humane.

7. The Def. his third demand was, whether these Ceremonies of covering, and uncovering, were not instituted to bee observed in Gods publike worship? Answer was given (by the Repl.) that this indeed was required, in every grave meeting of men and women: but not primarily, and principally instituted for Gods worship. Paul surely did not institute them for new Ceremonies, but onely urged the Corinthians, not to neglect them, as being naturall. The Repl. opposeth 1. that requiring is an institution. As if the Kings requiring his subjects to obserue Christs institutions, did therefore institute the Sacraments, &c. 2. His second answer is, that application, by injunction, was (as it were) an institution. So that by and (as it were) the Lords Sacraments have bene so often instituted, as they have bene applied, and injoynd, that is an hundred thousand times, and more. But if any man will needs use the terme institution in such a sense, that is nothing to our question; which
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ter, in speciall, was man. Otherwise, all Divine Cer-
emonies will proove humane institutions; and so the Rej.

hath disputed all this while, about nothing. The rest of
the Rej. his wordes, in this Section, are either mee-
repetitions of confuted fictions, or such as need no con-
futation, I may well againe repeat (as justified) the Repl.

conclusion: Seeing the Def. could finde but three exam-
ple of humane Ceremonies, in all the new Testament;
and none of those there can be shewed, to be of mysti-
call signification, or appropriated onely to Gods wor-
ship, or of humane institution, the Prelates may be asea-
med in such domineering fashion, to urge humane Ce-
remones upon the consciences of Ministers and People
of the new Testament.

SECT. 29.

Concerning the Ancient Custome of Significant
Ceremonies among Christians.

As the Def. was passyng over from Scriptures,
to humane writings, and customes, he was told
by the Replier, that heere hee may finde more
fish for his net, in the troubled waters of mans in-
firmitie; then were to bee looked for in the Scrip-
ture fountaines. This the Rej. thought not worthy of
any answer. Let the Reader yet take knowledge, that we
eesteeme
nothing like of a thousand objections fetched from testimonie subject to error, as we would have done of one plaine testimonie Divine, if it could have beene produced.

2. The oldest Records we have (saith the Re
document: humane misticall Ceremonies in Gods wor
tship, as apostolicall traditions: Which is not true: be
cause those which call them apostolicall, use not to call, oresteeme them humane. 2 The Records of the first age, which we have, are so imperfect, and uncertaine, that God (in so disposing of them by his Providence)doeth in a manner warne us, not to depend on them, but onely on his written Word. 3. The great variety that was found, in the first ages, about the observation of Lent, and Easter, doeth manifestly proove, they were not apostolicall: as Chamier sheweth (De jejunio, cap.7.) Not out of any certaine law, but out of private devotions, and consequently Superstition. In the next place, for a maine ground of this assercion (that the universall Church ob-
erving humane Rites, tooke them to have beene of A-
postolicall allowance) the Reringeth in the com-
mon text of Papists, out of Augustine, ep. 118. Such u-
iversall observations, not being written in Scripture, must be understood to be commanded by generall Councils, or from the Apostles. Where he faulteth twice in the translation, in (turning dantur intelligi, into must be understood, when D. Morton himselfe (Pr. Ap.lib.2, cap.28.4.) makes it a strong probability onely; and in turning commendata, by into commanded. 2. This being but a probable rule, and And Augustines conjecture of that probability, being also
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5. The Rej. calleth it, a spirit of singular singularity, to thinke, the whole Church, in the days of purest zeale, and frequent martyrdom, did not duly examine their Ceremonies. And yet the same Rej. (without any spirit of singular singularity) acknowledgeth, that in the two first ages, after the Apostles, there was either want of clearnesse, or a manifest touch of error, about some sixteenth points of doctrine, very important: pag. 458. Which if he will reconcile with this affected accusation, he must say, that Christians in those times, more attended to certain humane Ceremonies, then to divers points of divine doctrine, though in the maine power of Godlinesse they went beyond those which are purer both in Ceremonies and doctrine. But the truth is, he spake there for excessive commendation of our English-Church-doctrine, and so, in comparison, depressed the Primitive; and here he seeketh to defend our Ceremonies, by theirs, and so extolleth their judgement of Ceremonies in both places (according to occasion) exceeding the just measure, as it usually falleth out to those, who dispute out of affection, more then out of judgement.

6. The Rej. taketh it ill, that the Repl. should say, that the bringing in of humane Ceremonies, made any way for Antichristian superstition. But seeing that the Antichristian Papists, argue so strongly from those first humane Ceremonies, to divers of those which they use, and by us are rejected, that they cannot bee fully confuted, but by rejecting of both, I see no reason for his indignation. Gideon: Ephod, in the argument of the eight chapter of Judges (according to our new translation) was
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And was not the old crossing, as ever, as every coming to and going out, as she appareling themselves, as washing, as eating, as lighting candles, as sitting, &c., as a great cause of that Idolatry which hath been, and is used, about the cross? D. Fulke (in his Rej. to Brilow, cap. 3.) mainteyneth, that many abuses and corruptions, entered into the Church, immediately after the Apos-tles' time, which the Devil planted, as a preparation for Anti-Christ. The same Doctor also (ibid. sect. 4.) proveth many Ceremonies of the Primitive times, to have been unprofitable; because they are abrogated. And (cap. 9.) hee saith plainely, that the error of conceiving and using some superstitions, or superfluous Ceremonies, is common to the Fathers, with Popisists.

6. A great matter is made of that which the Replier said, concerning 1500. yeares experience of humane significant Ceremonies. For about this the Rej. saith, that it is wonderfull rashnesse, answering the spirit of monta-nus, to challenge the whole Church of error, in this matter, for 1500. yeares. But 1. it is rashnesse in the Rej. to accuse one of challenging the whole Church, who mentioned not, in his challenge, either Church or whole. 2. The whole Church cannot be understood, except the Waldenses and all like unto them, that is the purer part, bee excluded out of the whole Church. 3. Doctor Morton himselfe (Prot. Apol. cap. 25. sect. 9.) maintaineth this sentence of Mr. Calshill: the Fathers declined all from the simplicity of the Gospel, in Ceremonies; if by simplicity be understood a virtue, opposite, either unto superfluity, or superstition. And And are not superfluity and superstition, errors? 4. From the
the primitive times by the space of sixe hundred yeares the Church generally erred, in giving the Lords Supper unto infants, as D. Morton sheweth (Prot. Apol. 2. cap. 25. sect. 10.) and after that for many hundred yeares, it mended (for the common course of errors) soure ale doth in Sommer. 5. The Rej. cannot name any Church in all that time free from errors, neither he denie, but the Church that ereth in doctrine, errr in Ceremonies. Ergo. 6. Hee was unhappie mentioning Montanus his spirit, which breathed, a broached to many humane Ceremonies, that Church hath ever since beene more wronged there in Ceremonies, then in any other respect, or by any other spirit of that time, as all men know, that have those writings of Tertullian, which were dictated by piece of Montanus his spirit. Montanus would have three Lents, in stead of one: Montanus advanced the Cru unto more honour, then ever it had before: Montanus (in one word) was of a ceremoniall spirit.

S E C T. 30.

In this section, foure or five Protestant Divines named, as allowing of some significant Ceremoni. But there is not any one of them, whose judgement to the contrary, hath not beene manifestly declared will not therefore so much distrust the Readers atten...
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on, and understanding, as to weary him with needless repetitions.

S E C T. 31.

Here the Defendant urgeth upon us, the ordinary form of swearing upon a booke. To which if the Replier hath not said enough, I leave it to the Readers judgement, after hee hath compared the Rejoinder, which speaketh 1. of Gambolling; 2. of Bucklers and Quarrelling; 3. of a profe necessary to an answer; 4. of swearing by a booke; 5. of Sophistication, in confounding our Churches esteem, and the truth about this form of swearing; 6. of equality betwixt special solemn worship of God, and occasional swearing, in civill Assemblies. I will onely add, as an explication of the Repliers answer, that which Dr. Jackson answereth the Papists, about this fashion (Orig. of unbelievers sect. 4. cap. 35.) We use the booke, onely as a complement of the civil act, whereby we give satisfaction unto men; or as a visible resemblance partly, to by standers, or spectators, whose eyes by this means may become as true witnesses as their ears, that such protestations have beene made; partly unto him that makes them, who will be more wary and circumspect what he avoucheth and protesteth, when he perceiveth his speeches must be sealed with such remarkable circumstances, as they cannot be often recalled to his owne and others memory. To the same ende, men of honourable place and calling, use to lay their hands.
S E C T. 32.

Concerning the Lords-Day, Temples, and ceremoniall Festivals.

1. The Def. having spoken of his much sayling in the maine, and narrow Seas, commeth to object the observation of the Lords Day, as a fit example of a humane Ceremony: whereupon, the Replieth continuing his similitude, sayth, that he was at this time, eyther sea-sick, or sleepy, with his much sayling. This the Rej. calleth a scurrilous jest, and scoffe: so liberall is he of terms, when reasonable answers are not at hand. But if he had thought of the ordinarie sayings, Quandoquies bonus dormitat Homerus; animi perturbation est quaedam ea agritura; he would have spared an innocent usuall phrase of speech, and not markt it with so soule pich or tarread Scurrilisie.

2. Now let us heare, how hee can excuse the Def. his allegation, from all sickness, and drowsinesse! The observation (saith he) of the Lords Day, in place of the Lewd Sabbath, is not a humane institution: but the analogical and allegorical instructions, lawfully rais'd from that Day, are humane institution, not divine. I say againe, as the Repl. sayd, (without feare of the Rej. his Spite of scurrility) this is a sick or drosse answer. For it maketh all analogical instructions, instituted Ceremonies: as if nothing could be gathered from any fact, or text, in the Scripture, by
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by analogie, or proportion, but it must bee straight a ceremoniall institution! 2. These analogicall instructions, are, (as the Def. expresseth them) meditation of Christ's resurrection, and of our evereall rest to come. And who ever heard or read, that these were humane institution? What may instituted them? when? by what authority? upon what necessity? Are they ambulatorie, or mosteable Ceremonies, which our Convocation may change at their pleasure? Awake, awake, both Def. and Rej. and see the vanity and scandall of this allegation.

3. As a Parallel of the former example, Temples were added by the Defend. And to make it agree, the Rej. is driven to this issue, that if it be lawfull by accommodation, to put men in minde of heavenly things by earthly; then it is lawfull to institute things to that use. Which is as if hee should argue thus: if it bee lawfull, by accommodation, to put men in minde of Gods faithfulness in keeping his Covenant of Grace, by the constant course of nature, which he hath set in heaven and earth, or by the faithfulness and constancy of men morally honest, then it is lawfull for men to institute sacred signes for confirmation of the Covenant of Grace, and so new Sacraments properly so called.

4. Concerning Ceremoniall Festivals, of mams-making, our pradise cannot bee objected: because wee observe none. We take occasion of hearing, and praying upon any day, when occasion is offered. Wee say (with Hespinius de Orig. Fest. Christ. cap. 2.) Not the day, but the Word of God, &c. puts us in minde of the nativity, resurrection, and ascension of Christ. And this might be the
the reason, why the Repl. passed over this example, as of no moment. For we do not fear (as the Rej. imagineth) lest all the Churches of God will condemn us herein. Those that consent with Geneva, nor those of Scotland (except some of the new edition) nor nor any that follow Bucers judgement (in Matt. 12.) I would to God that ever Holy-day whatsoever beside the Lords Day, were abolished. That zeal which brought them first in, was without all warrant of the Word, and merely followed corrupt reason, for soth to drive out the Holy days of the Pagans, as one while drives on another. Those Holy days, have beene so tincted with superstitions that I wonder wee tremble not at their very names. See the place. Ccelampadius (in Isaiam, cap. I. v. 4.) thinketh that no wise Christian will condemn us. I never heard wise man yet, who did not judge that a great part at least of other feasts beside the Lords Day should be abolished. He ininuateth manifestly more then hee speaketh. Zanchi (how favourable soever hee speaketh of some festivals) cannot condemn us by that sentence of his, (in 4. praec.) It is most agreeable to the first institution and Apostolical writings, that only one day in the weeke be kept holy.
IN this Section (which the Repl. thought to require no answer) the summe is, that we are crosse and contrary to the Authors of our Service-booke, who thought our Ceremonies to be the better for being significant. Now if this be understood so, as if we disliked the significance of them, because those Reverend men did like it, then we are uncharitably wronged by rash judgement. If so, that though such excellent men did thinke so, yet wee thinke otherwise; then our answere is they were men; and though they saw much evill in Popish Ceremonies, yet not all; and therefore judged some tolerable for a time, which were free from some faults, that others were guilty of; though they banished divers, which were as free from darkenesse and dumbnesse, as those they retayned. Why they removed those, we see good reason: why they retayned, or rather tolerated these, more then them, we see none, that experience hath not confuted.

IN this last section, this reason is brought (according to the Rej. his construction) if all Ceremonies (properly so called) must some may be significant, then even...
303.
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either all Ceremonies are unlawfull, or some significant Ceremonies are lawfull. To which I answer 1. that all outward actions designed or purposely observed, and done in reference to some other thing, beside the cause or part thereof, which is the Rej. his definition of a Ceremony, Manuduct, p. 29. 30. are not mystically significant, by the Rejoynder his owne doctrine, ibid. pag. 32. 33. Mysticall significiation, in the want of it, doth not make a Ceremony, or no Ceremony. A character of significancie, maketh a double or treble Ceremony; Relation without significacion, maketh a single Ceremony. So, pag. 39. Simple Ceremonies are those, whose use is only for order and decency: Double are those, which serve also edification, 1. by some profitable significacion. 2. If all Ceremonies were significant, yet it doeth not follow, that they all teach a spirituall dutie, by their instituted mystical significacion: of which kinde of significacion, all the question is in this chapter, as is to be seene in the first section. 3. If all Ceremonies be significant, then there is no sense in exposing double Ceremonies to significiant: because none are, or can be dumbe. And yet this opposition is made use of by the Def. and Rej. as other where, so in these two last sections.

2. The Repl. taking from the Def. this proposition Nothing is properly called a Ceremony, if it be altogether destitute of significacion; sayth that this convinceth not us at all: because, if this be true, then our tenet is, that all ceremonies properly so called, of mans invention, should be packed out of the Church. What? (sayth the Rej.) even Sitting at the Communion, and a communion-Table? Yea, say we, even these if they can be prooved to bee Ceremonies
monies of man's invention.

3. From the former consideration, the Defen. was challenged, for having gone about to deceive us, often times before, by confounding all circumstances of order and decency, with properly called Ceremonies; whereas now, in the winding up of all, he confesseth, that they cannot be properly called Ceremonies, except they be significant. The Rejoynder his answer is, that all such circumstances are some way significant, though not symbolically: because they signify some way what is to be done, or where, or when, or why, or how. Now though every circumstance doeth some way argue that whereof it is a circumstance, and so in a large sense may be called a signe of it; yet every circumstance is not a signe of what is to be done: because some have no place, untill the thing be done. 2. Both the Def. and Rej. have hitherto confounded indicant and symbolical signes, except onely one place, where (for a shift) the Rej. sayth, Beza, differing in phraze from other Divines, meaneth by Symbolical, Sacramental signes, pag. 264. 265. Heere therefore to distinguish them, is to confesse their former dealing not faire.

4. If all circumstances belonging to time, place, person, instruments or manner of actions sacred, be sacred significant Ceremonies; then not the Clocke onely, but the leaden weights of it, not the ground onely upon which men stand in worship, but the Ruffles also strowed by occasion upon it, or the Besome wherewith it is swept; not the Preachers voice onely, but his black Cap, his comely card, not the Communion Table-clothe onely, but the colour
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colour of it; not distinct speaking only, but every Preachers proper Tone, are sacred, significant, ceremonial Weights, Rushes, Bezomes, Caps, Beards, Colours, Tones, &c.

See what an argument the Def. made against us, according to the Rej: his explanation: If Signes Indicant that is, such as by the nature of the things themselves, without any religious signification put upon them by institution, are lawfull; then Symbolical Signes, that is, those which teach a spirituall duty, by their mystical institution signification, cannot be unlawfull. In striving to helpe the Def. out of the water, hee hath sunke, and followed him deeper in, then before he seemed to be plunged.

5. Calvin (said the Def.) and some other, doe accuse some Popish Ceremonies, because they are dumb. They accuse them also (answerceth the Repl.) for speaking: as the Scripture doth condemn images, both for being dumb, and also for teaching lies.

Well said, (saith the Rej) When the Ceremonies are altogether dumb, they condemn them for not speaking: when they speake idly, or falsely, they condemn them for speaking amisse. But you condemn them simply for not being dumb. But heer is a great mistaking of the Rejoynders. For we condemn humane Ceremonies for speaking idly, that which Gods Ordinances doe sufficiently speak; and falsely, also for their manner of speaking, as if they had just commision to speake in Gods name, when they have not. When an image of the blessed Virgine, spake in the Church, to Berhard: good morrow Bernard, good morrow Bernard answered: O base Adam, you forget yours
sex, it is not lawful for a woman to speak in the Church.

The Scriptures also condemned the same image for standing (at other times) dumb in the Church. Even so condemn humane Ceremonies, both for standing in the Church dumb and unprofitable; and also for speaking in such a place, idly, and above that which become their Sexe or degree. I repeat therefore againe, not as a mere jest, in which name the Rejoynder putth it off, but as a sad and serious truth, that which the Replier concluded this Argument withall: Lay all together which our Divines say, and you shall finde, that in their judgements, Humane Ceremonies in God's worship, are like a hoole in a place of honor, who whether he speaketh, or holdeth his peace, still sheweth himselfe unworthy of that place.
CHAP. 4.

Concerning Idolatrous Ceremonies.

SECTION 1.

About the forming of this argument, and the general answer given thereunto.

IN the former argument as being most essential, suffered my pen to run a larger course, than in the beginning I intended. Here I purpose to hold it shorter.passing over therefore by-matters.

1. The Argument was thus propounded in the bridgement: It is contrary to God's word, to use (much more to command the use of) such ceremonies in the worship of God as man hath devised, if they bee notoriously knowne, to have beene of old, and still to be abused unto Idolatrie, and Superstition, by the Papists, especially, if the same be now of necessary use in the church. But our ceremonies are such. Etc.

The Def. his answer was so set downe, that (by the Rej. his owne confession) no sense could be discerned in it. But the said Rej. (after three patchings of the words and the distinctions, about abolishing, abused, and necessary) bringeth, for account, this answer, out of all: If
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Abortion, be meant, Abscission, and not Cure; the Proposition being meant of things indifferent, is false. But if in the exception, of things, necessary, be meant not an absolute, but a convenient necessity, the Assumption is false, which saith: that our Ceremonies are of no necessary use in the Church. Here we have three distinctions, between 1. Abscission, or cutting off, and curing; 2. things will in their nature, and indifferent; 3. necessity absolute, and convenient. Now I see how they agree among themselves: In the first, the Ceremonies are considered as members of our Religion, or worship, which must either cut off or cured (for so the Def. explaineth it of cutting off the members by the joints), whereas they were never members joyned to our religion, or worship, but to the Harlot of Rome. In the second, they are considered as no members, but things indifferent, and in the third (at the best) only convenient. 2. For the first, it is well knowne that they are cloutes, which have lien upon the plague-soares of Idolaters, many hundreds of years: and what wise Physitian, or Surgeon, was ever knowne, to goe about the curing of such clouts? 3. For the second, it is a mere affection of casting a myst before the Readers eyes. For both the Def. and Rej. knew well, that the Authors of this Argument, holde our Ceremonies not indifferent, but unlawful in their nature, and yet upon supposed indifferency, undertake to make good their Proposition; as having all sense on their side, namely, that things otherwise merely indifferent, receive some difference, by their notorious abuse to Idolatry. 4. For the last, The Ceremonies are here, only
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only in a blinde distinction, (as it were in a parenthesu) affirmed to be of convenient use in our Church. Now let any man consider of this dealing, whether it be not more necessary for the Def. and Rei. then convenient for the Reader. In the Abridgement, pag. 42. and 43. &c. it is largely prooved, that these Ceremonies in controversy, are not convenient. The Def. (professing a full answer to all that is objected) giveth no answer to any thing there alleged to that purpose. When he was challenged by the Repl. for not showing them convenient, the Rej. pag. 167. accuseth him of more impudencie, then he would have expected from any Friar, and yet directs us not to the place, where he hath gone about any such matter. The Rej. himselfe, undertaking to manifest their convenientie by the Rules of Gods Word, suddenly breaketh off, pag. 74. and referreth that demonstration to a fitter place: which place hitherto he could not finde, nor ever will. Besides, the Rej. confesseth, a multitude of godly learned men, (among whom were) Calvin, Beza, Martyr, Bucer, Hooper, Jewel, Fulke, Rainolds, Whitaker, Humphrie, Perkins, &c.) to have held our Ceremonies inexpedient, or inconvenient, at the least. Nay he himselfe hath beene in the same heresie. All this notwithstanding, he thinketh it not signifient, in one word, to lay (for a shift) without any prooue or declaration, that they are convenient for our Church. Conueniency is esteemed when as a thing after the consideration of all circumstances, is found to bring more good (at the least) then evill with it. And I dare appeal to the Rej. his owne conscience, whether our Ceremonies have beene cau-
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Is, or occasions of more good then evil? They may doe hurt (saith Beza) but they can doe no good. God knowes (saith Mr. Foxe) they bee the cause of much blindenesse and strife among men.

Let this (by the way) be well observed out of this general answer, that the particular answers following, in this argument, are nothing worth, but onely upon this supposition, that our Ceremonies are not onely curable and indifferent, but also convenient for our Church: which neuer Deo. nor Rej. nor any for them, will ever bee able with any shew of reason, and honesty, to demonstrate, while the world standeth. So that this whole fourth Argument is here in the first section, sufficiently yeelded. For all that we desire, is plainely granted, concerning the unlawfulness of all such human Ceremonies in Gods worship, as are notoriously knowne to have beeene and bee abused unto Idolatry and Superstition, if they bee now of no convenient necessary use in the Church.

S E C T. 2.


The second Commandement was here alleged, in the Abridgement, as forbidding all pro-vocation unto spirituall fornication, as the se-
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venth doeth unto that which is carnall. This the Dei, 
passed by in silence; and therein is defended by the Rej, 
because, according to his method, in one particular ar- 
gument, he taketh knowledge of it, par. 2. c. 2. c. 2. As if 
John a-Stiles his plea, for 3. akers of ground, were suffici- ently answered by John a-Noxe, if he cold with any shew- 
ward it off from 1. aker. His owne answer is, that as these 
venth Commandement doeth not forbid the use of all such 
things, as accidentally doe, or may provoke some men to be 
uncleanness; but only such, as in and of themselves, are 
working incitements therto; so neither doeth the second Com- 
mandement forbid the use of all such things, as the lust of some 
dolaters may turne to spirituall fornication; but only of such 
as have in themselves, or in such use of them, an latitude, a 
aptnesse, to provoke therto. But 1. Our Divine gener- 
ally teach (as Zanchy de Red. lib. 1. cap. 14. briefely ex- 
presseth their meaning.) The summe of the second Com- 
dement is, that in the worship of God, or Ceremonies thea- 
bout, wee are to devise nothing of our owne braine, or bor- 
ought of Heathenish Idolatrous rites. 2. Let this be so: the 
question yet remaineth; whether our Ceremonies, the 
Crosse (for example) hath not some habitude, and ap- 
nesse, to provoke towards Idolatry? I thinke it will not 
be denied, but the Crosse is an Idol, at Paris, at Ca- 
and among the Papists, in England. Now suppos- 
knowne harlot to be brought out of the Stues at Paris, 
Carls, unto Dover, and lodged there in an honest ma- 
bed, or bed-chamber (as the Crosse is in the bed of re- 
Religion, the holy Sacrament) would any man say, th- 
there were no habitude nor aptness, in such a harlot,
her lodging, to provoke, even an honest man, and much more, a dissolute companion, unto filthy folly? Difference I know none; but only that the spiritual folly may be more secretly, and mystically provoked, and exercised, then carnall can. The Rej. should have done well, if hee had given us a certaine rule, whereby wee might have distinguished, betwixt those monuments, or relics of Idolatry, which have an habitate or apnisfe in them to provoke unto Idolatry, and those which have not. For then more might have beene said therefrom, eather for, or against our Ceremonies. Now we cannot tell where to take holde, saving onely in this; that habitate and apnisfe of provoking, towards Idolatry, is in every consenting relation that any Ceremony (otherwise unnecessary) hath to any Idol: and all such relation of our Ceremonies to Idols cannot be denied; neither can their necessity to true Religion be with any shew of reason, or honesty, mainteyned. Beside, what jealous or wise husband, if his wife should receive anything from a knowne adulterer, who hath also gone about to undermyne her honesty, and keepe it always in her bosome, would take this for a sufficient excuse; that such a thing hath not in it selfe any habitate or apnisfe of provoking unto Adultery? And doth not God tell us, that hee is in like sort, a jealous God? From hence it is, that Mr. Perkins, with divers others, in writing on the second Commandement, doctrinally, without special medling with controversyes, making one head of things therein forbidden, the monuments and reliques of Idolatrie.

2. To Lev. 18.3.4; and 19.19.27. the Def. his answer was
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was (according to the Rejoynder his extraction) that these places doe not prove the abolishing of things indifferent in nature, merely for the abuse of them to Idolatry, which was (saith he) the point to be proved: because cutting off the flesh for the dead was evil in its selfe; and sowing with divers seeds in one field, was forbidden for a typical document of that sincerity which God required in his people. Where he mistakes, or perverteth the question: which was not of things indifferent, but not necessary, nor of all things not necessary, but of Ceremonies. 2. Cutting off the flesh for the dead, with a good meaning, nor was, nor is more evil in it selfe, then Circumcision, which both the Def. and Rej. allow as lawfull, under Presbyter John, pag. 285. 3. That typical doctrine of sincerity, forbidden plainly all mixing of Idolaters reliques, with Gods holy ordinances.

3. The Repl. alleged, that the words Lev. 18. 3. 4. are general: after their doings ye shall not doe: neither shall ye walke in their ordinances. To this the Rej. answereth, that these general words are to be restrained unto the matter spoken of, that is, incest, and such mad doings of the Egyptians, and Canaanites. But 1. why are these words more to be restrained unto the matter spoken of in the same chapter, then those, 1. Cor. 4. 40. Let all things bee done decently and in order, by which the Def. and Rej. extend as farre as it pleaseth our Convocation to call things decent, and orderly. 2. That they cannot be so restrained, is manifest out of the context; where the ordinances of Idolaters are opposed to all those Ordinances, Statutes, and Judgements of God, to the doing whereof is promised
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4. Exod. 23.24. (Sayth the Rej.) Speaketh of superstition, or visions worship. And this (say we) is the point by us intended: viz. that Ceremonies borrowed from Idolaters, are visions and superstitions worship.
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teth; In Ceremonies, we must holde us strictly to the Word of God; lest we should transgress either in number, or in forme, if mens traditions were to be followed.

6. Deut. 30.32. was (as it seemeth) misprinted, for Deut. 16.22. and so commeth after to be handled in the next Section.

7. As for 2. Corint. 6.14. (sayth the Rej.) that place condemneth only mariaige or familiar societie with infidels, and v. 17. partnership with men in uncleanness, by consenting therto. But he should have remembered 1. that the generall condemnation of Fellowship, implieth more then mariaige, or familiar societie. 2. That using of Idolaters Ceremonies, is more religious fellowship with them, then familiea societie civilis. 3. That Idolaters Ceremonies cannot be wittingly and willingly used, without implicit consent unto them, hitherto, that their Ceremonies are lawfull.

8. To Rev. 18.4. the Rej. answereth in many words, but to the purpose thus: As concerning Ceremonies only separating from those of Babylous Ceremonies is enjoyned, which cannot be separated from sinne. Which if it be underlood of sinne in the religious use of them about Gods solemne worship, is as muche as we desire: we onely adde (which is our defense) that suche an use of them is sinne in itself.

9. Calvins grave collection, on Lev. 19.27. was by the Replier alleged, which thus soundeth, according to the Rej. his owne emendation of the translation: Althought rounding, or cutting the hair, was in itself indifferent, yet God would not have it indifferent to his people that they as
little children, might learn by small sediments, that they
could not have his favour, unless they should be unlike to the
aliens, and unchristian, & be altogether and far different
from their examples, especially in those Rites wherein religion
was shewed. The Rej. answereth, that the cause of this
restraint, was the Jews childlike estate, by Calvins owne words.
But Calvins meaning is removed from the right center.
For that he meant not to exclude our age, he sheweth
in the next words: EXPERIENCES DOCTE, &C. EXPERIENCE
doth (not did) teache. And this childlike estate was the
cause (according to him and truth) not of the doctrine
taught, concerning unlikenesse unto Idolaters, but of the
manner, or means, wherein it was taught, namely, by
absteyning from that fashion of hair, and beards, which
Idolaters used. God teacheth us to teache our children,
agreeable to their age, not that afterward they should
forget, that which was taught them, but that they may
remember what they were then taught, and not depart:
from it, when they are olde. Prov. 22. 6. And did he give
us a contrarie example? The praeccepts given in the
Churches minoritie, are her direction (by proportion)
in her ripest years. And what direction is in these praec-
cepts, for us, the Rej. doeth not shew. Surely, I should
think, if the common sort of Gods people might not fa-
shion themselves then to Idolaters, then neyther now
our Ministers: if not then in a matter of passion, much le-
ffe now in actions pertaining to Gods worship: if not
then in a tuft of hay, much lefle now in a Ministring
garment, a Ceremonie consecrating us and our children
to Christ, and a solemne manner of receyving him in
his
his mysteries. The difference of childhood, from perfect age, may teach us, that we should not look for such particular warnings now what things of Idolaters we are to shunne, as were given in the Churches of the idolatrine infant, but make use of them; being now also generally warned to flee from all Idolatrie, & that in the same forms of speache which then were used. 2. He answereth, that it pleased God to set up a partition-wall between Jews and Gentiles, in things otherwise lawfull. Whiche is very true: but among those things, otherwise lawfull (as Calvin clearly insinuateth) Rites of human invention, wherein religion was shewed, had no place. 3. The Rej. addeth, that neither Calvin, ever affirmed, nor any learned and advised man, dare affirm, that no conformitie with Idolaters in any Rites, abused by them to Idolatrous superstition, is lawfull to be used of Gods people in his service. To which I answer 1. that if he taketh any Rites so largely, that among them he reckonet as Gods ordinances, then he saith nothing but truth, and yet nothing to the purpose. For the question is, of Rites deviz'd by man, not necessarie in the Church: as may be seen in the terms of our Argument, expressed in the Abrigement, though in part omitted by the Def. which omission was so approved by the Rej. that he accuseth the Repl. of wrong-doing for mending it. Pag. 404. We see now for what advantage. 2. If we may have leave to put in that part of the question, as it standeth in our Argument (Rites deviz'd by man, not necessarie) then hear Calvins and some other learned and advised mans judgement. Calv. Resp. ad Vesperpellem: It is more right and sound, to say, that the institutions
Susions of God may not be abolished for any abuse: but humane institutions, being defiled, and so proving hurtful, and offensive to our brethren, are to be abstained from. The superstitions against which true worshipers of God doe fight, came (for a great part of them) from unknowne pudles: and all of them are foiled with ungodly errors, which never can be removed, but by utter abolishing of their use. Why then doe we not simply acknowledge that which is true, namely, that this remedy (of abolishing their use) is a necessary remedie, for taking of dross, from the Church? Mr. Farrel Calvins fellow-minister, and in some sort, Father, Epist. Calv. 49. disputing against a popish fellow, whose name was Carolus, saith thus: When Carolus would obtrude his significations, in garments, and other magick-like signs; we opposed, that Christ hath taught us a purer manner of worshipping the Father, in spirit and truth, without shadows. And Princes may learn by Hezechias his abolishing of the brazen serpent, what they are to do in these Rites which idle men have erected, and added significations unto, according to their owne pleasure. 

Beza, their sonne, Disp. Genev. 66. The trifles which had proceeded unto manifest superstition, we have abolished as well worship. We also affirme, that they which retaine the reliques of unprofitable Ceremonies, and (out of superstitious judgment) correct them rather then abolish them, deserve ill of the Chur-
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ches.
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Yet some there are, who would have Pastors put on garments, which is not by their first bringing in, yet by their abuse, are Baals garments. You Papists have so abused these Ceremonies, that without violating of religion, we cannot receivethem.

D. Morton, our Defend. Appeal. lib. 3. cap. 2. Sect. 25.
Pope Stephen prescribed in such like cases of humane inventions: If our Ancestors have done any thing which is afterward turned into superstition, it is to be abolished without delay. Which was also the onely remedie which the ancient Council of Eliberis propounded against Idolatry. To omit particulars, it hath hitherto beene received for a ruled case among our Divines, as Rivetus (one of our last writers) sheweth, on the fourth Commandement: It is a rule, that things indifferent, not being necessary, if they be polluted with horrible Idolatry, are to be abolished. The Rejoynder his confidence therefore in this point, did exceed all comely measure. The opposite assertion may be better maintained: viz. that no learned and advised Divine, can be named, free from manifest prejudice, arising from the use and urging of such Ceremonies in that Church where he lived that doeth not condemn all conformity with Idolaters, in their religious unnecessary Ceremonies.
S E C T. 3.

Concerning Pillars, Lev. 26.1. and the name Baal, Hof. 2. 16.17.

It was said by the Repl. that for preventing of an evasion, or stopping of a muse, the Abringers added, that even such things are to be cast away, which had a good original, and use, (if they be not still necessary and commanded of God) when once they are found to be defiled by Idolatry, as Lev. 26.1. &c. To this the Rej. (abounding as it seemeth with leisure, and words) sayth divers things in generall, not worth much refutation. 1. He objecteth Tinkers' lucke, because then all our Churches must downe. But this Ting-tong shall not have the lucke to stay us: because we hold our Churches commanded, in generall, though not for their particular places and formes; which particularity was neither mentioned, nor meant in the Argument. 2. Hee taketh more then one knot in that rush (necessary or commanded) as if in either sentence that particle or must needs be distinctive, and not the same with and; which hee himselfe will not affirme in his second thoughts. 3. He affirmeth some distinction to be between things originally evil, and those that are successively evil: which we deny not; but only say, that distinction doth not make such a difference, as that therefore one should be rejected.
rejected, and the other received. 4. He denyeth the assertion plainly: which he might have done with fewer words, to as good purpose.

2. Concerning Lev. 26. it was alleged by the Repl. that those (at least some of those) titular pillars were first only set up for civil use. To which the Rej. answereth, that this was not the first beginning of their religious use: which is nothing to the purpose, except no use be good but religious. 2. that though many statues which afterward only for worship, were at the first, for civil respects, and had still a civil use, (for this antecedent only is the Repliers) yet it doeth not follow, they were civil at the first: which answer is by itself confuted.

3. Calvins collection or conjecture, was objected: that these statues were erected, to represent God: and this was answered, that according to Calvins phrase, there is a representation of God, in all pictures that corrupt Gods spiritual worship. The Rej. opposeth, that Calvin on Deut. 12.3. sheweth his meaning to be only of such representation as was in the golden Calf, and Michas Seraphim, not such as Jacob set up for a monument. Which may be Calvins Conjecture of that place in Deut. though not of this in Lev. Yet to such a monument as Jacobs was, being grossly abused unto Idolatry, Hezechias would have shewn no more courtesie, then he did to the Brazen Serpent. So Pelicanus, upon the place, collecteth: We must ceremonie according to Gods Word only. as upon Lev. 26:1. Even triumphall statues were forbidden. And Lyra, The memory of Idolatry is totally to be wiped out.

4. The Def. objected Jacob's pillar, Gen. 28:18. So (sayth
(As the Replier) he did offer sacrifices, in other manner, and place, then after the Law, was lawfull. To this the Rejoynder answereth, 1. that which Jacob did, was not unlawfull by the morall Law. But he is mistaken; not distinguishing betwixt the morall Law forbidding religious Ceremonies of meere human appointment, and allowing the same derived from Divine inspiration.

So Tertullian (de Idol. cap. 5.) answereth him, that defended Images by the brazen Serpent: Idem Deus, qui lege versus similitudinem fieri, extraordinario praecipit, Serpens similitudinem indixit. Si eundem Deum observas, habes legem ejus. Imitare tu Mosem, ne facias adversus legem simu. lchram aliquid, nisi et tibi Deus juverit. 1, e. The same God which in his Law forbad images, did extraordinarily command the image of a Serpent. If thou wilt obey that God, thou hast his law. Imitate thou Moses, not making any image (contrarie to the Law) except God command thee. So all our Divines in answer of Papists, objecting this & such like examples for will-worship) referre these doings to Divine revelation or instinct. Among these (for this cause) I reckon D. Iackson: whose in his Original, pag. 332. giveth us this Cathlick remedie and rule, seriously to be considered. Such actions as have been menaged by Gods Spirit, suggested by secret instinct, or extracted by extraordinary and speciall occasions, are then only lawfull in others, when they are begotten by like occasions, or brought forth by like impulsions.

5. To Hos. 2. 16. 17. (where the very name of Baal seemeth to be forbidden, because it had been given unto Idols,) the Defendant answereth (sayth the Rej.) implicitly.
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city, i.e. so as I have now answered to all that he hath brought about this fourth Argument. But he undertaketh, by a little change of wordes, to make that answer satisfactorie. For this end, he allegeth first, that the word Baal, in religious use and application, was originally, or from the first use of it, evil: because before Moses was borne, the great and common Idol of the Gentiles was marked out by it, as by a proper name. But 1. If the civil use of this word was originally good, that is sufficient to our purpose. For our Argument speaketh onely generally of good originals and beginnings. 2. If this word Baal did originally signify Lord, Master, Husband, (as it is generally taken) then by the Rej. his interpretation, it did originally signify a religious relation. For he holdeth every signe of a servant's dutie for conscience sake, to be a mystical signe of a spiritual dutie: pag. 314. And is not every signe of a Lords, Masters, or Husband's duty, or state, for conscience sake, of the same nature? 3. Ther is some question among the learned, whether Baal was derived from King Bel, or King Bels name from Baal? The most probable opinion is the later: as Sir Walter Raughtly sheweth lib. 1. c. 10. sect. 6. because Bel, Beel, or Baal, was as much to say as God. And Arias Montanus, in Hos. 2. sayth it signifies Numen, or the chief sovereign power, whatsoever it be, without restraint to this or that Idol. Now if this be so, what more evil was ther in the first use of the name Baal, then of God?

6. In the next place, the Rej. undertaketh to prove, that all religious use of this word Baal, in application to God, is not forbidden; but only as it might further...
A gross Sate against Ceremonies. 385.

The practice, or bear the appearance of grosse Idolatrie. In which answer, if he doeth not distinguish grosse Idolatrie from right; nor hath any mental reservation, about appearance, nor yet taketh might further, otherwise then the wordes sound, he sayth nothing but that which we not onely grant, but also make our plea. To this end he allegeth the use of it in Is. 54. 5. Ier. 31. 33. Nah. 1. 2. To which I answer 1. The Lord, in this place of Hos. did not speak of every time, but of that day. 2. He did not forbid himself to use this or that terme, at his pleasure, but men. 3. The word Baal Is. 54. Ier. 31. seemeth to be used in an allusion onely reproving, and upbraiding the Idolatrie of the people, which had followed Baal; as shewing that what they had sought for in Baal, was to be found onely in Jehovah. Otherwise it may be answered, that the word appellative is used, without any reflection unto the proper. And Nah. 1. it is no more given to Jehovah, then the name Idol is given to men, when unworthy teachers are called Idol-shepheard; or then the name Jehovah is given to dumbe creatures, when they are called Jehovah Livch Gen. 22. Jehovah Nisit Ex. 17. Jehovah Shamah, Ezek. 48.

7. He bringeth four interpretations of the place: of which, the first onely (as he sayth) may serve our turne in any part. But the first, third, and fourth, are in divers Interpreters conjoined. And there is scarce any grave Interpreter, which doeth not gather so much from the context, as we require. See Ierome, Arias Montanus, Oecolampadius, Calvin, Zanchie, Tremelius, Lunius, Sir W. Raughtly, himself, in the fore-noted place, observeth.
A fresh suit against Ceremonies: veth the summe: Although the name of Baal be justly to be used toward God; yet in respect that the same was given Idol, God both hated it, and forbad it. And it is not credible, that so many, and such Divines, should make collection, which hath no foundation in their interpretation of the text.

SECT. 4.

Concerning the equitie of the Commandements formerly mentioned; &c.

1. The third proof (sayth the Replicer) in the briggement standeth thus: The equitie of the Commandements is thus set downe in Scriptures: 1. The detestation which our jealous God beareth unto all instruments and tokens of Idolatrie, Exod. 20.5.6. Deut. 7.25.26. 2. That we cannot be sayd sincerely to have repented of Idolatrie, &c. except we be ashamed of, and cast away the instruments and monuments of it. 1. Chron. 33. 15. Is. 1.29. and 2.26. and; 22. 2. Cor. 7.11. See Calvin in Deut. fern. 52. Eph. 3. that we shall be in danger to be corrupted. Ex. 34.15. Deut. 7.25.26. Iudg. 2.13. Gal. 2.5. 4. We shall harder Idolaters. Ezek. 16.54. 1. Cor. 6.10. 5. There is more danger in Popish Ceremonies, because the Pope is Antichrist, and we converse more with Papists, then with other Idolaters. Now of all these reasons, and alleg
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Yet he goeth about (by many words) to persuade the Reader, that heer was no fault. To this end he speaketh of a Mark: shew, and shew by the Deu of the Deu, his professed method (to professe a full answer unto all objected, and answer what he pleased to object to himselfe) of professe and injurions dealing, that he should be told of this truth, of works, guards, and gallant shews, and garments only, in so many reasons, and Scriptures: What aile you? (saue he) What meane you? To all this, I answer nothing.

2. He himselfe undertaketh to answer all. To this therefore I will attend, according to the skill I have.

2. His generall answer is, that these five reasons of equity, doe not prove, that we are bound unto all and the very same ways of repressing Idolatrie, &c. which the Jews were bound to. This we confess, as the Reu. testifieth, neither could they, upon that supposition, be called five reasons of equity onely, but of rigor. And what a kinde of answering is this; to say, reasons doe not proove that which they were not brought to proove? The question is, whether they do not proove, that it is contrary to Gods Word to use (much more to command the use of) such Ceremonies in the worship of God, as man hath devised, if they be notoriously knowne, to have beene of olde, and still to be abused unto Idolatrie, by the Papiists, especially if the same be now of no neccessary use in the Church? This was the oppsition,
A fresh suit against Ceremonies.

for proffe whereof, these five reasons of equity were brought. And for this we have all our Divines that confound Popish Images, out of the selfe-same places of Scripture, as Vrcline on the Second Commandement, Ps. lanus, Syntag. lib. 9. cap. 26. and whom not?

His answer in particular, is first, to Exod. 20. 3. 6. Deut. 7. 25. 36. Isai. 1. 29. and 30. 32. that these places speakes Idols themselves, or their garnish, not of indiffernt Ceremonies. But 1. these places were not alleged against indiffernt Ceremonies, but against Ceremonious instrumens and tokens of Idolatry, not necessary unto true worship.

2. If they make against the use, or urging of those thing which are either Idols, or Idols garnish (as is confesed) it is sufficient. For the Cross is an Idol, and both Cross and Surplise, are the Garnish of Idols.

4. Some of these places (sayth the Rejoynder) are grossely mistaken, misalleged, and abused, as Is. 1. 1. 29. 20. Where confusion, and not Godly shame for sinne is spake of: Ezech. 16. 54. not speaking of hardening others: 1. Cor. 10. speaking of a thing in it selfe or ill: Exod. 34. 12. in Deut. 7. 4. speaking of marriage and league with Heathen: and Gal. 2. 5. not respecting Ceremonies abused. To the first answer, 1. that the shame and confusion judiciall which is brought upon Idolaters, is because they are not ashamed unto repentance. 2. All those of whom the Prophet speakeoth, were not judicially confounded, but penitentially ashamed. Ier. 31. 19. Ezech. 16. 54. should have beene joyned to the former allegations, as speaking mens shame in themselves, not of hardening others: 1. Cor. 10. condemneth embolding others to sin.
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eating things offered to Idols, though it were otherwise lawfull, as appeareth, 1 Cor. 10. 29. And a question may be made, whether it had beene more unlawfull, to eat such things in the Idols Temple, then to take from thence things notoriously knowne to be such, and eat them in Christian Congregations, at Love-feasts? Exo. 34. 12. Deut. 13. 4. speake not onely of a civill, but also of religious league, such as should hinder them from breaking downe their Altars, Images, Groaues, &c. as uniu-
us (in his Anal.) noteth, and the words immediatly followeing shew. Gal. 2. 5. placing danger in conformity to Jewish Ceremonies, doeth insinuate as much (at the least) in conformity to Idolaters.

5. The Rejoynder addeth, that Isai. 1. 29. and Iude 23. confute our assertion: because men may pray in Gardens, and a garment spotted with the flesh, being washed, might be used. And such confutations the Rejoynder aboundeth with. But wee can distinguish betwixt Gods good necessary creatures, and mans inventions of Idolatrous abuse, and unnecessary use.

Yet Gardens might not be used by the Jews, for their ceremoniall solemne worship. Neither is every washing polluted garment sufficient to make it fitting for an honest man, that hath other clothes to put on. The washing of a Cross, is like the washing of a piece of clay, or of a Leopards spots.

6. Now Sir (sayth the Rejoynd.) You have your will. The third proofe is examined, and found to be light, facing to bee repented of, as having abused men. Base an acquegost Boulton: The whole proofe is not examined. Nothing
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is said to the substance of the reasons, but only to the ceremonies, which yet are not found to be light, facing, abusive, &c. And nothing at all is said to the fifth reason: Seeing the Pope is revealed to be that great Antichrist, 2 Thes. 2. Apoc. 17. and his Idolatrie troubleth the Church, as this day, more than any other, and our people converse more with Papists, then with any other Idolater, there is more danger in retaining the Ceremonies and reliques of Popery, then of any other Idolatry whatsoever: Lev. 18. 3.

See Calvin.

7. Calvin was allledged in his 52. Sermon on Deut. speaking thus: If we have any drop of good zeal in us, it must needs vex and grieve us, to see the marks and signes of Idolatry: And that we must to the utmost of our power, deface them. The Rejoynder answereth, that he spake this of proper instruments and monuments of Idolatry; and namely, of Images. Which we willingly grant except he meane by proper such as never any belide Idolaters, either before, since, or at the same time, did use. And we adde, that the Croste is more than a proper instrument of Idolatry: because it is an Idol: Neither hath either the Defend. or Rejoynd. denied, as yet, that it is an Idol. We adde also, that mystical Ceremonies, are (in Calvins phrase) Images, either living, such as Gods institutions, or dead, as mens inventions. Inst. lib. 8. ch. 11. sect. 13. Addde lastly, that seeing the Def. and Re have admitted historical Images, as of the same nature with other mystical Ceremonies (in the former chapter) it is too late now to distinguish their natures.
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8. A second place of Calvin, is out of epist. 87. where he warneth the L. Protector of England, that nothing but pretence must be tolerated in the Church, which me ytther from Satan, or from Antichrist. To this the Rej. (calling for all Calvin) answereth, that Calvin that Epistle, speakeh against precise extremities above ceremonies; and that he professedly intended rather to exempe
Ceremonies from those here condemnned: as appeareth by judgment of the Service booke in Q. Marius time, the adumer of were sent unto him from Franch fort, by M. Knox, and M. Whittingham, not one whit bettered (as the Rej. saith dare say) & out of his Epist. to Bull. an. 1551. &c. Now because he will have all Calvin, he shall have enough Calvin.

Thus therfor he writeth unto the L. Protes:eur, I come the other head about abolishing and plucking up by the very cubs and corruptions, which the Devil in the ages past brought into Gods ordinance. It is evident that the Chris-
in or religion of Popery is baslydly and false. Where-
if we resolve to bring the people out of that gufe, we must bow the Apostles example 1. Cor. 11. From Whence is gene-
thought: that when men would reforme as they ought to do acceptably to God, they must then seak themselves to the word of God. For look how many mixtures do remaine, so many pollutions are there which distract men from the right use of those things which Lord had appointed for their salvation. Wherefore while he sink as that, is but in part pumps out, things cannot be good to be as the, should be. specially when religion appears ra-
masked, then sincere and wish open face, which I therefore

Cccc 3.
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note because I perceive many new a-days of another judgment, as if petty abuses were to be let alone, as long as greater matters be removed. Whereas contrari-wise experience it self sheweth what a fester soyle and fruitfull seed-plot of lies, mans invention is, that being but thin sown (as it were) with lesser graines, groweth so such a heape as if his nature did intend nothing else. Now the Scripture is far different from this. When David speaks of idols, he proffesseth their names should not go in or out at the dores of his lips, so sh should steadfast. Let us remove our foot as far as possibly we can from all the leaven of Satan. For what were all these Ceremonies but many who Christ in incitements to lead feeble soules untoward mischief, even snares to catch them in? But if we take that the prophet may be warned (forsooth) lest they stumble, yet not understanding who doth not behold men harden? them? So that doth that warning a saile to any purpose. Herefore if any such thing be left untouched, it will be but the foment and fuel of greater mischief, and a very blind set up to hinder sin.

De Drine from all entrance as was met.
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for, and that with such Arguments, as no Defender or Rejoynder will ever answer? 2. Whereas he sayeth that he darest say Mr. I. nox and Wissingham sent the heads of the Service-booke not one who bettered, insinuating that they made the worst they could of it, quoting the Discourse of Transfo troubles, it is as much as to say, he dare deny, that which those good men sayd, and proved (by representing their writing) concerning their owne fact, without any reason. Surely their conclusion was this: Other things not so much shame, as pittie, compelleth us to keep close:

Note (sayth the Author of that Discourse) that the description is very favorably put down. If you conferre it with the booke, and the usage of the same in many Churches of this Realme, you can confess no lesse. And thereof you may gather, what M. Calvin would have written, if they had noted all the abuses of the same. Beside the Letter itself (written by M. K. and M. Wh. unto Calvin) is to be seen & read, in that Discourse; where mention is made of the Surplice, Kneeling, and Cross; But none of Confirmation, Offerings, Womens Purification, and such other things as the Rejoynder would have Calvin onely to have respected.

3. For Calvines Epistles to Balingger, 1551. they were two: and in the first, epist. 120. he excuseth onely as tolerable in extremitie, the Cornerd cap, and Roches: and what is this to our Ceremonies urging and urging? In the second epist. 121. he exhorteth the Protestant, to help Hope, standing even against those poperies. What can the Rejoynder gleane from hence. 3. As for that
that the Rejoynder addeth, that Calv. Instit. lib. 4. cap. 17. sect. 37. (for Easter day was handled before) professedly alloweth our kneeling, it is nothing so. For he speaketh only against the Papists kneeling unto the Holy Procession; and for aggravation of that Idolatrie, saith that in the Supper it self, we may kneel to Christ. There is not one word of such kneeling as ours is. There is no Non-Conformist, which refuseth to kneel unto Christ, in the celebration of the Lords Supper.

9. But Calvin (sayth the Def.) hath these words: 'that in labouring to remove such things as may seem to nourish Idolatrie, we must take heed of being too superstitious, urging too vehemently things in their own nature indifferent. To which there needeth no answer, then this: we assent to those words, without any exception. Also Calvin, the Replier made mention of Martyr, Gzas, Wolphius, Vrsinus, Machabaeus, Zanchius, Similus, Zepurus, Fulke, and the Authors of our Homilies, as quoted in the Abridgement (pag. 24.) to the same purpose. But the Rejoynder thought not them worth the answering in special: and therefore I must leave them to consideration only. To the rest of this Section I answer nothing but, Nihil dicet.
SeCT. 5.

Concerning Daniels abstinentce.

Here nothing is handled but Daniels example, Dan. 1. 8. Neither doeth the Rejoynder adde any thing to the Defendant, but onely, that Daniels forbearance of the Kings meat, was grounded on speciall ceremoniall injunctions of God, and not upon our morall rule, that the abuse had made the use unlawfull; nor was this a Ceremony in Gods worship. To which I answer that our argument is also grounded on the equitie of Ceremoniall injunctions, and that equity is our morall rule.

2. It must needs be, that if good meats (not otherwise uncleane) were unlawfull unto Daniel, then it was because they were defiled by Idolatry: which is all that this place was alleged for.

3. If this was not a Ceremony of Gods worship, the Argument is so much the stronger: because all Christians know, that whatsoever is unlawfull out of Gods worship, the same (not being by God appropriated to his worship) is much more unlawfull in it.

D d d d s e c t.
Sect. 6.

Concerning Hezekiah's breaking down the brazen Serpent.

This example is so pregnant, that it hath by all sorts of Divines beene used and improved to so much as our Proposition doth require from it. The Superstitious Authors of the Canon-law, could not shut their eyes wholly against this light. For so D. Abbot (Def. of Mr. Perk. part. 1. pag. 168.) transl. that law, Dist. 63, cap. Quia. If our predecessors have done some things which at that time might be without fault, and afterwards bee turned to error and superstition; we are taught by Hezekiah's breaking the brazen Serpent, that the posterity may abolish the same, without any delay, and with great authority. And the same Doctor Abbot confesseth, the force of this consequence from Hezekiah's example, to make against such private use of the Cross, now, as Constantin, and the ancient Christians had of it. What then but the time, did hinder that good and learned man, from seeing that it maketh much more against the public like use of the same Cross in Baptisme? I never yet could meet with that Papist, which denied the consequence: The brazen Serpent (having beene God's owne ordi- nance) was for Idolatrous abuse, to be abolished. Therefore hu- man inventions, for like abuse, much more. Yet the Def
and Rej. deny it. With what reason, shall appear.

2. The Def. gave five reasons for Hezekiah's abolishing the Serpent. To which it was replied, that no man doubteth, but Hezekiah had reasons, more than five, for that he did: and that the like may be alleged for abolishing of our Ceremonies. This last (faith the Rej.) shou'd have been shewed. So it is (say I) in the following dispute.

Let them (addeth the Replier) be abolished by publike authority, and I will undertake, reasons to justifie the action done, will easily be acknowledged, even of those that now can see none to perswade unto the doing of it. Like enough; (answeth the Rej.) and well enough: because it is lawfull, and just to abolish them as inconvenient. Now let this be well noted. In the generall answer to this Argument, it was pleaded (pag. 406.) that Ceremonies abused to Idolatry are to be abolished, if they be not conveniently necessary. Heere our Ceremonies so abused, are confessed to be such, as that, if they were once abolished by publike authority, reasons could easily be found to prove them justly abolished as inconve-nient. So that nothing but publike authority, doth make them justifiable, or free from such inconvenience as deser-veth and requireth the abolishing of them. And who can conceive such a vertue in publike authority, as to make that morally convenient which before was inconve-nient? or to make reasons forceable, for justifying an action done, which are not forceable for justifying the same, as to be done? Our cause by this confession, wanteth nothing but one Fact, or act of publike authority, to make it justifiable; so farre at least, as concerneth this questi-
on: whether the Ceremonies are to be abolished or no.

3. Because the Def. did make this one ground of denying our consequence from Hezekiah's zeal against the monuments of Idolatry, that He did not abolish the Idols which Solomon suffered to bee set up in favour of his strange wives; because they were (at that time) neglected Idols.

It was replied, that it may well be thought, they were destroyed by Hezekiah, and set up againe before the time of Josiah. This the Rej. calleth rashnesse to be repented of; because it is said (2. Reg. 23. 13.) that Josiah destroyed those high places, which Solomon had set up. And was it such a rashnesse, to say that it may be thought so? the phrase is more modest then theirs, who peremptorily affirme those Idols to have beene neglected untill after Hezekias time; when the Scripture testifieth plainly, that Abaz, Hezechias his father, worshipped Moloch (which was one of those Idols) by making his sonne to passe thorow the fire; and was so madly given to superstition, that he sacrificed under every gree tree. 2. Reg. 16. Nay, so it was said, then some learned have with great probability affirmed: namely, that these Idols with their appurtenances were first defaced by Solomon himselfe, after his repentance; and being restored after by Idolaters, were againe defaced. Salianus (in his Annals ad 3309.) faith thus: We think also that while Solomon lived, that whole ship of Idols was broken up and ruined. And with all, the statues, the groves, and altars, as also the rest of idolatrous monuments 2. King. 23. 13. to have reference to Manasses and Ammon (who had set them up in the same place, and upon the same foundation) and not to Solomon, who died
Where he sheweth by divers instances, both out of Scripture, and out of common speech, how that word which doeth not always note the same singular substance; therein confuting all the ground that the Rej. had for confuting the Repl. of rashnesse to bee repented of. This sentence is the more also to be favoured; because according to the other, which our Def. and Rej. maintaine, it will be very hard to answer that objection against Solomon's repentance, which Rabanus on 2. Reg. 23. grounded on that superstition: Solomon never truly repented of his idolatry: for if he had manifested fruits worthy repentance, he would have taken order with those idols, which he had set up by removing them, and (being so wise a man) never have left them to stand for stumbling blocks to fools, as if what he had erroneously devised, had been well and wisely done. Beside all this, it is not credible, that the same individual Temples stood by Jerusalem from Solomon's time,
time, to Iosias; if it were but for this, that the Assyrians
came even unto the gates of Icrusalem, spoiling and
breaking down all costly buildings, (such as Solomon's
Temples were) not sparing, but deriding the gods of Na-
tions. 2. Reg. 18.

4. It was added by the Replier that those Idols
should have been destroyed, (though they had been for
the time, neglected) because that evil for which Iosias
destroyed them ought as well to have been prevented,
as corrected. To this the Rejoynder answers that
this is not true, except Hezekia had suspected that evil.
And whoe will say, that ther is no cause to suspect evil
of an Idol, though it be for a time neglected? Or can
any man thinke, that if Israelites had neglected them, the
Sidonian, Moabite, or Ammonite, gave occasion of any
evill to be suspected by those Idols? The Spanish and
Frenche Papists (to say nothing of English) when they are
passing by the Cross in Cheapside, doe reverence unto it,
give they not cause to suspect, some evill to cleave unto
it? 2. The same means (sayth the Rejoynder) are al-
ways requisite for prevention, which must be used for re-
verie. Yes truely, about Idols (if we judge out of the
Scripture) the very same means. Burne then (sayth the
Rejoynd.) all your Popish bockes, lest they fall into the hand
of Popelings to abuse them. So will I certainly, if you
can shew me, that they must be burned when Pop-
elings have had them in their hands, and abused them
which heer you grant concerning these Idols.

5. Zanchius was cited by the Defend. to prove, that
this abolishing is not the univerfall remedie for all aba-

les,
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And because the Replier could not finde the place, we are by the Rejoynder directed to the later edition, pag. 678, where I finde these words: This rule is to be observed: that things grown to abuse & defiled by superstition, if they be indifferent may, yea, of times, ought, to be taken away. Here (I hope) is nothing against our proposition. And yet the Deo hath nothing else to catch at, nothing else (I say) but those wordes: they may be removed, as signifying, that they may also not be removed: As if every thing that may be removed, may also not be removed! The Rejoynder addeth, that he admitteth of some Feast-days, as tolerable. I grant, he speaketh something favorable of them: but therein, he neither speaketh to our question directly, nor in that how that which he sayth may be accorded with his owne rule. But pag. 800. (sayth the Rejoynder) he restrayneth the consequence to things manifestly Idolatrous, not to indifferent rites. So doe we also: But the Rejoynder as it seemeth, maketh Salomons Idols, (if they be for a time neglected) indifferent rites, which Zanchie never did. Nay Zanchie pag. 649. from this example of Hezekiah, reprooveth those that keep in secret the monumens of Superstition, though out of Churches. True (sayth the Rejoynder) but between such Monuments, and indifferent Ceremonies, he distinguisheth. And so doe we, in some sense: but that things otherwise indifferent, may by becoming monuments, prove unlawful, Zanchie never denied. To Zanchie, were added (in the Abriage, pag. 24.) as witnesses of our consequencie from Hezekias his example, Augustine, Calvin.
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Calvin, Martyr, Wolphins, Lavater, Sadeel, Jewell, Bilson, Fulke, Rainolds, Andruce, and Perkins. To all these it was unseasonable (sayth the Rejoynder) to answer at full, in this place. We must therefore wayt (though in vayne) for a place which will seeme seasonable.

6. The Defender in fine, noted two disparities betwixt the brazen Serpent, and our Ceremonies: 1. That the Idolatrie of the Jews about that was publicke, general, and in the same Churche; which is not so with our Ceremonies. 2. That there was no other meanes to cure the Idolatrie of those times; as now there is. To the former it was answered 1. That these circumstances are not rendred as reasons of abolishing the brazen serpent, in the Text, but invented by the Def. True (faith the Rej.) yet any man may conceive that they might be reasons. But for generality, I cannot conceive how it can be proved: and the publike abuse, though it might be reason, yet not such a one, as that with it, abolishing should be used, or suspended. But our Ceremonies (ad- deth the Rej.) must in comparison be likened to the brazen Serpent used well, at Jerusalem; which ought not to have beene abolished, for such another in relation to that, set up at Bethel, and made an Idol. Wherein he mistaketh much, For first our Ceremonies were never good, or well used. Calvin is allowed of by the Def. and Rej. for his moderation about them. Let him therefore speake: I answer the turne-caste, What is there in the Papacy unlike the brazen Serpent, except only the original? Epist. 265. The Papists Ceremonies are naught from the beginning. 2. The Papists did not take these Ceremonies from us, but we from them,
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It may be very well questioned, whether the serpent at Jerusalem, considered as no way commanded of God, should not have beene abolished, if the ten Tribes should have taken occasion by it of Idolatry? It was answered 2. that private idolatry is also to be removed, as well as publike. That cannot be de facto, saith the Rejoynder. Yet thus farre it may be very well de facto, that nothing be used in publike, which is knowne to nourish idolatry in private. It was answered 3. That all these circumstances did more then agree to our Ceremonies, in the beginning of our reformation. To this it is rejoyned 1. that our Ceremonies were never the object of grosse idolatry: which he would not have said, if he had thought of the Cross, or that the proper means of idolatry are as well to be abolished, as the objects. The 2. rejoynder is, that though they ought to have beene removed; in the beginning of reformation, yet now not: which is as if a debtor should pleade, that he owed indeed so much money to his creditour long agoe, but now (though it hath beene every yeare called for) he is quit by deferring the payment. Sure (sayth the Repl.) our Ceremonies are not growne better since the reformation, by any good they have done. That is not beene considered (answereth the Rejoynder) but if they bee not grown to lesse abuse? As if lesse superstition, with much mischiefere, were not enough to cashiere such Ceremonies as doe no good!

To the second disparitie, it was replied, that this is the very question, whether any other means be sufficient to cure the diseaue of human Ceremonies idolatrously.
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truly abused, beside abolishing? This (sayth the Rej.) you make a question of. And was not the Defend. disputing against us? what reason then had he, to make our question an argument, or answer against us? It was replied also, that experience hath shewed the disease of our Ceremonies is not cured, in the Dominions of our Hezekia. Yet (sayth the Rej.) the means (without abolishing) may be sufficient, if they were well applied, that is, given and received. As if the same means would not have been in like manner sufficient in Hezekias time, against the Idolatry of the Serpent, if they had been well applied i.e. given, and received! Heerin certainly is no dispa-
rity.

A piece of a Comparison, betwixt the Primitive, &
the present English Church.

1. Because the Def. 3. or 4. times, repeated, and ur-
ged, (as much making for his cause) that our Church is truly reformed, that it doeth most live; express the face, &
full body of her Primitive Mother-Church; the Repl. there-
for at last, was forced to say somthing to this; especially
in this place, where it is questioned, if we will allow it to
be called a reformed Church. He answered thersfor in gen-
erall, that in the maine points of doctrine, and the
grossst Superstitions, our Church is reformed; but in
regard of Ecclesiastical governement, and some Cer-
emonies, it is not. To this it is rejoyned, 1. That by fact
and body, was meant only doctrine and religion, not go-
vernment, or Ceremonies. The Defend. thersfor under-

flood
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Good this term, as Cardinall Perone; and the Replier as
Andres, whose in the beginning of his answer, hath
these words: Points of faith seem rather to pertayne to the
inward parts, then to the face. It is the Agenda of the Church,
he should have held him to. In that is the face of the Church,
&c. After this, the rejoinder making all the Primitive Church,
that was within divers hundreds of years after the Apostles age,
out of the Centurie-writers, and others, gathereth a catalogue of errors and defects, in
document, and observances, which by little and little,
began in those times; and thence concludeth, that our
doctrine is purer then it was in the Primitive Church, and al-
so some observances. Now 1. this extention of the Primitive
Church is taken without leave. 2. Those errors of
doctrine may no more be attributed to the Primitive
Church, then the errors of Mr. Mountague, and others
like him (who are neither few in number, nor meane
for power, as things goe) may be to the English Church,
3. In the other matters of Ecclesiastical Policy, and Cer-
emonies, we hold that for which the Rejoynder for-
merly objected unto us, as a spirit of singular singularity,
pg. 384. and now confesseth to be true; namely, that the
Apostolical purity began presently after to be corrupted, and
so proceeded in defection more and more. Yet all this
doeth not hinder, but divers corruptions may be found
among us, which were not knowne in the first primitive
ages. Nay let it be marked well, how strange an assertion
is made up by this reckoning of the Rejoynders! In
Hezekias time (saith the Defendant) the idolatry about the
Serpent, could not be cured but by abolishing the Serpent: but

E e e 2
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in our most truly reformed Church, which doth most lively express the face and full body of her Primitive Mother Church, this disease would be found curable without any such extremity. The meaning is according to the Rejoynder's interpretation; the disease of idolatry is more easily cured, in that Church, which doth lively express the face, and full body, of these Churches, which were infected with many errors, and declining in many things, to superstition, then in Hezekias Church, most purely at that time reformed. Surely the Rej. in a great part of his glosses, forgot his text; otherwise he would never have in this manner confuted it.

Cathedrall musick with Organs.

2. The first question was, If the Primitive Church had such chainting Idol-service, as is in our Cathedrall Churches? The Rejoynder after some words spent about singing, (about which he bringeth not the least resemblance of that in question, until the fourth age after Christ) excepteth first, that organ musick was gods ordinance in the old Testament, and that is significant, or typicall; and therefore is sinfully called Idol-service. 2. That all men whose hearts are not adverse, by distraction, stupidity, or prejudice, seeth such musick to work much upon their affections. To this I say, that his denying of Organall musick to have beene significant or typicall, is without reason, and against the current of our Divines; taken (as it may seeme) out of Bellarmine de missa. lib. 2. cap. 15. who useth this evasion against those
those words of P. Martyr: Musical organs pertain to the Jewish Ceremonies, and agree no more to us, then Circumcision. So that we may neglect it, and take him as saying, that nothing which was ordained in the old Testament (no not sacrificing of beasts) is now an Idol-service. 2. For that, and the other, both together, it is fit the rejoynder should be put in minde how many, and what kinde of men, he accuseth of distraction, stupiditie, or prejudic:!

1. Thomas Aquinas (in whose time this faction was not in generall request, much lesse in the Primitive) in 22.q.91.2.4. Opposeth thus: The Church useth no musick for divine praises, lest it should seeme to indure, and anwereth thus: Musical instruments doe more stirre up the minde to delight, then frame it to a right disposition. In the old Testament there was some need of them, both, &c, and also because they did figure out something. Erasimus, in 1. Cor.

14. Seyth thus: We have brought a tedious and player-like musicke into the Church, a tumultuous noyse of many voyces, such as I thinke was not heard among the Theaters of Greeks or Romans. For which purpose, whole flockes of bores are maintaine at great charges, whose age also is all the more learning such gibble gabble. As such cost is the Church so, a peculiar thing, &c.

It is evident that some Ecclesiasticall chanting and roarings in our Temples (scarcely also understood of the Priests themselves) is a most foolish and vain abuse, and a most pernicious let to piety. I make no question but all that kinde of musicke
muscike was a part of the legall pedagogie. In the solemne worship of God, I doe not judge it more susable, thin if we should recall the incense, tapers, and other shadowes of the Law, into use. I say againe, to goe beyond what we are taught, is most wicked pernicacy.

It would be too tedious, if I shou'd reckon up all that have assented to these. I will adde onely the two and thirde grave learned men, which were chosen in King Edward dayes, to reforme Ecclesiastical lawes, and obedience: they judged this law fitting. It likes us well to have this dious kinde of muscike taken away. Certainly these were neither distracted, nor slupid men: whence their prejudic came, let the Rejoynder himselfe judge.

Chancellours, Commissaries, and Officials.

3. The second question was about these children of the earth, dealing with the keyes of Christ Heavenly Kingdome, whether they can bee founde in the face, or body of the Primitive Church? The Rep. answereith plainly and roundly, No. Yet these humane creatures, are those that keep most misrule among poore Christian men and Ministers also, in Ecclesiastical censures, of suspension, and excommunication, with intolerable exactions. That afflication therefore of the Defend that the Church of England dought most lively expresse the fac
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and full body of her Primitive Mother-Church, is in one
great part of it, dashed by the Rejoynder his No. 2. The
Rejoynd. addeth, nor did any Presbyters execute any Church
Censures, without leave or consent of their Bishops, or unprea-
thing Elders at all, execute any Censures of the Church. Now
1. this is nothing to the purpose, but a meere diversion,
that something might seeme to be said beside No. 2. For
the first, I answer with Junius in Bel. Cont. 5. lib. 7. cap.
14. an. 27. Censures are in common to be acted by the
Presbytery: so that as the other Presbuters did not act them
without the consent of the chiefe Presbyter, or Bishop,
so neither could any Bishop do it without them, of and
by himselfe. That Bishops afterward dared so to doe, it
was tyrannidis indignis, meere tyranny. 3. For the confu-
sion of the second, I propound a remarkable place in
Origen, against Celsus lib. 3. extant also in his Philocalia,
collected by Gregorie Naz. and Basil, let forth in greeke
and latine, by Taurinus: were cap. 18. Vnto Celsus, ob-
jecting that Christian teachers sought for simple foolish
auditors, Origen answereth, that Christian teachers did
first discern and try their auditors; and of the approv-
ored, they had two orders, one of beginners (that were
instructed) and another of those which had made fur-
ther progress. And among these latter (distinct from
teachers) he relateth thus: Some are appointed who are to
look to the life and manners of such as are admitted, that they
which doe ought unseemly, may, as need shall require, be ex-
cluded the Congregation, and they which doe otherwise, may
be cherished, and dayly grow better. This is the translation
of Taurinus. The rest of the Rejoynder to this question
hath...
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Pompos Bishops with sole power of Ordination and Excommunication.

4. The question is if any suche were in the Primitive Church? The rejoynnder answereth concerning Pompe, that Peace and beneficence of Princes brings in this difference of outward estate. But all difference of outward estate was not meant by Pompe. For some Ministers, that have convenient means for a liberal kind of life, with hospitallitie, should be pompous. We are not so simple as to account the Pastor of Sutton Field, (as such) pompous. There is certainly a pompous state of a Baron, or Earl (which the Defence himself, at his third flight, unto Durham, is silent on that requireth many idle attendants, for no other but only for Comportment, & Lustre of state; that which must have so much time spent in brideling of the Bishop's horses, as the ancient B. B. tooke to preache divine sermons in, as M. Hooper speaketh; that which makes a poor man afraid to speak unto his Minister, with such trembling, as Majestie bredeth; that which would make it ridiculous, for a meane man to desire a visitation of him, for himself, his wife, or children, in sickness or other perplexitie; that which requires a Chapel not onely to doe other duties of religion for him, but even to give thankes at his table, and that standing, who
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He seth, that (to omit other characters) which maketh all his doings Lord-like, by way of Commandement: I will not hear speak of, draw an excommunication against him; take him pursuavs; sailour, see to your pris.

As being notorious in divers of them; but only note one example, out of mine owne experience, which many others can parallel by theirs: I was once, & but once (I thank God) before a Bishop: and being presented unto him, by the chief Magistrates of an Incorporation, for to be preacher in their towne; the lowly man first asked them, how they durst choose a preacher, without his consent? You (sayd he) are to receive the preacher that I appoint you. For I am your Pastor, though he never fed them. And then, turning to me, how durst you (sayd he) preach in my Diocese, without my leave? So that without any other reason, but meet Lordship, the whole Incorporation, and I, were dissuaded, to wait his pleasure: which I (for my part) have now done this twenty year, and more. If this kind of Pompe were in the Primitive Church, or if it be not in ours, the Replier may be blamed for mentioning Pompe in his Quarre.

2. Concerning Ordination, the Rej. his answer is, that the Bishop doth not (regularly) do it alone. What is this sole power of doing it? If an Irish or Welsh Bishop, ordaineth one at London in his chamber, or in some Chappell, and inviteth him that commanded the person to him, for to joyne with him, for fashion sake, in the gesture of hands imposing, be he of what place or Diocese soever, in whom is the power of Ordination? If the Bishop
Bishop of London, ordaineth a minister at large, and biddeth his Chaplain, or Chaplaines, doe so much as add their hands to the business, is there power in the Chaplain, more then in any other, that by chance may be present? Power of Ordination is not given (by our Lawes) to individua vaga, that is to say, Vagrant men, whom the Law taketh no notice, such as were wont to be called Hedge-Priests, but to authorized Prelates. These are toyes, to mocke the Church (if not God with. Such doeings were never heard of in that Church which deserveth the title of Primitive. Of Excommunication, the same answere is given; and so the same answere may serve. Let this onely be added, that therein, the Bishop hath such absolute power, that he may derive the same to his Chancellors, Commissaries, Officials, &c. like vnderlings, to be dispensed by them, even unto the commanding of Gods Ministers for to denounce their Censures, without any discerning what aequitie there is in the cause, and what assistance of Ministers is required, appeareth by this stile: John Hone, L' of Law official &c. to al Rectors, &c. For as much as we (proceeding rightly and lawfully) have adjudged all and every one, whose names are under-written to be excommunicated; and since the discreet Mr. Rouland Allen Preist, hath excommunicated them, by our meere office in Writing; we doe therefore commit to you &c. to declare openly, &c. given under the Seale of our offici- lity, such a day, and such a yeare. If any footsteps of such an approved power could be shewed in the Primitive Bishops, all Christians might merveyl at so suddain and monstrous a defection. But both Defend. and Rejoynd, know,
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A knows that it is a relic of Popedome.

Calling of Ministers, without express consent of the Congregations over which they are set.

5. The question was whether any such thing was in the Primitive Church? The rejoynder his answer is affirmative; that it seems ther was such a thing: because it is said only of the Apostles, that they ordained Elders in the Churches, Act. 14. 23. and Titus, Tit. 1. 5. appointed the Ministers. 2. Sometime Ministers were chosen by prophesy; and sometime by lot. 3. The people's consent was not held of divine necessity. For the great Council of Laodicea, Can. 13, restrained the people from choice of their Ministers. Beside, the people of this Land have given their implicit consent in Parliament, to such as the Patrons and Bishops call: And if they doe their parts, it is as well, and sometime better, than if they were chosen by the people. Finally, God hath not forbidden our manner of calling Ministers, nor commanded the other. When I, let it be marked, that the question was only of the people's consent; concerning which the rejoynder in all these words, answereth just nothing. 2. The first place he bringeth against the people's election, Act. 14. 21. is the chief place, which Protestants use to bring for it; as Bellarmine (de Ciceris, lib. 1. cap. 7.) observeth of it. This argument is the chief foundation of J. Jusius, Calvin, Chemins, and others. Of Bellarmine's answer, the rejoynder maketh an Argument against our Divines, who have confuted that answer, and so sufficiently answered his Argument, long before he framed it.
it: which yet he taketh no knowledge of, but nakedly propoundeth it, as if this were the first time of beating it off the stage. It is (sayth he) one ly sayd of the Apostles, not of the Churches, that they did ord. in Elders. Acts 14.23. So (say I) it is onely sayd of the Apostles, and not of the Churches, in the very same verse, that they did pray and fast: doeth it follow from hence, that the Churches have no hand, part or consent, in prayer and fasting? If not, then neyther doeth the onely mentioning of the Apostles in creating Presbyteres, exclude the peoples forne choice, much lesse their consent. If any man desire large and full clearing of the place, he may find it in Anius his Notes on Bellarmine, Contr. 5. lib. 1. cap. 7. annot. 59. 63. 64. where the Conclusion is, that Bellarmine doeth in this argument nugari, nothing but triste, disloying things that ought to be conjoined, as if there were contradiction betwixt these two Propositions: The Apostles ordained; the Churches ordained. If the Rejoynde would have brought a fittting example, he should have shewed us, that Paul, or Barnabas, being at Jerusalem, ordained a Minister, and sent him to Antioch, Iconium Lystra, signifying by letters, that such a man was appointed their Pastor, though they never knew, or heard of him before. For that had been something like unto the practice of a Bishop, whose upon the Patrons presentation, wheresoever he be, sendeth his Minister from the place, or Palace of his residence, unto a Congregation 20. 30. or 40. miles of; which poor despised People, must be content, with tolling of a Bell, as sufficient notice given of their Ministers fitnesse, and their necessitie to

acknow.
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3. In the second place Tit. 1:5. whereas our translation hath, that Titus was to ordain Ministers, the Rejoynder turneth ordaining into appointing, and I may better turne it into setting, or placing. Now (which soever translation be admitted) the Rejoynder's argument is lighter then a feather, except it be supposed that Titus could not effect that Ministers should be in every Church of Crete, neither by, nor with the Churches consent: which is too absurd a proposition for any reasonable man to believe. Take the Rejoynder's translation in ordinary rigour; Our King doeth appoint Bishops; and yet they are not placed in their Seats, without some kind of consent and election of others. And yet I hope the Rejoynder himself will not say, that Titus took so much upon him, as this commeth to.

4. As for choosing Ministers by Prophesies, that was very extraordinary, and therefore had no place in the question of ordinary calling. Yet 1. Prophesies did not less require the concurrence of the Churches consent, in an ordinary Minister, than it did the Presbyteries ordination in Timothies person, 1 Tim. 4:14. It was one of an extraordinary cause of that consent, which otherwise should have been grounded on the persons qualification. Prophesies also or visions did sometime follow the Churches election, as in Celerinus, of whom Cyprian (Epist. 34. ed. Goulart.) recordeth: When he wavered about consenting to the Church, by a vision of the night he was forced to assent.

5. As for election by lot, I do not thinke any example can be given of it, wherein the Churches election of
divers persons betwixt whom the lot should designe, with their consent, did not concurre.

6. As for the Primitive Churches tenet of Divine authority, nothing can be proved out of the Councell of Laodicea, which was after Italian time. The Synod of Africa (Epist. 68. Cypr. ed. Goul.) doth informe us thus: The people is selfe hath power both to chuse worthy priests and to refuse unworthy ones. The which also we see to come from Divine authority. Yet Calvin answereth, that even that Laodicean Councell did not restraine from election, but only from disorderly electing, by themselves. And therin learnedly seconed against Bellarmines rejoyned, by Junius, in Bell. Cont. 5. lib. 1. cap. 7.

7. As for implicit consent in Parliament, it maketh nothing to the question. And yet it cannot be proved that every thing decreed by Parliament, have the Churches implicit consent. For then the Church did implicitly consent unto all the alterations of religion, in King Henries, King Edwards, Q. Maries, and Q. Elizabeth's days, how opposite soever they were on to another neither can it be shewed lawfull, for the Churches of Christ, to leave their priviledges which Christ hath given them, to the pleasure of any Parliament.

8. To say, that the Patrons and Bishops sending without the Churches consent, is as good, or better then the Churches free consent, well ordered, and directed is all one as to say, it is as good, or better, that Wome should be married without their consent, then with it.

9. As for the final answer, I referre the Reader partly to that already sayd, and partly to D. Ames his an
Ministers going to law for their places.

6. The question is, if this was knowne in the Primitive Church? It is rejoyned 1. that Bishops were often in examination at Synods, about their title to their places, which was as much. But 2. This was not in the Apostles time.

2. Questioning before Synods, about Ecclesiastical affairs, is of Ecclesiastical nature; going to law, not so. In Synods all things ought to be determined by God's Word: at the Kings Bench, and Assizes, the Judges pronounce sentence by mans law. Yet the good ancient Bishops, were so farre from seeking a title to their places, by Synodical judgement, that they withdrew themselves, as being afraid to have such a title put upon them, either by Churches or Synods: examples of which modestly, we have even in declining times, Basil, Gregoric &c. A law we finde also (Cod. de Epist. & Cler.) mentioning the same disposition: The Prelate ought to be so farre from ambition, that nothing but compulsion should draw him, though he be desired, let him give backe, and when incited, let him shift, &c. For certainly he is unworthy the office of Priesthood, unless he be ordained unwillingly. Certainly, these men would never have sought those places by course of law, which they hardly accepted, being obstructed upon them. 2. The Rejoynder sayth, Lawing about places ariseth upon the title of Patronage, a civil inheritance. Whereas the question is not from whence it ariseth, but if it appeared in the face of the Primitive Mother-Church?
Church. This answer is as much as to say, our Church hath a speciall wound, or sore in her face, which the Primitive Church had not; and therefore must have plaister upon it now, in those times unknowne: that is, our face doth not lively represent that face, which is the question. Beside, if the lawing be necessary, about the Patrons civill title, what hath the Minilctor to doe with it, except ambition or covetousnesse, doth cause him to take other mens businesse upon him, for his owne advantage?

Pluralists, Non-residents, Dumb-Ministers.

7. About these, the Rejond. confesseth that they are the sore of our Church, but not allowed, or tolerated, for he then Mr. Hooker sheweth. Now 1. If they be sore, being also in the face, that is, our chiefe eminent, Convocation men, bearing them in their fore-heads, surely they must needs disfigure the Primitive Face. 2. Though I have no more leisure to secke and confute Mr. Hookers mitigations, then the Rejoynd. had to allege them, yet I shoulde if the Stues be tolerated, and allowed at Rome, that sores are tolerated, and allowed in England, they are well knowne; more publiquely protestted; they are practised in the Bishops Palaces; and not onely the Convocation Faculties, but most Bishops doe gainde by them. But, saith the Rej.) If you can tell us the Certaine and safe remedies of this sore, I am perswaded the Church will thank you. But I am neither so perswaded of the Convocation Church, nor yet that the Rejoynder himselfe is so perswaded. Men
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... does not usually give thanks, for that which formerly they did not desire, and if this Church had desired a reme- die, the Convocation-men would long since have begun (according to their skill and power) with themselves, their Chaplaines, the Benefices in their gifts, &c. They would also have hearkened unto Parliament-remedies of wise and careful Physitians, which have been often prescribed, prepared, tendered, & almost applied, but by the Convocation-men, refused, and opposed, as the world knoweth, and the Rej. is not ignorant of it. In the close of this question, the Rej. insinuateth, and (as half ashamed) onely insinuateth a secret distinction, bet- twixt careless Non residents, and another kind, of them that are careful: the former of which he affirmeth to have beene often condemned, though never removed. Of which distinction, as being left obscure, I cannot speake so much as I muse. Onely this: Carefull Non-residents seeme to be such as have great care to get some pretense in Court, University, or some great mans house, for absenting themselves from their charges (which God hath laid upon them, if they be lawfully called) and some care to provide a tolerable Curate, for supplying their places. Now these the Rej. seemeth to excuse, for which they are more beholding to him, then the Churches are, upon whose spoyles they live, and aspiring by them unto higher places. And as for the careless Non- residents, how commeth it to passe, that non conformi- ty can as easily be removed, as condemned; and such condemned felons as these, be so long reprieved, after their condemnation? Certainly, if they were as great enemies...
enemies to the BisHop's kingdome, as they are to Christ, a quicker dispatch would have beene made of them.

Simony.

8. Of this, it was asked, if it were so ordinary either in the Primitive Church, or (almost) in the Popish, as it is in England? Here the Rejoynder venteth a proverb, that almost saveth many a lye; adding, that the Papists faces are washed with faire water, and soule water cast upon us: and then telleth of a Canon imposing an oath for prevention of Simony: and not onely the guilty man loseth his place, but the Patron his title, for that time. Now though all this be nothing to the Primitive Churches face, yet it is not so to be passed over. For (to begin with the last 1. The course taken against Simony, which he spake of, is no Canon of the Convocation house, but a Parliament-law. Canons (I hope) do not deprive Patrones of their title, which they have by civill inheritance, as the Rejoynder told us even now. 2. This oath imposed (it bee generally urged) doth make our English Simony worse then that which is found among Papists, assaying perjury unto it. 3. Because the Rej. will not take the confidante limitation of almost, in other sense, that as if it were the cover of a lye, I am content it be left out and then desire him to prove the assertion a lye. If it cannot, it had beene sufficient for him (whoso familiarly accuseth others of scurrility) to have denied the which was said, putting us to prove it. And prove
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we can (so farre as vices of that nature use to be prooved) by the generall voyce, even of conformable men. Doctor Andrewes (long since) in a latine Sermon before the Convocation, tolde them enough, after his playing fashion: They give out, that not one of the Minorites doe with money, or more basely purchase our Parsonages, but also you Majorites doe either with great summes of money, or with the spoyle of the Churches, unworthily הבשובר your Cathedral places, of which dissease our Church hath long beene sick, and for which it hath long beene ill spoken of: Did his fere, or almost all save a ly? If it did then, now it hath not so much to save. For many conformable men, will almost (if I may use that word with good leave) swear, that nothing hath hindered them all their dayes, from Benefices, and kept them in Curate ships, but onely the general abuse of Simony. Every Page, and Lackie, at the Court, and many Scriviners, can tell, how much this and that Bishop, or Deane, gave to such or such a Buckingham, and how much the said Bishop received from his under Officers, and other, by him promoted. Neither is all Symony in buying of Benefices, and Bishoprickes. Selling of Visitations (which is an usuall practise of our Prelates) and such like trickes are in the same nature in the fourth degree. 4. As for washing the Papists faces with faire water, the Rejoynder may as well say, that he washed Sodoms face with faire water, who said, that Israel, and Judah, had justified Sodome in her abominations.

Gggg 2 Prophane
9. The question was, if so many such were members of any Primitive Church? This the Rejoynder doth not affirm: but denieth any members of our Church to contemne profession our Religion. Which I leave to the judgement of every Reader; if he doeth not know some in England, who contemne Religion? I would to God, the Rejoynder were (in this point) on the true part, and the Replier on the false. But when the practice of Religion is derided on stages, and that derision applauded by so many spectators, when those that make conscience of sinne, be they never so conformable, are scorned by so many, as Puritans; when in all Pulpits that are possessed of good Preachers, warning is ordinarily given, of scoffers and scorners at Religion: I thinkke the Rejoynder will not finde so many assenting to this negation, as he shall to the point of Conformitie. His meaning is such, that by the same reason, it may be sayd, there is no professed contemner of all Christian Religion, among the Papists, nor of all Religion, among the Turkes.

Carnal proceedings in Spiritual Courts.

10. The question was, if suche courses were in the Primitive Church? The Rejoynder confesseth no. But (sayth he for excuse) they are not instituted, nor allowed by
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Church. The confession I accept: the excuse cannot be excused. Are not those courses instituted, or allowed, which are every day practised, in the Bishops, Chancellors, Commissaries, and Officials Courts? Is it not the Church that practizeth these things? Doeth the Church neither institute, nor allow that which it continually practizeth? The Rejoynder in his Definition of a Ceremonie, confoundeth Institution and Observation: now, constant observation is without any institution. Is our Church a Medea, in professing, she alloweth better things, and professeth and practizeth worse; meliora video, proboque, detiora sequor? If this be true, what need any man make any conscience of those Excommunications, which sent from our Spiritual Courts, flie about the whole land, to fetch in mony? the Church doth not allow them. It is no scurrilius (I hope) to repeate that which D. Andruys preached to the Convocation-house: The Church-Censures now a dayes do onely touch the purse, Evil doers when they have payd their fee returne scar-free; if no money then have at the offenders with the Episcopal sword; presently at one blow they are cut off from the Church delivered over unto Satan, proclaimed Publicans, Heathens, Anathema. For the most ridiculous things, and against every good man, these brutish thunderbolts do fly up and d. wne, and onely to be feared of the purse.

Gggg 3. Taking
Taking of mony, for Ordination, Citations, Absolutions, Change of Penance, &c.

11. Concerning any shew of these abuses, in the Primitive Church, our Rejoynder hath nothing to say. He turneth himself therfore to deny, or defend them, our Church, so well as he canne. 1. No man with sayth he, may take mony for Ordination. To which answer, if may be understood of a lawfull may, I think it true, not onely of our Church, but also of Rome, as may be gathered out of the first Session at Trent. But the mays are kept in the pocket, both there, and here, where the contrarie may, de facto, appeareth publike in the face and forehead. If any one Minister be ordeyned, instituted, without giving of mony, a hundred other may wonder at him, and the Starre or Planer, that was then over the place. 2. As for Citations, and Absolutions, they (sayth the Rejoynder) are things of industrie, necessary to be recorded, and therfore mony may be taken for them. As if ther were more industrie in Absolution, then in Ordination, in Baptisme, or any other Ecclesiastical Act, ther were more necessitie of recording Absolution, the Ordination, or Baptisme! And if ther were such a difference, or if all these required industrie in recording them, I hope the revenues, and in-comings of our Bishops may suffice for that industrie, without new exactions of mony. 3. He affirmeth Commutation, or Penance to be grounded on Exod. 21. 29. 30. where it written
written, that the price of an Ox, or Bull, may be taken for
the head: and it is allowed (addeth the Rejoynder) by
R. Ames, Cal. Conf. lib. 3. cap. 54. num. 48. where he
sayth, that the party condemned to pay twenty pound sixe, may
lawfully pay it, before it be required, to escape the exeucuting
forty pound, or a greater mischiefe. But if cythere this, or
that, make any thing for changing the publicke confess-
on of a scandalous sinne, into paying of money, I leave
it (with this whole comparison of fases) as the Rejoyn-
der doth, as the Inrue of discreet, unpartike, and honest
men.


Councels, and Ancient Writers.

These testimonies were as illustrating breifly
brought in of the Abrigers: but largely ran-
ked by the Defender into so many sections, as
the main burden did lye upon them. The Replier
therefore conjoined them in brief: and so will I not pafs-
ing upon the Rejoynder his many words; whose sayth
That in the Abrigement, they fill seven whole pages:
when as these answered by the Defend. in 14. Sections,
make in the Abrigement, little more than one page.
He desirith us also to help their dulness, whoe cannot
distinguish, bemixt testimonies, and proofs. To which,
though it be but skornfully propounded of them that
accuse
accuse us of dull sophistry, cap. 2. sect. 11. I answer, that common use of speech doth shew a difference, between some testimonies or witnesses, and proofs. For all good Christians are sayd to give witnesse unto God and his truth, but not properly to prove eyther God, or his Word.

2. Out of a Carthaginian Synod, two things were alleged: 1. that certain Altars in high ways, erected in memorie of Martyrs, should be abolished. 2. That all reliques, and monuments of Idolatry should be utterly destroyed. In the first, the Replier confessed, that there is nothing express to our purpose: because those Altars are noted which are destitute of Martyrs reliques. Ye (sayth he) there was as good reason, for abolishing other as them. No (answereth the Rejoynder) because by the Altars destitute of reliques, the Church was mocked. And was the Church mocked (say I) by those which had reliques in them: not onely because they had no certaine rule of discerning true reliques from false; but also, because they were by such meanes induced, to place a sanctall holinesse in those places, and led on to the invocation of Saints departed.

The second place is expounded by the Defend. at Rejoynd. onely of Idols and immediate instruments of Idolatry: which cannot bee true, except all places groves and greene trees (there mentioned) which had servd to the use of notorious Idolatry, were immediate instruments. And if that were so, why not, or were not once our Ceremonies as immediate? Because (sayth the Rejoynd) they were rather subjects of superstition. Which is a new nothing
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nothing. For subjects often are al one with objects, and main objects of superstition are idols. Places were rather objects (distinct from objects) than images, such as ourrosse is. The summe is (sayth the Rejoynder) that node in the former Canon, reformed and continued a bu.

Ceremony notoriously abused to superstition: and in the latter, we were zealous against all monuments of idolatry. Zealous indeed, they were against known idolatry: but they did not discern all the superstitious and idolatrous deeds, which at that time were springing up among them, in immoderate and unwarrantable honouring of saints. As for their reformation of Altars with reliques, was no more, then divers Popish Synods have professed to doe. But this I would have marked, that Altars with Reliques honoured as they were in those days, are now with the Rejoynder accounted good religious Ceremonies.

3. A councell of Brady, or some other (it is all one) prebad Christians to decke their houses, &c. in such manner, and at such time as Idolaters did, that is sayth the Def. and Rej. at the same time, in the same place, and manner. This the Replier accepted: and assumeth, that ours differ not in those circumstances, but in opinion onely.

The Rejoynder heere first rejoyneth, that this Canon to be understood so, as if it had sayd, we must not keepe the festivall days of Pagans, with them, as they doe: but may keepe in a Christian manner unto God, the same days, which they observed impiously to the service of the Divell. Now let this be understood, for me (though his marginal quotations proove it not) in his sense, Chrysoft. hom. i. de

H h h h

Laz.
Laz. speaking of no more Christian observing the day, then the day following. He'bernun dicem, &c. Agrin que & bombie, &c. And more ancient testimonies may be brought even against sending of New yeares gifts, at the time (Tertull. de Idol. cap. 14.) Let this (I say) be granted: yet the allegation is strong to our purpose, except it can be shewed, that our Ceremonies have no more agreement with the Papists, then preaching and praying upon New yeares day, hath with the Pagans idolatrous luxury, upon the same day; or that they have not the proportion unto Popish Ceremonies, which bay leaves and greene bowes used of Christians would then have to Pagans bay-leaves, and greene bowes.

After this, the Rej. taketh great pains in a large gression, that our Ceremonies differ from the Papists Ceremonies in time, place, person, and not in opinion onely. Where is very little to the purpose except lawfulness and unlawfulness doth depend on that difference of time, place, and person. For the Replier did heere respect those passages, wherein the Defendant saith onely to opinion succour, in differencing our Ceremonies from Popes that ours may be lawfull, though the Papists be unlawfull: as cap. 2. sect. 6. Yet see in short what the Rej. hath found out.

Surplice.

1. It must (sayth the Rej.) among Papists be hallow or consecrated. But this is nothing to time, place, and
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...neither is consecration of Surplices more unlawful, then of Altars, Churches, and Church-yards.

2. Among Papists, no act of ministerial service may be usefully performed without it, except the maffe. This is not true in either part. For they preach without Surplices though divers in England hold them on in the Pulpit) and the Masse-garment of linnen, Pontificall surplice; and many times put over the Surplice. So the Rejoynd. himselfe testifieth in his third difference: which therefore answereth itself, and their practise of putting on more magnificall vestures, at high Masses, or high places, either upon that, or without that, is sufficiently practised, according to our Canons, in Cathedrall Churches, Coapes.

4. They in Popery pin a number of mystical significations upon the parts of it. But this pertaineth to opinion, not to time, place or person; and containeth no difference, save only in number.

Crossing.

1. The Minister (sayth the Rejoynder) with us, may crosse himselfe, the people, or other things. Now though this be nothing to the purpose, yet I would faine know, out of what Canon, hee setheth this may not with us? and if there were any such, upon what reason it is grounded, that will not take our crossing of the baptized person, by the nose?

2. With us, the childe may not be crosse before Baptisme.

H h h h 2 nor
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nor after, with Christme-yle. But of that same may not be fore, I aske as before. And as for crossing with oyle, I would be informed, what religious difference there is betwixt drye Crosses, and oyle, as C. Parjtsenfis distinguisheth them?

3. The Croff is so used with us, that it neither addeth ur. due to the Sacrament, nor capacity of grace to the childe. No more it is among the Papists, by the judgement of many learned, as hath beene shewed in the first part of this writing (though this be but matter of opinion, which concerneth not the present question) See Thomas Aqui. nas, 3. q. 66. a. 10. But why is it used? To intimate why Baptisme bindeth unto. That is, to doe that by mans insti. tution, which Baptisme had done by Gods appointment. Whether this be a good reason or no, I here inquire not: this I affirm, The Papists professe the same.

Kneeling.

1. This gesture (saith the Rejoynder) may before, by occasion of any of Gods ordinances, be performed lawfully to God. By occasion, I grant: but before importeth more. Might the Jewes kneele before the Cherubims of the Vaile, as they might before the Arke? Might they kneel before the Brazen Serpint? Might they before every Ephod? May we before every Pastor? When the Rej. hath resolved these questions, we shall further consider.

2. The gesture of kneeling, in the act of receiving, was never any instituted Ceremony of the Church of Rome. Then the
A fresh suite against Ceremonies.

the Rejoynder deceived us, when in his Manuduction, p. 30. he tolde us, that institution, and intended observation, are all one. For he himselfe confesseth, in the next page, 479. that among the Papists, the receivers of the Hoste, doe kneele, of an ancient custome. Custome surely, ancient, and constant, hath (by all law) more in it, then every intended observation.

3. Bellarmino and the Masse-booke, mention not kneeling in the act of receaving. They mention not indeed the peoples kneeling; because they make small account of their receaving, the masse being complete without it, and that being (with them) an accidentall complement of it. But they mention the Priest's bowing to the Hoste many times, in his receaving.

4. The Pope himselfe receaues the Hoste standing. The Pope is a lawlesse man, and may doe what he please, as also impose what he please upon others. But yet, in the place quoted (Sacræ Ceremoniæ, lib. 2. pag. 181. Colon. 1558.) no such thing appeareth. In the page next before, I finde this. *The Pope boweth low, as the omming of the Sacrament, and reverently adores it.* And one thing, (worthy of observation) concerning the Popes receaving, I finde in Alexander Hales, (in the last words of the second part of his Tractate concerning the Masse, which is the tenth question of his fourth part) that the Pope was wonte to receive sitting, in imitation of Peter and the other Apostles, Confirming that which our Defend. and Rejoynder doubt of. *If it be asked wherefore Sr. Pope receives sitting, it may be answer'd, in memory of B. Peter, and other Apostles, who are the last supper sitting. This may by some*
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Some be imputed to the Popes great pride, for that as it is in that booke of Ceremonies which the Rejoynder quoteth, pag. 160. The Romish Bishop doth reverence a man under heaven, by rising up to him, or by inclining, or uncovering his head. So it may be thought from the same principle, he doeth not reverence to the Hoste. But the rather assent to Alexander Hales, because I have read some where, I think it is in Hospinian de Templis, that the Pope hath no Organ-piping-musicke in his Church or Chappell. And these I account the reliques of ancient simplicity, in worship, which the Pope received from the first Bishops of Rome, and regarded not to make alterations of, without advantage.

5. The people which receive not, doe reverently bow themselves. Much more therefore they that receive.

6. True it is, the receivers doe kneele, of an ancient stome; but only for convenience of putting the Hoste in their mouthes, by the Priest. The former part indeed is true. But the latter is so false, that the Lutherans themselves, who as Apes of the Papists in this part, put the Hoste into the receivers mouth, in like manner as they have received the custome from the Papists, profess, and mainetayne, that they doe it for adoration. By omitting this outward veneration of Christ (viz. kneeling) the people seeme to deny Christ's bodily presence with the Calvinists. All these things being well considered, it will be found, that (opinion of some set aside) our Ceremonies differ not so much from Papists, as the Popish shaving of Crownes doe differ from that which was in use among Jews, and Gentiles, of shaving whole heads, according to Baro...
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Barthius his distinction, and an. 58. or then the Brisons square shewing of crownes did differ from that round shewing, which Augustine the Monk, sent by Gregory, imposed upon them: wherein Pissens a Papist, in his Historical Relations of England, pag. 19. doth note one part of that Controversie to have consisted: or rather (to return unto the argument of this section) the difference is (by the Rej. his plea) as if Christians should have in olde time, hung out bay-blues, unconsecrated, out of an upper-chamber, in the afternoone; when the Heathen hung them out consecrated, before mone, in their lower chamber; and that upon Institution, when the Heathen did it onely upon an ancient received custome. Are not these fine distances from idolatrous, and superstitious abuses?

4. An African Councell condemned certaine Feasts used in memory of Martyrs, because they were drawne from the errors of the Gentiles. This the Replier affirmed to make against our Ceremonies. The Rejoynder answereth 1. That this is not enough to defend the Abridgement, nor to oppose the Defendants answer. But if the Ceremonies be hereby condemned, it is all that the Abridgement sought for; and as much opposition to the Defend, as the Replier cared for. He answereth 2. That the Councell doth not condemn any Feasts used by Christians, but one; the very Feasts of the Heathens. But it seemeth otherwise, so farre as I can confesse these words of the Councell: And this we are to seeke of the Emperors, that such Feasts as are in many places contrary to Gods Word, and from the errors of the Gentiles, be forbidden. I remember not any such phrase of those times, wherein Gentiles are said to...
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draw from the errors of Gentiles. They did certainly introduce Feasts unto Christians, findeing them too ready for to draw such things from them. They were not Heathens, that are spoken of, in the third Council of Toledo, cap. 22. The people that should attend divine Service, give themselves to unseemly dancing. Hoftinian (de Orig. Fes.) after Beas. Rhenanus, in Terœul. de Coron mil. speaking of these, and such other Feasts, declareth the truth in these words: The old Eish. ps were Monte when they could not call men from the Superstitions of the Heathens by the praying of the Word, to seeke at least to doe it by observing their holy dayes, with their owne worship. But this was to draw one nagle with another, no way to take off the Superstition. Although then the beginning of these Solemnities were tolerable at first, yet at last they grew to such a heape of Superstitions, that they became the fountaine and beginning of most horrible thing. Yet suppose the meaning to be of Heathen Feasts, the reason notwithstanding (drawne from the errors of the Gentiles) pertaineth to Christians, except Christians may draw fro the error of Gentiles, though Gentiles may not. In the 3. place the Rej. undertaketh to proove, that the Council did establish those Feasts of Martyrs: because the petition made for abolishing Heathen Feasts, was to provide for the due and free observation of the Martyrs Feast. Whereupon be concludes, that the Church may lawfully make use of an human Ceremonie, for her good; though the same kindes of Ceremonie, have beene notoriously abused, by, and to Idolatry. And in the parting, he giveth us gentle thanks for this Winesse. Now 1. for his thanks, the matter is not so much worth. We can afford him (without any dam-
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to our cause ten times as many witnesses, who in their practice have confuted that, which sometime in their doctrine they have taught concerning Ceremonies. 2. I will grant him also, that it was not the intimation of that Council, wholly to abolish the Celebrations of Martyrs birth or death-days. Yet those Feasts (Convivia) which were used at them, in imitation of the Cathen, they did (in all probability) labour to abolish. For Augustine, who was then alive, and is likely to have had a hand in the Decree, did wish them abolished. This appeareth every where in his writings: As Epist. 64. and 9. And great reason ther was for that, and more also, for the superstitition, and luxurie of them was intolerable. Those luxurious banquets (saith he; Epist. 64.) are opposed of the sory people to be as well the solace of the dead as the honour of Martyrs, whosoeuer carry their meates thither which the better sort of Christians do not and almost all the world over is neglected; yet whosoever doth that will have been sanctified by the merits of the Martyrs. And as for the Celebrations themselves, they were partly used by Christians, as the same Augustine saith (cont. Faustum.) for the Prayers and merits sake of the Martyrs. If the Rynnder houldeth this a due observation of a human Ceremony, and to teacheth, we have no cause to thank him for it.

The Papists confesse in deed, that ther is no example of such Feasts in Scripture, much lesse præcept: but yet they will hardly grant them to be human. Baron. ad 458. We grant them to be human: but the common doctrine of Protestants deny them to have been duly observed.
observed at the least in that time, & in that manner which Augustine declarereth, it being not only without example or precept of Scripture, but also directly against the rules of it.

D. Abbos (Def. of Perk. pag. 886.) saith more, namely, that offerings yearly made for the dead, and for birthday days, were first brought in by the Haretick Montanus, who made gain of them.

3. Tertullian (out of Coron. milit.) was cited in the Abr. thus: We may give nothing to the service of an idol; nor borrow anything from it. If it be against religion, to sit at table in an Idols temple; what is it, to be seen in the habit of an Idol. The Defender answered, he spake of habites then dedicated and appointed unto the service of Idols: but our Ministers are not urged, to reverence the Mass. Priests brazen Idol, or to put on the very same Romish Surplice, now used in their Mass, even therfore, because it is Popish. Of this the Replier proveth, that this sameness is vainly alleged, and lesse then nothing. The Rejoynnder for succour, saith that this individual sameness was a stragling soildier, and confesseth it to be taken prisoner. But in an answer grounded on dissimilitude, where the same qualitie is affirmed of one thing, and denied of another, if that qualitie be stragling, in eyther part, and so taken prisoner, the whole answer must needs be held captive. And this captive soildier may easily be taught to fight against him from whom he was taken; as once (by report) it was in this manner: A Minister in Queen. El. her days, was urged by his Ordinarie to wear the Surplice, which
after other delays, alleged, that the Surplice proffered
him to put on, was the very same that the Masse-Priest
was wonte to sacrifice in: the Ordinary admitting that
excuse, commanded another to be made: which being
done, when it was brought him in the Church, he
made it up, and spake thus to those present: Good peo-
ple, the Bishop himself confessed, that the former mas-
sing Surplice, was not to be worn by a Minister of the
Gospel; and judge you if this be not as like that, as one
egg to another? let this thersfor goe after the other:
and so he justly cast it away.

Yet let us see what other soldiers the Rejoynder can
finde in this squadron, not stragling and taken? Theres
words set down (sayth he) in a different letter: dedicated
and appointed. As if a different cassock did save a soldier
from stragling! The business dependeth on him that
weareth the cassock: and whoe was that soldier in the
Defender his answer? or what was the thing dedicated
and appointed: but the same Individual habit? if other,
then first shew the congruittie of the Defender his diffi-
icultitute: and then shew also, that other Crosses, and Sur-
plises are not dedicated and appointed unto the service of
Idols, by Papists. The Defender also (addeth the Rej.)
addes, that the comparisone betwixt Papists, and Pagans is not
altogether so aqual. He sayd in deed, that he would hear-
after shew such a thing: but with soldiers promised, or
threatned onely, I never knew any serious combat
ought.

After this, the Rejoynder allegeth, that it cannot be
sayd of these our Ceremonies, (as Tertullian sayd of the habiss
1112
he op-
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he opposed, that they were dedicated and appointed to the service of an idol, from the first, and never used by any godly men. But first, this can be no good explication of those words: we may borrow nothing from an idol: i.e. nothing which hath not been used by some godly man. Secondly, he layth not, that no godly man had ever used crowns. Thirdly, Every old usage of godly men, doth not lessen the Idolatry of it. For then sacrificing of oxen should now be less Idolatry, than of unclean beasts. After these skirmishes, the Rejoynder finding that there was no houlding of ground with such soldiers as the Defender had mustered, pressteth new, at his owne charges. And first he bringeth in one persuasion, that Tertullianians clear and professed judgement, was directly against our assertion, and for conformitie: because he saith, Finally those things agree to our, and the use of others above, and to the things of God, and to Christ himselfe, which indeed are profitable to the life of man. Meaning the Sunne, the Moone, the Stars, Fire, Earth, and such like good creatures of God. If this be against us, then we are also against our selves. For never any non-conformist in England or (as I think) in the World, dreamed, no not in an age, any thing to the contrarie. And that this may directly make for conformitie, the Rejoynder must shew, how our Ceremonies are mee more profitable helps unto the necessity of mans life? In the next place he maketh use of diversity alleging that Tertullian brought other arguments with him against the Garland. But we keep our standing upon the argument of borrowing from the service of Idols: lest theirs shift for themselves.
Thirdly, he adjoyneth Accusation, that Tertullian di-
empir'd: in bitter contention, and factional opposition, wrote
his booke against the Church; quoting for it, Renatus, or
as I understand him) Rhemanus, and Doctor Abbot. But
neither of these can helpe. For Rhemanus in the Ar-
ument of that booke (de Coron. mil.) defendeth Tertul-
lin, about the Garland; and sheweth him to have main-
tained the same sentence in his Apologie, which was his
master piece, written without distemper, and not equal-
by the best tempered writing extant, of the same kinde.
Doctor Abbot speakeith sharply of Tertullian, for his
maintaining of ceremional traditions; wherein he was to
be blamed: but not for his generall rule of not borrow-
ing from the service of Idols: whereas the Defendant and Re-
joynder allow those traditions, as appeareth in this Re-
joynder, pag. 493. and oppose this rule. And it is most
certaine, that Tertullian did not receive any distemper, or
factional disposition from Montanus, against Ceremonies
abused to Idolatry. For Montanus brought in the blood
of children into the Supper, but about the Crosse he did
in the judgement of Doctor Abbot, and all our best divines.

I have somewhat merrily answered, in this passage,
by occasion of the Rej. his mentioning of a stragling
Soldier: if any man will accuse me therefore, of this or
that fault, as the Rejoynder doeth the Replier, upon like
occasion, Tertullian, whose cause I pleade, shall make
my Apology: It will agree to trueth to laugh, because it is
of a pleasant disposition; and to sport with her competitor,
because it is secure, and feares not the wals of her Bulwark.
Only this would be regarded, thus our laughter be not un-
worthy.
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Worthy lest it be laughed at, but if it be worthy, it may be due.

6. Another place Tertullian (de oratione, cap. 11 & 12.) was objected, where he sayth, that Christians might not wash their hands (for a Ceremony) or lay aside their cloakes, before prayer; nor sit upon their beds, after prayer; because the Heathen used to doe so. The Def. his first answer being that these Ceremonies were not condemned merely for resemblance with Idolatry, but for opinion of necessity; it was replied, that Tertullian speaketh plainly: therefore it deserves to be proved in us, because it is observed in the service of an Idol. To which the Rej. opposeth nothing, but that the Heathen might use their Idolatrous Ceremonies with opinion of necessity. Let it be so: yet Christians may be reprooved for mere likeness unto them, though either they have not the same opinion, or the consideration of that opinion set apart. Merely doeth not always signify only; nor can it so stand in the Def. his answer. For then thus he should speake: not only for resemblance, but (without any also) for opinion. If he did meane so, we say on the contrary, not only for opinion, but also for resemblance. So farre as I can understand the word merely for, it noteth not more, then is implied in Tertullian's therefore it deserves. A deserving cause is merely a cause, or else malefactours are not punished merely for their evill deserts. In the former testimony, out of Tertullian, pag. 484. the Rej. translated meras utilisates, any commodior use. If mere commodities, be all one with any commodities, then merely for resemblance is anything at all for resem-
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Resemblance: and so the Def. denieth Tertullian to have condemned those Ceremonies he speaketh against, any thing at all for resemblance with Idolatry; which yet Tertullian doeth as plainly speake, as ever he spake any thing at all.

B. Iewel (sai the Replier) doeth urge these Testimonies of Tertullian, merely in regard of resemblance: of others it is not needfull to speake. The Rej. answereth 1. that Iuel doeth not urge these Testimonies of Tertullian. But it is to be scene in his Def. Apol. par. 3. cap. 3. div. 1. how he citeeth Tertullian de Coron. mil. and de Idol. with which the Rejoynder will not deny, this (de Orat) to consent. 2. He citeeth them (addeth the Rej.) not for unlawfulnesse, but for inconvenience of resembling Idolaters. Concerning this distinction, enough hath beene said in the first part. Yet this heere is worthy of observation; that both the Def. and Rej. in the first section of this fourth chapter, confessed, that human Ceremonies abused to Idolatry, are therefore unlawfull, except they be of convenient necessity, at the Rejoynder speaketh, pag. 406.

What reason then had Iuel, or hath the Rejoynder in his name, to confesse such Ceremonies inconvenient, and yet make them lawfull? But that Iuel understood Tertullian, to speake against such Ceremonies, as unlawfull, it appeareth out of these his words: Tertullian disputes sharply therein, that a Christian may not weare a lawrell-crowne, and that for no other cause, but because the Gentiles did so. I have onely the latine edition at hand; and therefore quote it. But eyther the interpreter failed much, or else Iuel expressly speake there of unlawfulness (non licere) and...
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and not of other inconvenience. The Rejoynder next answer dependeth onely on that which was formerly confuted, namely, that meerey is onely.

The Replier added, that it doeth not appeare out Tertullian, that he respeeted opinion of necessity and efficieny, in these Ceremonies. For which, he is charged by the Rejoynder, with offence, against men, simple, and learned, as also against God himselfe. And why all this? Because (forsooth) Tertullian sayeth, that such washings and cleansings, as many superstitiously affect, against every prayers are not true, but those which we have in Christ, and in purification of the hearts. But this is no sufficient ground for deep an accusation. For if now one should admonish Non-resident, who sendeth a reading Curate, to supply his place, in these words: This is not true fulfilling of your Ministry, but those personall offices, which are in Scripture enjoyned; and the meaning of these words being questioned, one should deny, that by them it was implied, that the said Non-resident held it necessary for him, in conscience, to be absent, and send such a Curate for supply: would any man accuse the denier of offending against God and man? It was further observed by the Replier, that the washing condemned by Tertullian, had relation to Christ's delivering by Pilat, after washing of his hands and so like unto our signe of the Crosse, in regard the originall signification and use of it. The Rejoynder answereth many words: but to the purpose (besider repetions) he sayeth, that those washers did believe Pilat have beene cleansed by his washing, and so themselves by their from guile of sinne. And this he gathereth from Tertullian.
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ans confusion: We adore Christ, and not deliver him: we should abhorre the example of him that did deliver him. But out of these words no such collection can be made; any more then some like invention out of these: we adore Christ, and not crucifie him: we should abhorre the example of them that did crucifie him, and left a Cross in the place, for a signe and memoriall that he was crucified. That washing was a signe immediately of Pilats washing, and so of Christs delivering: our Cross is immediately a signe of Pilats Cross, and so of our Saviours crucifying. This is the likeness which the Replier truly noted.

Concerning the Ceremony of Dossing cloakes, before prayer, the Defender put it off to opinion of necessity; because Tertullian in condemning it, hath these words: sic oporset, i.e. if it must be. It was replied, that our Prelates say also of our Ceremonies, sic oporset, i.e. If must be so, and yet disclaime absolute necessity. But (answereth the Rejoynd.) they held an internall simple necessity of conscience; not externall onely for order sake, as our Prelates doe. Of this distinction, see the first part of this suite. The collection of this opinion, from Tertullians scissa: nisi: qui putant, except there be any so foolish as to have such an opinion is so palpably vaine, that any man may see, he durst not impute that opinion unto those washers he spake against; but onely sheweth, that from their prudence, such a fond and absurd opinion, which themselves would condemn, might perhaps by some be collected, Tertullian spake, as we now speake. If crossing ought to be used in Baptisme, the Apostles in their doctrine concerning baptizing would have made some mention of it: except perhaps some
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Some thinke, that they did not then know, or cared not to use, the right or best way of signifying Christian vallour, and constancy, in fighting under Christ's banner.

In opposition to that which was alleged for Tertullians respect unto opinion of necessity, and efficacy, in condemning those Ceremonies, it was replied, that he condemneth them only (that is, if they had but this fault long) that they were empty observations, and to be warmly upbraided with vanity, as being done without any warrant from Christ or his Apostles. For such things serve not religion, but to superstition, and are affected, and forced, and therovercurious, then any thing rationally at all, and even therefore to be restrained, they do so suit the Gentiles. Here the Rejoynder after a little touch upon the particle only, now expounded, answereth, that: this was because of an opinion of necessity, which is properly superstition: because the same Tertullian (de Coron. mil.) alloweth sundry human signifyant Ceremonies, held as free, and used for instruction in which answer, the first part is manifestly false: if Tertullians owne words may be heard: those Ceremonies an superfluous and vaine, which are not, without any authority of Divine or Apostolical command, and are to be accounted superfluous: and even therefore to be repressed, because she make us (in some sort) like the Gentiles. The second part which containeth a reason, is void of all truth. For 1. Tertullian did not account those Ceremonies human but of Apostolical though unwritten tradition: Tradit auxilia, consuetudo, confirmatrix, & similes observatrix. 2. For freedome, to allege this, is cleane contrary to Tertullian intention: because he went about to prove the necessi
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tie of absteyning from the Lawral-Croune, by the ne-
cessitie of observing these unwritten traditions. 3. For
instruction, I would be informed, what instruction the
was, in Crossing, at every step, and goeing forward and at
every turne, at clothing ones selfe, at washing, at bed, at board
&c. 4. D. Abbot (whose judgement of Tertullian, the
Rejoynder commendeth, pag. 485.) in that very place
which he commendeth (Def. Perk. pag. 833. 884. &c.)
sayth plainly, that Tertullian defended those traditions a-
gainst the Church; that therin he contradicted himself; and
that those traditions were partly blasphemish and heretical de-
vices. About Tertullian, nothing material followeth.

7. Melchiades decreed, that no Christian should fast
on the Lords day, or friday, because it was a known cus-
tome of Pagans, to fast on those days.

The Rejoynder. 1. Sayth one answer was, the incongrui-
tie of fasting unto the Lords day. But this not being fetched
out of Melchiades, the Replier justly passed by, and so will
I, though enough may be sayd against it, as the Reader
may see in the Altar of Damascus, pag. 669. &c. 2. He
telleth us also of another answer, by a distinction, be-
twixt a light Ceremonie, and a sacred solemnitie. But this
nether is in Melchiades, nor holdeth congruitie eyther
with Scripture, forbidding Symbolizing with Idolaters
in light Ceremonies; nor with it selfe, the light Ceremonie
being sacred, and also a solemnitie. 3. The Rejoynder ad-
deth out of his owne store, that the prohibition was
only of open and solemnne fasting, not appointed by the
Church. Which is as wrenched an evasion, as the former:
because the question is of open and solemnne Ceremo-
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nies, and Melchiades disallowed that any Church should appoint it, in condemning the thing without any distinction, or limitation, for a reason, that layeth more fault upon the Churches, if they should appoint it, than upon private persons, if they should observe it without appointment. For he groundeth his condemnation upon 2. Cor. 6. What concord hath Christ with Belial? What agreement hath the Temple of God with Idols? May the Temple of God have agreement with Idols, in Ceremonies, if the Church appoint so? 4. The Rejoynder addeth a note out of a later Council, being a Juris of twelve Bishops, wherein other phrases are used. Much good might it do them that can make any thing of it.

The passage being thus cleared, let us now come to that which the Replier tooke for the Def. his only answer: Melchiades forbad fasting at the same time with Pagans, because they lived in the same Country, at the same time, and place. This (sayd the Replier) could not make the difference: because so little a distance may be between one Country, and another, that it can bring up no difference of moment. The Rejoynder answereth 1. that it was a reason of inconvenience only. But Melchiades sayd out of 2. Cor. 6. that it was to make the Temple of God agree with Idols. Is that only inconvenient, and not unlawsful? And if it were nothing but inconvenience was it not confessed, in the beginning of this Chapter, that Ceremonies Idolatrously abused, if they be not convenient necessity, are unlawful? If this be so, the much more unlawful are they, if they be inconvenient. He addeth 2. that some place & time may make a difference which
which the Replier denied not; but onely sayd, that e-
very distance of Countrie (such as is betwixt Dover and
Calais, is not sufficient.

8. Ambrose taught Monicas, Augustines mother, to
leave bringing of Wine and Cakes to Churche, because
it had a shew of conformitie with the Gentiles funeral-
falls. The Defender answered, that it was an act of sa-
crificing, & c. as Bellarmine doeth, de Sanctor. Pass. lib. 1.
cap. 14. Nay sayth the Rejoynder Bellarmine nether
so answered, nor had occasion so to answer. But if he
had considered, that the Defender maketh this fact of
Monicas, to be a sacrifice, derived from the Collyridian
hieraticks; and that Bellarmine there answereth to the
argument taken out of Epiphanius, against those Collyri-
dians, as may appear by comparision of cap. 11. in the
ende; and that in the objection, ther is no mention of
sacrificing, but Bellarmin answereth by covert of that
terme; he would have forborne this censure.

It was also pronounced an incredible thing, that Au-
gustines religious mother, should then sacrifice to a crea-
ture, which the Papists now will not profess to doe.
To this the Rejoynder is, that the Defender never sayd
Monica did sacrifice. Consider therfor his words, re-
printed by the Rejoynder pag. 301. The act (objected)
was sacrificing: Thou compare our Ceremonies, with Ceremo-
nies of sacrificing. Did we object an act as comparative
to our Ceremonies, any act, beside that of Monica? Cer-
tainly no. If therfor the act objected & compared, were
a sacrifice, then Monicas act must needs in the Defender
his account, be sacrificing.
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The other passages depend upon the difference now touched, until that answer of the Replier commeth in: Neither Ambrose, nor Augustine, nor Monica, his mother, regarded any thing in condemning that act, but only, lest any occasion should be given to intemperate ones of filling themselves beyond measure; and because these superstitious vices as it were resembled the superstition of the Gentiles. The Rejoynder heer denieth that Ambrose, Augustine, or Monica did condemn this act. Which is very strange, seeing Ambrose did publickly forbid it, by the Rejoynder his confession; Monica hearing the reasons, was affected with them in her conscience, to forbear it; and Augustin applaudeth them both. Yet the Rejoynder hath reasons for his denial, such as they be: 1. Augustine sayeth his Mothers intension was good. 2. It was usual in Africa. 3. He thought that his Mother would not have been so taken-off from that custom by any beside Ambrose. 4. Ambrose did only restrayne Monicas privat devotion, as having publickly forbidden that manner, for a double inconvenience, not for unlawfulness.

Now the first of these reasons import, that Augustine condemned nothing that was done of a good intention. The second implieth, that he condemned nothing that was usual in Africa. The third supposeth, that Christians are not more easily drawn from unlawful customs, by one man, then by another. The fourth contradiceth first itself, conjoyning the restrayning of the privats devotion, with publick forbidding; and secondly, the Defender and Replier whose (in the beginning of this chapter) confesse Ceremonies Idolatrouslly abuted, 1606.
to become unlawful, except they be of convenient necessity; and so much more, if they have a double incommen-
sacy in them. The rest of this section doth only jarre upon the same strings:

9. To a gravesentence of August. (Hom. 6. de verb. Dom. in Matth.) If you ask how the Pagans may be known, inlightened, called; leave all their solemnities, and forsake their royes. The Defendant answered, that those solemnities and royes are not to be used together with Pagans. The Rejoynder addeth, that Augustine meaneth feasting with idolaters, in the Temples of Idols, which could not be used apart from idolaters. Suppose it were so: yet the question remaineth, whether using such royes of theirs apart, as may be used apart, make more for their conversion, or for their hardening, according to Augustines judgement? But it is not so as the Rejoynder imagineth. For 1. Augustine spake of them, which were present at feasts, made at the solemnity of the Genius or Patron of Carthage, whom those Christians, he reprooveth, denied to be an Idol. 2. All the Citizens of Carthage could not celebrate that feast in one Temple. 3. It doth not appear, that the Patron had any proper Temple. 4. The Citizens being parted into divers places of feasting, why might not the Christians that would keepe that feast, have one place apart? 5. Suppose the Christians had taken some part of the Bucket, or made one like it, and carried it into their owne Temple, to use it there, with another opinion then the Heathen had; would Augustine have allowed it? 6. The case was at Carthage, as it was in Popishtimes, with the Company of Smithes at London,
London, who after some worship done to their Patron, Dunstan, had a Feast in their Hall. Now if some Protestants refusing to be at their worship in Dunstan's Church should yet have been at their Feast in the Hall, I would know, whether they had more symbolized with Papists in the worship of Dunstan, then our Conformists do in the worship of the Cross?

That which is after added by the Rejoynder out of other places of Augustine, concern not our present question: because there Augustine considereth not any relation unto idolatrous abuse. Neither by citing one general rule of Augustines, did we bind ourselves to follow all his counsels.

10. Concerning the Councils of Nice forbidding Easter to be kept on the same day with the Jews Pasche, over, the Rejoynder maketh long worke, to little purpose. 1. He sayeth (with the Defendant) that it was not for unlawfulness. 2. He confirmeth that answer, by a story of the business, marking, that the Council fell about Easter, onely, it seemed good to us. 3. He excepteth against the words, as they are cited in the Abridgement, And so spendeth many good words, and phrases, requiring any confusion. Now, 1. Concerning the words, as they are found in constantines letters patents, they were cleared before, cap. 3, sect. 6. 2. The same like form of words, is used in the same Council about things unlawful, though not so desperately evil, as denying the Faith. 3. The succeeding practices, and customes, doe shew, that unlawfulness was understood for presently after, those which kept Easter with the Jewes.
Iewes, were accounted a sort of Heretickes, styled Quaratdecimani. And what ruffeling, Augustine sent into England by Gregorie, made against the ancient Britons, for dissenting in that observance, after, and out of other stories, Mr. Foxe doeth at large relate. But for such matters, I leave them (with the Replier) to those that are skilfull in human traditions; not regarding that judgement of the Rejoynders. If you bee not skilfull in human traditions, you may hazzard your selves and others: because I doubt not, but skill in Gods word alone, is sufficient against all such hazzard.

The reasons rendred by the Defendant, for the Nicene prohibition of keeping Easter as the Iewes, are three: 1. Hatred of the Iewes. 2. Because of the Iewes insultsations. 3. For uniformity. Of the last, it was Replied, that uniformity might have beene, if all could have beene drawne to the same time with the Iewes. Which the Rejoynder confesseth to be true, if they could have beene drawne thereto as well. Where r. He taketh it for granted, that all were well drawne to the time determined; the contrary whereof appeareth, as in others, so in our ancient Britons. 2. Well or ill, that is, easily or hardly, these make no difference in uniformity, but one, in the meanes of accomplishing the same. The other two reasons are sayd by the Replier, to agree unto our Ceremonies; because we are to hate the Idolatrous superstitions of the Papists, with a perfect hatred; and the Papists insult over us, for borrowing our Ceremonies from them. About this (because it could not be denied) the Rejoynder spendeth many words and phrazes, partly
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Rhetorically good, and partly Morally not good; which I leave as I found: because there is no doing with them, but in great leisure, or in idle time.

In the conclusion, it was asked by the Replier, for what causes many other Ceremonies of the Papists were abolished, if not for these two last named? or if the same causes that abolished them, would not sweep away these, if it pleased them who have the beezoms in their hand? About this the Rejoynder first, referreth the Reader to a preface set before the Service-booke, and I am contented he should seeke if he can finde any such reasons there. Secondly, he addeth, that wee which have not the beezoms in our hands, should not shuffle abroad the dust with our feet. No more doe we (say I) but onely keepe it out of our eyes, and throates, so well as we can, giving reasons, why the Sweepers should not thrust it upon us, nor us for it out of the doores.

11. About the Gangren forbidding fasting upon the Lords-Day, many words are spent by the Rejoynder. The summe is, that such fasting is there spoken of, as was performed out of an Heretical opinion, either of necessity to doe, or of contempt of the Lords-Day. But this cannot be proved. For there being divers different editions of that Councell, none of them mention opinion of necessity: and in the ordinary greek copy, there is neither contempt, nor consumacy, named, as Binias noteth. Beside, opinions and contempt, as they are inward, cannot be noted by the Church. If they were outward, in word; then not so much the fasting upon opinion, as the opinion it selfe, was to be condemned. If the act it selfe was taken for a manifestation
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manifestation of such an opinion, that is it which we urge. As for that accusation which is laid upon the Replier, for relating the Defendant his answer, so as if he had referred the matter unto contempt of Christian profession, that is removed by the Defendant his owne words, related by the Rejoynder, pag. 521. Contemps, so wit, of the Christian profession. See before, in Melchiade, his decree.

12. The Councell of Braga, forbade abstinence from flesh for avoyding of all suspicion in consenting to the Priscillian Hereticks. This (sayth the Rejoynder) was in respect of inexpediency onely. Let it be so: yet 1. They that forbade it, held it not lawfull to be commanded, as our Ceremonies are. 2. Inexpediencie, or inconvenience of Ceremonies notoriously knowne to be idolatrously abused, maketh them unlawfull, by the Defendant and Rejoynder their owne confessions, in the first section of this chapter: where convenient necessity is required, to make them lawfull.

13. Thrice dipping in Baptisme, was condemned, by a Councell of Toledo. It was added in the Abridgement, that Gregory allledged and approved this decree: and the Replier, named Leo in stead of Gregory. Here the Rejoynder catcheth holde of the names of Gregorie, and Leo, and findeth matter for many words, in the account of their lives, not agreeing to the fourth Councell of Toledo, where this was decreed. Now the Replier was (through haste) mistaken, as understanding the first Councell of that place, for the fourth: and the Authors of the Abridgement, or their Scribes pen, misplaced the word alledges: because the Councell doeth allledge.
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Gregory, and not Gregory the Councell: Let that manner be held, which Gregory the first defined. These are not stragling Souldiers, such as formerly were taken from the Defendant as the Rejoynder spake, but Souldiers boys, or Bedes, upon whom little or nothing dependeth in the battell. Let them therefore goe; or by exchange be dismissed. Gregory hath the same sentence, lib. I. Epist. 41. and therefore approved the decree of Toledo, before it was there decreed. For recall answer, it is rejoyned, 1. That all things forbidden, are not condemned unlawful. But yet (by his leave) whatsoever is forbidden lawfully, and reasonably, is held unlawful upon some reason; and therefore so farre condemned for unlawful, as it is lawfully forbidden. Certainly, in Lawe, forbidding doeth as well imply some unlawful evil, as commanding doeth necessary good. 2. The Rejoynder denyeth the Papist to make any superstitious construction of our use of the Crosse. But this is plaine enough: and it commeth after to be handled, yet in this place it is enough, if they make a superstitious construction of the Crosse, which we make use of, though not of our use, which the Rejoynder addeth, that he might with some colour accuse the assertion of falshood. More was not, nor needed be affirmed by the Replier, in this point. 3. He pronounceth it a malevolent calumniation, that our owne Canons, and Canonicall Imposters make a superstitious construction of it. But this hath beene prooved before, especially in the Second Argument, where it hath been convinced of will-worship. 4. He formeth a new proposition; and thereupon girdeth at sitting in the Lords-Supper:
A fresh suit against Ceremonies per: which is not worth the answering. All the rest of his words turne upon the loose hingel of inconvenience without any unlawfulwesse, now often confused. This therefore shall suffice for this testimony; and so I end, the head of Fathers, and Councels. For Leo's words, make not directly to the purpose.

Concerning Protestant Divines.

This head was passed over by the Defendant, but the Rejoynder undertaketh to cleare it: wherein, either his skill, or his confidence, must needs occasion wondering.

1. The generall Assembly of Scotland (anno. 1566.) writth to the Bishops of England. If Surplice, Corner-Cap, and Tippet, have beene badges of Idolaters, in the very act of Idolatry, what have the Preachers of Christian liberty, and the open Rebukers of Superstition, to doe with the dregs of the Romish Beast? And in their Confession: We detest all the Ceremonies and false doctrine of the Romish Antichrist, added to the ministration of the true Sacraments: we detest all his vaine Allegories, Rites, Signes, and Traditions, brought into the Church without, or against the Word of God. To the former testimony, the Rejoynder answereth 1. That these words are not the definitive judgement of the Assembly, but only spoken as the Plea of some tender-hearted men, which suffered for refusal of those things. Now if this were so as the Rejo make it; yet this we may gather from thence; that the Plea of many godly ministers of England, in those dayes, was
was, that our Ceremonies are unlawful. For so it is there sayd: many thousands, both godly, and learned, have their consciences continually stricken, with these sentences: who hath Christ to doe with Belial? What fellowship is there be- twixt darknesse and light? &c. in the words formerly said. What meant the Rejoynder then, to perswade his Readers, in his Preface, and upon all occasions, that our Ceremonies were not by Non-Conformists held unlawful, but onely inconvenient, untill of late? If nothing else can, yet this his owne (not confession, but) peremptory an- swer, may so convince him, that he must acknowledge his accusing of us, as dissenting therein from the first seek- ers of reformation, in the Ceremonies, and so the occasion of his bitter writing, is a mere conceit, built up by desire of putting some colour upon that, which, na- kedly beheld, would be offensive. Observe further, that a definitive judgement, is vainely here denied, where it was never sought for. The Ministers of England did not send into Scotland, for a definitive sentence, concerning the use or abuse of things in England. Neither were they of Scotland so simple, as to take that authority of defining upon them. But for their advising judgement, is plainly enough to all that read their words with any indifference. They were not ignorant of our English question: there were among them, that had beene at Frankford, as Mr. Knox, Mr. Goodman, &c. They did not so farre forget themselves, as to send allegations in other mens names, into England, to be admitted there, which themselves did not allow of. Befside, they directly call them unprofitable vaine trifles. Yea (sayth the Rejoynder) but they disclaim
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They disclaim indeed professed entering into the ground of that question, as mediators use to doe, but yet insinuate their judgement of it. Ceremonies may be damned, though the consciences of all that use them, be not condemned. Unprofitable vaine trifles, found not of comparison. Neither is there any thing in the letter, that gives any inkling of such a limitation.

To the second testimonie, taken out of the Scottish Confession, the Rejoynder answereth, that it respecteth all Ceremonies, as they were Antichristis, formally, and not all materially. After which manner, it is easie to answer any testimonie that ever was alleged. For in the Confession, there is no difference made betwixt all, and some; neyther can the Rejoynder give any apparent reason of his formal interpretation; and it is well known, that the very material Popish Ceremonies were then detested by Mr. Knox, with those that agreed unto his direction, as they also have been, ever since the Reformation, abhorred generally in Scotland, untill of late, when that which one of them calleth an Altar of Damascus, came into that Countrey.

The Rejoynder his 2. answer is, that they of the Assembly professed, what liked them best in Scotland; not what they thought others bound to do, as appeareth by our late King James, the chief of them. But before this can stand, it must be shewed, in what Synod, we despise, is taken, for wee like not so well in our Country; and then, how the after-interpretation
pretation of one, who was then but fifteen years old, can over-sway the common interpretation of the whole Church?

2. *Oecolampadius* requireth a Minister of Scaphusium (Epist. 1. lib. 1. pag. 129.) utterly to cast off all the Ceremonies of the Papists, in celebration of the Lords Supper, as those which cannot be continued, without nourishing of the superstition and impiety, whereunto they served of old. The Rejoynder answereth 1. That the was not *Oecolampadius* his own advise, but that which some others would have had him given. But he propounding it and only excusing himself modestly that he was 'tween put on others so farre (insinuating that though he himself was so resolved, yet he durst not urge others thereto, and therefore only requireth convenience without offense, insinuating his allowance of that advise. And who (think ye) were the Authors of that advise, by *KuInglius* &c. 2. The 2. addeth, out of divers Epistles, the *Oecolampadius* would not have all that country use themself in Ceremonies, to Basili, Tigner, or Bern that he holde gold, silver, glasse, or wooden vessels in administration of the Sacrament, indifferent. As if any of us were of another mind, this is a meere colour of something, where nothing to be found.

In the third place, he sheweth, how *Oecolampadius* allowed of the terms of Sacrifice, Altar, and omitted noted Ceremonies, but only the Latine tongue, in reading the Epistle, and Gospel. But if the Rejoynder had considered that terms are no Ceremonies, and that *Oecolampadius* allowed and Praised this last mentioned improvement...
formation, when he was (in comparison) but a Novice in religion, before he came to Basil, he would not have so erred in this quotation, as he doeth: The Abriders (sayth he) never (I thinke) read Oecolampadius his Epistles. But he hath no just reason to thinke, but some of them had read those Epistles; unless he can shew from whence else they had this testimony. I have read them long since, and remember well, that to be true which now I layd. How it stood at Basil, with Popish Ceremonies, when Oecolampadius was Minister there, it appeared out of Zwinglius, his Fellow Minister (de Baptismo) in these words, worthy to be recited, though somewhat too large for this place: I will easily grant the Catholic, and confesse, that the strife which they made about Baptism, hath not beene altogether without benefit: For hence it comes to passe, that those things which the foolish superstition of human reason had added therunto (as Exorcismes, Spitting, Salt, and such like more) being brought into question, are now become vaine & unprofitable in every mans judgment. Wee denies not but wee received those things from our Fathers.

--Howsoever it is evident they were not of God, but set up by man; which also it may be, (consideration had to that time) might have beene borne, because that as the Israelites heretofore affected with a desire of Egypt, looked back to the delicacies thereof, so they which lately are come over to Christ, were a little prodence and prone to Heathenish religion, which contained many such rites.

---

{Mmm m mm And}
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And these, Christian men were wonte to turne into other use, that they might in some sense be freed from that superition. But how much better had it beene, if all and every of those things had beene abolished at the first.

3. Concerning Calvin, I say, as the Rejoynder sayth, that which is alleged out of him, hath sufficiently beene handled before. As for the new addition, which the Rejoynder here bringeth, as making against us the gold and silver, come and wine, and usefull meeting place, may be retained, after idelarious abuse of them he knoweth, and all the world knoweth, it maketh nothing for such Ceremonies as ours are; nor any thing against us, who continually profess the same truth. Excepte meant to abuse the Reader, I know not wherefore should bring in such impertinent allegations.

4. Mr. Bucer was alleged in the Abridgement's scarce esteeming them sincere Christians, who can abide the Ceremonies of Antichrist, or such as have affinity with his. The Rejoynder opposeth other places, where he speaketh for a toleration of some such Ceremonies. Neither of these allegations can be denied. What then shall we say? Surely 1. That Bucer though he was a revereable zealous man, yet he was a man; and so shewed himselfe sometime about Ceremonies. So Calvin obser-ved, Epist. 13. Bucer was so zealous for the propagating the Gospel, that contented with the maine, he was sometime more remise then was meate, in allowing petty matters and tooke them, but yet for all that, they bad their weight. To the same purpose he gently admonisheth Bucer himselfe, even concerning the matters of England, Epist. 15.
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This by name I commend to thee, by all means to free thy selfe
from envy, under which thou suffrest (though unjustly) a
many many, as thou thy selfe knowest. For they still take you
by middle dealing, so to be either Author or Abettor. And
according to this observation, we finde, that Cassander,
and Baldwine, writing against Calvin himselfe, about
Ceremonies, oppose unto him every where the name
of Bucer. 2 It is to be noted, that when Bucer looked
simply to his Rule, he condemned all ceremonious re-
liques of Idolatry as much as any: but in some particular
perplexity, other impressions did sometime draw him
to an unwilling toleration of some such reliques. But
then he doeth it so fearfully, and with so many cautions,
that any may see, it was but a suspensive sentence of to-
leration, extorted by a kinde of necessitie, not any al-
lowance, out of constant judgement. Thus Beza in his
Answer to Baldwine, whose alleged Bucers allowance
of our English Ceremonies, answereth: As for that En-
glish reformation, which you ascribe to Bucer you do the good
man not a little wrong. To manifest this, he allegeth these
wordes of Bucer: There be who with the leaven of Anti-
christ, would joyn together God and Belial.

All these things considered, that which Bucer spake
against such Ceremonies, is to be taken for his judg-
ment: and when he occasionally varied therfrom, that is
to be imputed unto his good, but excessive affection.

5. The wordes cited out of Musculus (loc. com. de
ind. pag. 421. 422.) are: It is not fit, that those thinges
which are rather superstitious, then religions, or have so much
a shew of superstition, should be retayned in the Church. God

 MMMM 2 forbid,
forbid, that I should mainteyne any traditions, Rites, or Worship, which are Popish. And I call them Popish, which either of their owne nature or by abuse, do serve unto Popish impiety, superstition, and blindness andes all which I am perswaded ought to be detested, as much as is possible. Now maketh the Rejoynder his answer: 1. He sayth, Musculus speaketh onely what is meete, not what is unlawful. This thereceth out of the first words: it is not fit. But first, may things not meete be appointed, and urged, as our Ceremonies are? Secondly, Musculus speakeketh of such things as he holdeth unlawful to maineainte: God forbiddeth I should maintaine them. 1. Would he then have mainteynamd our Ceremonies (as the Def. and Rej. doe) sometime as lawful though unmeet, and sometime as meet, as of convenient necessity? Thirdly, he speakeketh of such things as are to be detested as much as is possible: are they lawful? 2. The Rejoynder addeth, that Musculus speakeketh of such human traditions, as had been formerly under abuse, but were now reduced to another use. In which wordes, (if they be right printed) he maketh Musculus to speake as directly against our Ceremonies, according to his owne interpretation, as the Abrigement doeth. li not be left out by the Printer, then he may be convinced by those wordes of Musculus: so much as a show of superstition.

But (sayth he) our Ceremonies considered as Ceremonies, (otherwise then in their materials) have no outward shew of Popish superstition, which consisteth onely in the reso and intention of their use. As if cyther outward shew, or outward superstition, consisted onely in inward intention!
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Such miserable answers have at the least, an outward show of no sincere intention. His 3. answer is, that Musculus speaketh of such traditions as in their present, and publick professed use were Popish. He doth not indeed exclude such out of his censure: but if he spake only of such, what need was there, that he should so carefully interpret what he called Popish traditions? or what meant he in his description of them, to leave our present publick professed use, and use such words, as every ordinary impartial Reader must needs take to be more general?

6. P. Martyr giveth for a Rule, to the Ministers of Poland, that such order in the administration of Sacraments, is to be kept, as different most from the toys and Ceremonies of Popish. It is an excellent Rule (sayth the Rejoynder) but he sayd not, that human Ceremonies abused unto superstition, in Popery, are now unlawful for us to use. As if he that sayth, we ought to keep that order which differeth most from Popish toys and Ceremonies, did not say, we ought not to use Popish Ceremonies! He speaketh (without question) of an internall ought, or suspicion, which the Rejoynder (p. 492.) confesseth to bind the conscience.

The same P. Martyr sayth: Certainly, if we did from the heart hate superstition, we would doe our endeavour, cleane to put out and deface all the footsteps, and monuments thereof. He speaketh (answereth the Rejoynder) when Missalattire, Altars, and Crucifixes, were as yet remaining. Now for Missalattire, I know none then remaining, which remayneth not now. Altars also have...
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ever since remain'd in diverse Churches, and are now
(for countenance of other Ceremonies) comming upa-
gaine where they were abolisht, with an Idolatrousad-
dition of bowing unto them. Crucifixes will soon fol-
low, and that by good right, if the Defender and Rejo,
their groundes be good. For the doctrine being chan-
ged, and the materials only of Popish Crucifixes remai-
n ing, what can be sayd, to make them simpie unlaw-
And for their conveniencie, whose may judge of that, be
those that have authority of praescribing and impor-
matters of order and decencie? But to let that passe, P.
Martyr spoke of that time, when he supposed the doc-
trine reformed; and manifestly riseth in his discourse,
from those specials, to the general to all, ouste's of sup-
fition, and not those onely. But (layth the Rejoynder;
the same P. Martyr professteth, no separation would be me:
for such matters. He sayth so in deed of the Surplice,
pag. 1127. and so say we; especially upon the same con-
dition, that we may be suffered to abrogate them for our
owne pratitie: Ferremus, nobiles graniando quod eas abrog-
verimus. To this the Rejoynder addeth diverse senten-
ces of P. Martyrs, somewhat favoring a toleration (for

time) of our Ceremonies, especially in M. Hooper's cah.
To which I answer, that this was in perplexitie, cau-
bly the mischief of our Ceremonies, which are therefor so
much the more to be hated, even that they have alway
bred such trouble unto good men, who should have
troubles enough, though they were abolisht. Question:
of this kind, are to us somewhat difficult. There is some-

more hard I confesse of those garments they call holy, & which

somewhat
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He himself refused to wear the Surplice, and that upon such ground as may move us to refuse it, as he pro- 

posed: When I was at Oxford, I would neither use those white 

robes in the Quire, though I were at that time a Canon 

had a reason for it. But what which moved me then and 

will now move, and perhaps may justly move you, is name-

ed that is not to be done, which shall confirm, what 

consience cannot allow of. 3. He tells us plainly, 

that these Ceremonies are mere Papatus reliculae, mere 

relics condemned by Bullinger, and that he 

has, upon hope of their abolishing, only tardior ad 

stadium, loath to persuade unto suffering of deprivation for 

them. All these things are found in the places quoted 

the Rejoynder. Let any indifferent reader guess by 

them, what was P. Martyrs judgement, in his free, and 

perplexed thoughts? Certainly it was not that which 

the Defender and Rejoynder have represented unto us 

themselves; whose accuse all these (beside other faults, 

any, and great) of superstition that refuse them as un- 

savourable; they being cited both orderly and so decent.

7. Bezas words are: that the footsteps of Idolatry 

ought not to appear in the Church, but to be utterly ban-

ished. The Rejoynder answered 1. that this toucheth 

our Ceremonies, in Bezas judgement, Epist. 12. It 

touched our Ceremonies in the eight Epistle of Beza; but 

or in his own: what difference was ther between these 

to Epistles? Only this: in the former, he wrote to 

Bishop, and so with him the foulness of our Ceremo-

nies plainly; but in the later, he speaketh to poor 

Ministers
Ministers, persecuted for those Ceremonies; whole great affliction, with the Churches detriment, made him to conceal some part of his judgement.

Yet in that twelf Ep. he insinuated the same judgement of our Ceremonies: They which began to hate Superstitions so far as to curse their footsteps, how greatly are they offended?

There is yet fresh Superstition of the signe of the Cross, most desestable. They therefore have done wonderfully well, with some banisht that rise out of the Church, whereas some parts we see no good. Because by kneeling at receiving, sprang that most abominable Bread-worship, and still coming to the minds of many, is worthily ablished.

The Rejoynder noteth 2. that in Beza's judgement, many things may and must be tolerated, which are not rightly imposed. Which is true: but 1. let it be then openly confessed by the Rejoynder, that our Ceremonies are not rightly imposed, before he abuse this rule. 2. Let him tell us, if approving by subscription, and use, be meer toleration? 3. The same Beza telleth us: Tolent quaedam putamus que omnino ferri non debent. con. Wes. We think somethings may be tolerated, which altogether may not be born.

In the 3. place, it is added by the Rejoynder that Beza sayth of some, that reteyne the Cross, they may use their owne libertie. But in the next words he addeth: If he have any just Causes of retaineing this signe in their Churches. So that he limetheth that libertie unto such causes as he was not privie to; nay to such as they at Geneva, four to be clean contrarie: As for us, we have many necessarie reason.
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reason why we do not way tolerat that signe. & their causes, alleged in the 8. Epistle, were not peculiar to any time or place, but perteyne as well to England, as to Geneva. So that this was but to stop a Papists mouth, with using of gentle words, and suppositions concerning our unwarrantable course. Of the surplice he speaketh sometime more indifferently: but in the same places, he will have it not subscribed to, not defended, or rejoyned for, but by all means hastened out of the Church, as a ridiculous stage-play garment, or a Foolscap.

3. Many other Divines were named, as Zanchius, Pezzelius, Mollelbus, Zegedinus, Danus, Machabens, Zeppe- rus, Wiggadus, and Sadeel; but their words not cited, except only Sadeels, for avoyding of unnecessarie tediousnesse, they all speaking to the same purpose with the former. The Rejoynder hath one general answer for diverse of these; that they allowed some human Feasts, which have been abused to Superstition. Now though this be no direct answer, and the Authors may in part forget their owne general rule, in some particular; yet this may be further sayd; that they accounted not these Feast-days such kinde of Ceremonies, as we speak of. This appeareth in Zepper, whose put them under the head of Order, cap. 13. whereas he handleth the Crosse under the head of Sacramental Ceremonies, cap. 10. In particular, 1. Danus and Zegedinus (sayth the Rejoynder) speak not to our purpose. Danus I have not at hand: but Zegedine in his tables of Baptisme, calleth them Popish additions, by which Baptisme is propinued. 2. Zanchies judge.
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And this doeth abundantly appear out of his Epist. to Q. Elizabeth, printed before, in English. 3. Zepher alloweth the ancient use of the Surplice. If he did, then he should not have crossed his rule given, cap. 10. reg. 4, out of the Scriptures, at least in his opinion, except he judged the Surplice before that ancient use to have been notoriously abused unto Idolatrie. But the truth is, Zepher doeth but comparatively excuse a supposed ancient use of that garment, which in ancient times was not known, but as a civil habit, usual in hostile countries.

4. Wigandus (sayth the Rejoynder) was Illyricus his assistent in the furious opposition of the Surplice. Whereas the truth is, Illyricus himself did not furiously oppose, but use the Surplice, as Calvin testifieth, Epist. 117.

5. Sadeels words are: We reject whatsoever remaineth in the Church of Rome, which came either from Jews, or Pagan. The Rejoynder answereth, that Sadeel showeth what Ceremonies the Refor. Churches of France did reject; but not what were necessarily to be rejected of all Churches. Henfrib also the limitation of Jewish and Paganish Ceremonies. But he clean mistaketh Sadeels meaning: Jewish and Paganish, are no wordes of limitation, but of explication by way of reason. Our use of his testimonie is 1. thus: Whatsoever Ceremonies they of France have rejected, are in Sadeels judgement Jewish or Heathenish, which can have no lawful use in Gods worship. But the Churches of France have rejected our Ceremonies in controversie. Frgo. 2. Thus: If Jewish and Heathenish Ceremonies are to be
to be rejected; then Popish also, they being in their nature, or kinde, Jewishe, and having evermore been notoriously abused unto Popish Idolatrie.

9. M. Rogers, Martyr, in King Edwards days, would not consent to conformitie in Cap, and Tippet, unless the Papists might be constrayned to wear upon their sleeves a Chalice and Hoast. True (answereth the Rejoynder 1.) but other good Martyrs did. Therefor (say I) not they, but M. Rogers was alleged. Yet beside zealous Hooper, with whom after Ridly and others agreed, Heavenly M. Bradford might have been added, whoe in his letters to Erkinald Rawlins, calleth forked caps, and tippets, Antichristian pelfe and bagage. He 2. answereth, that the question was for inconveniencie, not unlawfulness. But he knoweth well, that M. Hooper, and so (in all likelihood) M. Rogers stood upon such inconveniencie, as in their learning was unlawfulness.

His 3. and 4. answer is of different intentions, in the same materials. But this was in King Edwards days, by all professed: and yet M. Rogers and such could not see it sufficient. 5. M. Rogers would (sayth the Rejoynder) allow the same things with some marke of difference. Not allow, but tolerate; not upon every marke of difference, but such as he knew would never be consented unto; that is, not at all.

10. Publick injunctions were wonte to forbid all Monuments of Superstition; and the Canons 1571. did forbid the gray Amice, and all other garments defiled with like superstition. Therefor (sayth the Rejoynder 1.) by did not take our Ceremonies for sucho Monuments. But
that is nothing to the Proposition: Nayther yet maketh it much to the Assumption of this Argument, what these or those did then take our Ceremonies to be. What they are indeed, we shall see in the Assumption. He 2. allegeth, that the Surplice was none of the Mial garments, as the Amice. But first Bellarmino, whom the Rejoynder made (of late) the Canon of Mial garments, maketh no more mention of the Amice, then of the Surplice. Durandus, or G. Minoricensis, Rational. lib. 3. cap. 1. sayth, In some things about the Altar they may use the Surplice. Steven Mephem. cap Linteam. No clain may be suffred about the Service of the Altar, unless he know the Surplice on at Masse. 3. The Rejoynder addeth, that is a strong imagination, to thinke that the very Injunction, and Canons of this Church, could prove her to judge her own impositions unlawful. Which if he meant of formal particular judgement, it is his owne weak imagination; if general and virtual judging, ther is neyther strongnesse, nor strangenesse in it: because this Church hath no privilege that way above other Churches, of which none were ever found nor can be, imposing any thing unlawful, which did not professse that truth, whose content did prove that unlawful imposion to be unlawful. D. Morton hath plentifully shewed so much of the Popish Church, as the Rejoynder will not deny.

11. R. Itewell was cited, as approving Tertullian's judgement concerning the unlawfulness of Garlands, though not evil of themselves, because they had appearance of evil. Well (sayth the Rejoynder) then they were not evil in themselves, by abuse. That is, abuse did not make them
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them evil, before they were abused. Which is true. But if B. Jewel allowed Tertullian's judgement (as the Rej. judgeth) by the abuse they became evil, and unlawful. Appearance of that which is evil in its selfe, is evil in its selfe; but the abuse was evil in its selfe, and the after use was an appearance of that abuse, in Jewels judgement. Ergo. It was also alleged out of Jewels Ap. c. 2. div. 9. that the Paps had so misused sundry Ceremonies, that we may not longer continue them without great conscience. The Rejoynder answereth, 1. That this was spoken of other Ceremonies, not of those in question. 2. That Jewel was a Bishop, and used Episcopall garments. 3. That upon his death-bed, he professed, that he would not give any of his brethren, who were of contrary opinion, containing the Ceremonies. Now 1. If other Ceremonies (among which yet holy Garments were objected by Harding, in that place) may by abuse, become unlawful, what privilege hath the Crosse, as much abused as any? 2. As Jewel was a Bishop of England, so Cajetan was a Cardinal of Rome; and therefore as Cajetan condemned many Romish superstitions, in so much as when he died, he refused to be buried in a Church, as the story of his life, prefixed to his Commentaries on Job, saith, so might B. Jewel condemn some superstitious Ceremonies in England. As for his wearing of Episcopall Garments, let D. Fulke answer in his Repeale of Heskins Parliament, p. 412. Mr. Heskins girdeth at the proclaimer (B. Jewel) as wearing Aaron's garments for a Bishopricke. But if the Popisb Priests had no more pleasure to say Mass in their vestiments, then the Proclaimer to minister in Coapes, I think the common
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sort of Papists would have lose devotion to the Masses, this God's people have to the Communion, when it is ministr'd without any ceremoniall attire. 3. Those words which the Rejoynder allegeth out of his Godly speech, a little before his departure, make much against the Rejoynder, because they shew 1. That many then opposed our Ceremonies as unlawful, which the Rejoynder denieth. For how else could they more dislike them then Bishop Jewel himselfe, who held them (by the Rejoynder his confession) very inconvenient? 2. That B. Jewel would not grieve or prejudice those that were so minded, which our Defendant and Rejoynder labour to doe with all the strength they have, and all the advantage they can catt holde on. Jewel durst not have called them Superstitious brethren, factious and exorbitant men, &c. Moreover, two faults are committed by the Rejoynder, in reciting those words of Jewel: one, that he leaveth out the word pedagogia, wherein he accused our Ceremonies as belonging to the infancy of the Jewish Church: and the other, that he tooke no knowledge of the following words wherein he accuseth the Pope as the fountain of those evils which gave cause and occasion of strife, and as is were short bones to the dogs. Where he maketh our Ceremonies reliques of Popery, and causes of dissention. Add unto this, that in his Epistle to Q. Elizabeth, before the Defence of his Apologie, he prayeth to God, that he might live to abolish all groves and high places, in England and it will appeare how lawfull our Ceremonies were in the judgement of that good learned man, as well in his life time, as at the hour of his death.

12. B. Pii
12. B. Pilkington sayd, that it is our fault generally, that we differ no more from the Papists, in all our ministry. True (answereth the Rejoynder) but he thought not these things to be simply unlawfull. As if B. Pilkington had learned, and taught a distribution of faults in religion, some unlawfull, and some lawfull faults! It is a new distinction coined since his time.

13. B. Westphaling (with Augustine) peremptorily affirmeth, that Jewish Ceremonies cannot be used, no not with an intent differing from that of the Iewes, without our danger of damnation. We allow this (answereth the Rejoynder) because God hath repealed them; and to use them were to call the coming of Christ into question. And is it so great a sinne, to use Jewish Ceremonies, without a Jewish intent? How then durst the Defendant and Rej. pag. 285. affirm, that to use some Jewish rite (even Circumcision itself) without a Jewish opinion, is not damnable? In one, or both of these places, they much forgat themselves. And they that disallow of a Jewish Ceremony, used without a Jewish opinion, how can they allow of a Popish Ceremony, in any use?

14. D. Bilson, alloweth in reformed Churches, that they can by no means digest one dram of Popish Ceremonies. It was well spoken (answereth the Rejoynder) in defence of those Churches which had cast off all the Ceremonies of the Papists, for the consequence sake; but proveveth not, that all Churches are bound to doe so; or that this Bishop thought so, advised and urged these Ceremonies. Where he would perswade us 1. That our Church can lawfully doe that, which Reformed Churches cannot by any means doe.
2. That
2. That whereas Reformed Churches regard the evil consequence of such Ceremonies; ours need not. 3. That Doctor Bilson Warder of Winchester, either did write otherwise than he thought, or else changed his thought, when he was risen to be Bishop of Winchester. The judgement of these conjectures I leave to the understanding Reader. We urge onely his plaine words: Vae laeant quantum valere possint.

15. To Doctor Humphrey, the Rejoynder had no thing to oppose, but that afterwards he did weare the Surplice. Now the truth of this dependeth on the Re his heare-say, so farre as I know. Yet be it so: doeth not the affliction, and poverty, make many a wise man, turne little aside out of his way? The histories of all ages tell, sic such infirmities to have beene found in many Gods and learned. And after-yeelding to the Surplice with out giving any publike reason for it, doeth not argue that he did not formerly holde that (and constantly in other) unlawfull, upon those groundes which he hath left in print, unrecalled. I doe not believe that there was so much shewed under D. Humphres hand for our Ceremonies, as his Epistle, represented in the forme of this Chapter, hath against them.

16. Concerning Doctor Fulke, one sentence of his was alledged, that he which dislikeneth our forme of vice, as not differing sufficiently from the Papists, shew eth his scale in diestraction of Idolatry. This (sayth the Rejoynder) was a charitable excuse of them. The urging then, defending and rejoyning, for our Ceremonies that manner as now is used, is an uncharitable accusation.
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not agreeable to the minde of Doctor Fulke. A second sentence of the same D. Fulke, is: We abhorre whatsoever hath but a shew of Popery. Therefore (concludeth the Rejoynder) he did not judge our Ceremonies to have any shew of Popery: Nay rather, therefore he abhorred our Ceremonies. For that of their Popish shew, he doubted not, it appeareth out of divers passages, in his writings: as in his Rejoynder to Martiall, art. 4. Mr. Calshill answereth well, that the Ceremony of the crossse, once taken up of good intent, being grown into so horrible abuse, is justly refused of us. And art. 5. Although the elder and better age used and received the signe of the crossse tolerably, yet considering the same full abuse of it, it ought now, of right and conscience, to be condemned. Martiall will none of that: for (sayth he) things good in their owne nature, must not be taken away, or condemned, for the abuse. Very true; but who will grant him, that the signe of the crossse is good of it selfe? It is as much as may be borne, to grant it a thing indifferent. But (sayth the Rejoynder) our Ceremonies Doctor Fulke hath (of my knowledge) used and defended as lawfull. Of this knowledge, or his using and defending all our Ceremonies, his writings doe constrain me (at the least) to doubt. He was once so farre off from using all, that rather then he would use the Surplice, he went out of St. Johns Colledge, in Cambridge, with his pupils, and hired chambers for himself, and them, in the towne: Mr. Travers is my author of this. If afterward he was bowed something by the times, unto a little use of one Ceremony, that he might in some manner, and measure, excuse: but if he had purposed to defend that, and the other Ceremonies, some
foot-steps of that defence would be found in his writings, as there are divers of his opposing them. They know the true truth is, that many good men through the equity of the times, have been brought to be distressed between the desire of liberty in the Ministry, and hatred of superstition; so that they have said with the Apostle, I knew not which to choose; and so afterward, have given some place unto the latter. To judge their persons, it is far from us. We onely make use of their free and unimpeached judgment.

17. Of D. Andrews, and Mr. Merbury, I have not to say: because their Catechismes I never saw. D. Sutcliffe, though he were a Deane (as the Rejoynder saith) yet he writ in his latter time, as a Divine, not as a Cathedral man; and so he was cited. His proposition is this: All Ceremonies taken from Jews and Pagans are unlawful. We onely add, that Ceremonies taken from Papists, are subject to the like censure; because Popish superstition, or Idolatry, is no more lawful then the other. Of Mr. Greenham, (beside that which hath beene often confuted the Rejoynder saith onely, that he did not persuade men against the use of our Ceremonies; and that he was loth to be put unto the solution of that objection: Beare the Sulpice on their preach not. In which there is nothing pertinent. For to give proportionable answers, I myselfe was present, when an honest Conformist persuaded another not to conforme: For (sayd he) though I have not strength enough to stand out, yet I would not have you that have strength, for to yeeld. If all should yeeld, the truth concerning these matters would be buried, and more superstition is to be expected. This
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This was more then not to perswade unto Conformity: And as for the second, I thinke the Defendant and Rej. would be loath to be put to the solution of this objection: Confeffe the Ceremonies to be unlawfull, or loose your livings, and liberties, with disgrace. Thus (sayth the Rej.) I have broken thorow the army of Protestants. That is, just so, as a naked body breaketh thorow a thicke of thornes, getting more gashes, then he made steps for his passage.

S E C T. 21.

Concerning the Assumption of this fourth Argument: namely,

that our Ceremonies are human devises, notoriously knowne to have bee, and still to be abused unto Idolatrye and Superstition, by the Papists, and are of no necessarie use in the Church.

1. That this was the Assumption, or second part of this Argument, no man can doubt, that readeth the Proposition, or former part, set downe in the first section of this Chapter, and understandeth the processe of reason. The Defendant therefore was blamed, for setting downe the Assumption thus: Our Ceremonies have bee Idolatrously abused by Papists. The Rejoynder not willing to forfaik him in any failing, allegeth 1. That the Defendant toke the sub-
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 stance of the Assumption from the Abridgement, and other
 Which might indeed have occasioned him to add some
 thing unto the Abridger's assumption; but in no wise
 detract any thing from it: at least, not out of them
 others, to patch up a false syllogisme (the whole middle
 or third argument, which was used in the proposi-
 tion not being repeated in the Assumption) which every
 man in Logick can put off with a wet finger. He added,
 That the clause (if no necessary use) is no part of the Ar-
 gument, but an exception, answered before, sect. 1. And
 yet see how he contradicted himself! The Defendant
 answered it: but it was no part of their Argument. He
 answered it was a part of the Assumption: If in their
 exception of things necessary, they, or a convenient necessity,
 be denied their Assumption, pag. 406. Yet now he denies
 that to be any part of the Assumption. The truth
 both the Defendant and Rejoynder, were loath to meddle,
 (more then of necessity they must) with the conve-
nient necessity of our Ceremonies, lest they should evi-
dently either wrong their consciences, or betray their
 cause. In the 3. place, he denies him to have omitted
 these words (human inventions, or devises) saying, that the
 Replier hath untruly added them: because neither they,
or any like them, are in the Abridgement, pag. 26. or 27.
 But let him, or any other, looke once againe upon the
 Abridgement, in those pages, and he shall see upon the
 margent, these words: All the Ceremonies in question, in
 human inventions, &c. After this, he accuseth the Replier
 for not observing every word of the Abridgement, in repe-
ting the Assumption: but he could shew no finis
 changes:
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2. The Defender his answer to the foresayd Assump-
tion, was by the Replier thus collected: These Ceremo-
onies are either generally, or individually, and numerally
the same, that have been abused to Idolatrie. If generally,
then it hindereth not, but they may still be lawfully used,
though they have been so abused: If individually, then it is
not true, which is affirmed (in the Assumption) nyther doeth
it follow from thence, that they must be abolisht, because they
have been so abused, except they be the same formally, that is,
in intention and opinion of those that impose & practise them.
For this he is accused by the Rejoynder of doing no jus-
tice, but playing the shefespare, which changeth coats with
an honest passenger. Now for this, to spare the labor of
writing out againge many lines, I desirde the Reader to
looke upon the Defender his wordes, as they are reprim-
ted by the Rejoynder himself, pag. 761. & compare them
with the Replier his summe. If he can discerne any diffe-
rence, let the Defender be the honest man, and the Re-
plier, what it pleaseth the Rejoynder to make him. No
material difference is noted by the Rejoynder but onely
that the Defender hath not those words (if generally, then
it hindereth not, but they may still be lawfully used, though
they have been so abused) nor any thing which will bear such
a collection. To which I oppose those words of the Def.
If you take it in the generalitie, then cannot you justify any
one of your Ceremonies, belonging to Order and Decencie. For
they have been some way abused. Was it not his meaning,
to say, that as other Ceremonies of Order, so these in
question, if they be onely generally the same with those
that have been abused, may be justified, that is, lawfully
used? Let the Defender hold his owne coate: then he
cannot so easily escape, without being discerned, as the
Rejoynder by changing, would have him. Certainly
the Replier did not sneevishly take his coat from him;
nor had he any cause to wish eyther it to himself, or his
to the Defender for any advantage that he might getb;
that change.

3. Against the foresayd answer, it was opposed, that
by this meanes, any kinde of Popish, Iewish, or Heathenish:
Ceremonie, may come in, so ther be new particulars,
and a new intention used. To which it is rejoyned:
that though they be not excluded, upon that sole point, of be-
ving been abused, yet they may, upon other just exceptions,
be shut out. But the Rejoynder should have shewed their
just exceptions, which remaine, after the particular
matter, and the evill intention be removed. For ac-
cording to the Defender and Rejoynder their groundes,
cannot guesse, what they should be. The Rejoynde
mentioneth dumbe, darke, numerous, burthensome, incom-
gible, foolish, ridiculoue Ceremonies. But all these excep-
tions have been discussed before: where we have shewd
that all these vertues are founde in our Ceremonies,
well as in Popish, beside numerousnesse, which in this
place cannot be applied to the purpose: because the in-
ference was of any kinde, not of any number. Dumbu,
indeed, is denied to be in signifigant Ceremonies: but
what is ther amongethe Popish Ceremonies, which
not made by Durand of Mystical signification? It is no
darke, what men say our Crosse doeth signifie: but how
4. While the Replier was going on in confusion of the Defender his answer, namely, that in Ceremonies abused to Idolatry, those are not forbidden, which are generally the same, but only the same individuals, the Rejoynd. finding that undefensible, out of curtesie, as he sayth, setteth up another answer, which he calleth a Faire Marke; namely, that sometime, when the particulars or individuals, which have been prostituted to Idolatry, may not lawfully be used; yet others of the like kinde, may be lawfully used with lawful intentions. But this is little curtesie, or faire dealing, when the Repliers arrow was short, and lucke in the Defender his White, elving the very Peg of it; to set up another Marke, and then accuse the shooter, that his arrow doeth not stick in this Marke, set up after the short was made. Beside, this concerneth not our Assumption, which should be the Rejoynder his Marke: because there is nothing in it of human Ceremonies, not necessary.

5. It was replied also, that by the Defender his rule (by partic of reason) it might be gathered, that of Ceremonies instituted by Christ, those onely are commanded, which he did sanctifie in particular. No: (sayth the Rejoynder) because in institution of the Sacraments, there was orderued a continuance in the like kinde. Does this. And was ther not also, in the prohibition of Ceremonies human, Idolatrously abused, ordyned a continuance in the like kinde, in those wordes, Deut. 12. shal not doe so to the Lord thy God?

6. From the same rule, the Replier sayd, it may be
concluded, that no Popish Ceremonies are Jewish or Heathenish: because they are not the same individually or in particular. Not so neither (sayth the Rejoynder) because they use Jewish Typicals; and others, as still in force the Jews' laws; and Pagan Rites, with the like intention. But 1. The Papists do not use Jewish Typicals, as types of Christ yet to come; and therefore according to the Dei and Rej. their sentence, must be excused: because the holde Circumcision it selfe lawfull to Christians, pag. 289.

2. They do not hold any Ceremoniall Jewish lawest binde Christians. See Bellarmine, De Justificatione, lib. 4, cap. 6. It is neither good, nor safe, to accuse any beyond their deserts. 3. Likeness of intention, betwixt Pagan and Papists, is such as admiteth much dislikeness. An such likenesse there is betwixt our Ceremonies, and Popish.

7. It was inquired, whether the Scripture, forbidding conformity with Heathen Idolaters, in shaving of heads, and cutting of beards, did mean the same head and beards onely? No: (answereth the Rejoynder) because the like in kinde was forbidden. And this is that which the Replier sought. For then by proportionable equity, Ceremonies like in kinde to Idolaters, are forbidden to Christians, at this day, and not the same particular onely.

8. Because the Defendant objected, that all circumstan
ces of Order and Decency have beene abused to Ido
lattery; the Rejoynder noted, that this is one advantage he maketh of leaving out of our Assumption, those limitations: Ceremonies devised by man, of no necessary use: be
cause
cause Circumstances of Order, and Decency, are necessary in their kind, and not mere devises of men; Bemarmin himself being Judge, de effect. Sacram. lib. 2. cap. 29. Upon this the rejoynder having little reason to oppose thereto, after some repetition of confuted shifts, commeth on with a current of words, like a flood from the hills, after a great rain, which carrieth much mud with it. For after some rousing of Circumstances in their particulars, with adding of divers, neither mere circumstances, nor allowed by us, as he supposeth (which make nothing to the purpose) this muddy mush is found in the valley: The matter comes to this issue: you are the godly men; other reformed Churches are the Churches of Christ. All other men are Carnall, Time-servers, Formalists, that have no conscience, no sincerity, no godly wisdom, no zeal; you are the only men. I cannot devise, what occasion he had of this extraordinary passion, but that he was angry, to see he could not confront reason with reason. In his could blood, I dare say, he will recall these words of distemper, which cannot be fastened upon us, and therefore rebound upon him from whole violence they proceeded.

With more shew of reason, he addeth, that for necessity in the kind, a surplice in the kind of a garment, the Cross, in the kind of admonition to profess the faith; and kneeling, in the kind of a reverent gesture, are as necessary as any circumstance of Order, and Decency. But this comparison hath beene largely confued in the first part of this Writing, in the head of Ceremonies, &c. Here, it shall suffice to note, that time, place, and such like circumstances,
A fresh suite against Ceremonies.

ces, are so manifestly necessary in their kind, that the particulars may be deduced from them, by particular considerations, without any institution: but no man can deduce our Ceremonies from those kindes named. Mans will is the onely reason, of them; as Gods will is the onely reason of Ceremonies truely divine by institution. No man can conclude thus: we must every where have some garment, and therefore in England, a Surplice. We must always in Baptisme, have some admonition to professe the faith; and therefore in England, Crosse. We must use reverent gestures in receiving the holy Communion; and therefore in England we must kneel in the act of receiving. But we may conclude thus: We must have a fit place to meete in; and this place is generally fittest for our Congregation: therefore we must have this. We must have a convenient time to meete in; and this houre is generally most convenient for our Congregation: therefore this. The Monkes may as well conclude: We must have some garments: therefore we must in one order have blacke, in another, white; in a third, blacke over white, or white over blacke; in a fourth, gray; a fifth, partly coloured; in some, al linnen; C. ad infinitum; as well (I say) every whit, as the Rejoynder can conclude from a garment to a Surplice; from admonition, to the signe of a Crosse; or from reverence in a table-gesture, to kneeling.

To Bellarmin, the Rejoynder answereth, that he speaketh of natural Ceremonies. Which is true: but are not these conteined under the generality of the Defendants words: there is no gesture, or circumstance of worship which
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which hath not beene abused? And as for other circumstances, which are called civil, many of them admit onely of such variety, as nature doth lead unto, by occasion of this or that determination, common to religion with other affaires.

9. That our Ceremonies are not individually, or singularly the same which Papists have solemnly abused, the Replier said, it is no marvell: because it is impossible to carry the same particular signe of the Cross, from the Fonte, to the Church doore; or to keep it being so long as it is in making. That is therefore no great mystery. The Rejoynder answereth nothing to this, save onely that he descanteth upon the terme mystery.

10. It was added (as an overplus, not for necessity of the Argument) that as it seemeth, Papists doe give divine honour unto the signe of the Cross, as it is used among us: because they ascribe divine operation unto it, as it was used by Jews, Heathens, and Julian the Apostata. Eccl. de effect. Sacram. lib. 2, csp. 31, and they do not account us worse then them. The Rejoynder opposeth 1. That the Papists honour not the Lord's Supper in our hands. The difference is, that unto that Sacrament, they require a right-ordained Priest; but not so to the Cross. 2. He answereth, that they ascribe this divine operation unto it, onely when there is an intention of such an operation, in him that maketh the Cross. Be it so: the Patrones of our crosling, defend that use which the Cross had among the Fathers, who allowed that intention, as Bellarmine (in the place now cited) sheweth. And how shall the inward intention of them be discerned?
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This at the least seemeth to follow, that as for uncertainty of the Priest's intention, divers Papists worship the Hoste, only upon condition, if it be changed into the body, by the Priest's intention; so they must ascribe divine honour unto our Crosses, upon the like condition of such an intention, as was in the Fathers.

11. About materiall forme: some, the Replier refused to dispute: that was (sayth the Rejoynder) because if he had, he must either have opposed all learning and common sense, or else have yeelded to the Defendant, the change of essentiall forme maketh the same materiall to become another thing, as in the changing of water into wine. But with consent of all common sense, we may say, the our Crosse differeth not so from the Popish Crosse: the wine did from water, Ioh.2. 2. It were no opposition to all learning (whatsoever Aristotle teacheth) if one should say, that not the forme onely, but also the matter was in a great part changed, when water was turned into wine. 3. Opinion, and intention, is not the essentiall forme of a ceremoniall Crosse. For one and the same ceremoniall Crosse, is used by Papists, to divers intentions, as to represent a Mystery, to cure diseases, to drive away devils, &c. Bellarmine in the fore-cited place. And opinion belongeth to the efficient or making cause, not to the forme. 4. The very making of a Crosse in such a manner, or with such circumstances, as put upon it a relation to religion, maketh both matter and forme of that Ceremony; and so after idolatrously abused, enricheth with it at least a shew of an Idolatrous Ceremony. But this shew the Rej. referseth unto the fifth chapter.
and beere opposeth onely, that likenesse and sameness are not one. Which is true of individuall or singular sameness, not otherwise: for those things are like which have one and the same qualitie. But he himselfe will not say, that onely the same individuall or particular Ceremonies, which Idolaters abuse, are forbidden to us. He hath hitherto in all this section declined the defence of that absurdity. This quidity therefore is not to the purpose.

12. It was added by the Replier, that we have no intention, or opinion, in the use of the Crosse, but the Papists have the same (though they have others more) and therefore there is some formall sameness in their Crosse and ours. To this the Rejoynd, in many words, answereth nothing, but that this replie stifies it selfe: because, if we have not all the same opinions, which they have, then they have not the same with us. But it doeth not follow of positive opinions, concerning the Crosse it selfe. For we may want some of their opinions, and yet they have all that we have, the same. Doeth not he that knoweth most, of this or that, know the same thing with him that knoweth little, though he knoweth more?

13. Another odd reason was framed by the Repl. thus: If this doeth make a Ceremony not the same, that men have not altogether the same opinion of it; then among the Papists, there are as many kinde of Ceremonies, Crosses, Surplices, as there are diversities of opinions, about their nature and use; which no man will say. Yes (sayth the the Rejoynder) I will say it of Ceremonies: and he that shall denye this, must lay aside both learning,
and conscience, not knowing what to say. But he is too too confident, upon the ground which he is driven to by force of a contrary winde. For without laying aside of learning, and conscience, we may thus argue: If this be so, then all human Ceremonies used among the Papists and brought in (as hitherto all have used to speake) by Popes, are not Popish. For they may be this or that Hedge-Priests Ceremonies, who hath added his opinion and institutition unto them. 2. The Pope) by the same reason) cannot know, when his Ceremonies are observed, or omitted; because he cannot know all opinions and intentions of men. And the like reason holding with us, our Church must inquire into the opinions and intentions of men, before she can know, whether her Ceremonies be observed, yea, or no. I leave then to a Convocation-consultation, if it be not necessary, that in the Bishops Articles, the Church-Warden should be asked, upon that oath, which they usually take and breake, With what opinion, and intention, their Minister doth weare the Surplice, and use the Cross? For otherwise, it cannot be knowne, whether he useth the Ceremonies of the Church of England, or others of his owne making? 3. When men have no opinion or inten tion of such Ceremonies, but onely that they are necessary to stand betwixt them and deprivation, or excommunication, or other vexation (which is the case of our best Conformers) then, though they use Cross, Surplice, &c. they doe not conforme to the Ceremonie of our Church, but in hypocrisie, and so with great sinne.
Three wordy exceptions (he useth to call such things quarrels) the Rejoynder herer maketh: one that the Replier put in not altogether the same opinion, for not the same: an other, that he mentioned onely opinion, whereas the Defender joynd to it, intention: the third, that Crosses and Surplices, are wrought upon, as they are material. But the two later of these are now voided, by my repetition of the reason: and the former is the Rejoynder his owne interpretation, pag. 575. 576. namely, if our opinion be not altogether the same, then it is not simplic the same.

14. Instance was made (by the Replier) in the Al-tar erected by Vriah, 2. King. 16. which was idolatrous, like that of Damascus, though for another intention.

The Rejoynder answereth 1. that this Altar was not formal, the same with that of Damascus. But the formalitie of that Altar, conteyning all the idolatrousnesse that was in it, or belonged unto it, and that Idolatrie being in part common to Vrias Altar, with that of Damascus, it must needs be in that part the same, though not altogether. Idolatrie against the second Commandement, hath some formal communitie with that which is against the first. He addeth 2. that if Achaz had intention of offering to false Gods, then his intention was the same with theirs at Damascus. But yet there would be found a difference of intention in Achaz, in that he intended worship both to the true God, and to those false; whereas they at Damascus were onely for the false. And Vrias intention might be (as it seemeth to have been) onely to satisfie the Kings minde, that he might keep his fa-vour,
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Vour, upon which intentions, Court's Preâlat's use to goe very farre.

15. In the last place, it was observed by the Replier that this answer of the Defender is the very same with that which Papists give unto our Divines, when they are accused for using of Heathenish and Jewish Ceremonies. Although in the outward signe there be some likenesse, yet absolutely there is great difference: for outward actions are their kind from the end and intention of them. Bellarm. defect. Sacr. 1.2. cap. 32.

The Rejoynder being angrie, useth divers short wordes, and after answereth, that this plea is unsufficien: for the Papists: because they retayne Jewish Ceremonies, like Jewish ends: and Pagan Ceremonies to like superstition ends: but our intentions are no way like the Papists. Bellarm. sayth as much for their Ceremonies in the place noted: The rites of the Gentiles were done for the Worship of Devils: but ours are for the Worship of the true God: therefore there is as much difference betweene ours and theirs, as between Sacred, and Sacrilege: as betweene piety and impious, as betweene God and Satan. Jewish rites signified Christ: because ours are partly in memorie of things past, and partly to signify the glorie to come. And yet our Divines cease not to excuse them of Jewish and Pagan Ceremonies. In the judgement thencefore, such differences cannot excuse Ceremonies from being Popish.
S E C T. 22.

Concerning the Crosse Popish and English.

In this Section, ther is nothing material, save onely, that the Rejoynder undertaketh to prove, that the Church of England hast utterly and cleane taken away the Ceremonie of the Crosse, which was among the Papists abused: or, that Wheresoever, and howsoever the signe of the Crosse was a Ceremonie abused in Poperie, it is taken away in the Church of England.

But because in common understanding, this is to prove day, night, and night, day, he requireth two positions to be granted him (which before have been confuted) 1. That nothing is a Ceremonie properly so called, but in respect of, and in the use of it, as a Ceremonie. 2. That the signe of the Crosse, though it be but one kinde of thinge, yet is made so many several Ceremonies, as there be several uses thereof. And these things being taken for granted, he gathereth a Catalogue of many Popish abuses, which (thorough Gods mercy) we are freed from. Yet in his very first instance, he betrayeth his cause. For he maketh it a Popish Ceremonie, to signe the breast with the forhead (and to the forhead) in signification, that the mystic of the Crosse is to be beleived in the heart, and confessed with the mouth. This Ceremonie (layth he) we have not. Yes surely we have the very same formal opinion
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opinion and intention, so far as signification commeth to. For not to be ashamed of confessing faith in Christ crucified, &c. is nothing else but to believe with the heart, and confess with the mouth, hand, and feet, the mysterie of the Crosse.

But it is not worth the while, for to consider the severals of this Catalogue. This onely I would know; if we have not taken the Ceremonie of the Crosse from Papists, from whom we took it? The beginning of it was (so far as appeareth by bookes) from the Valentinian heretickes. The first honorable mention of using it among Christians, is in Tertullian, when, by the Rejoynder his sentence, he was infected with heresie: & his use our Defender and Rejoynder (I dare say) will not allow: at bordes, and beds, putting on apparel, and shoes, &c. Tell us (I pray you) from what Author, or Age, this Ceremonie of the Crosse was taken, which now is urged upon us? I have more than a doubt, that such exception may be taken against that propagation, and such proofe for the taking away utterly of that Crosse, as you have brought for the abolishing of the Papists Crosse. If be a new Ceremonie, invented in England, just at the time of Reformation, the Author of that invention should be made knowne: and if he can approve his Ceremonie, to be grounded rightly, his name may be added in Polido, Virgil, de Inventoribus rerum.

SECII
SECT. 23.

Concerning Scripture-proofs, for human Ceremonies
Idolatrously abused, and yet lawful to be used
in God's worship.

1. The Replier his wordes are these: No example
can the Defender finde in all the booke of
God, for lawful reserving of Idolatrous Cer-
emonies, but onely two; one of Gideon, Iud.6.26.
and another of Ioffhua, Ioth. 6. 19. These wordes the
Rejoynder accuseth of dishonestie, not to be used against a
Pagan. And why so? 1. Because the Defender under-
took onely to prove, that some Ceremonies, which have
been formerly abused, are not the for necessarilie to be abo-
lishe, if they may be reduced to their indifferente use. Now
by abused he meant Idolatrously abused, or else he touched
not this fourth Argument, whose assumtion himself
repeated thus: Our Ceremonies have been Idolatrously
abused. The Replier in stead of Idolatrously abused, put
Idolatrous: because (as such) they are Idolatrous. And
that, which is not necessarilly to be abolished, may be retay-
ned: therfore the Replier (seeking brevitie of speach)
used the word retayned. So doeth Beza adv. Harchinum,
de Cuna, Speake: Non defunt, qui Pastores vellent in illis, so
non origine, as curns usu Baaliticis vel Stibus apparete. So that
in this, ther was no unchristian dealing.

QQQQ 2

The
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The Rejoynder his second reason for to deepcensure, is, that the Defendant grounded not his proposition upon these two examples, but from the equity of the precepts of God, unto these two men. The Defendant indeed layd, that his proofo was by the general equity of Gods Law; and then bringeth these two examples. Wherein he was spared, that nothing was opposed to his gathering of generally equity of the Law, from two examples, which (according to his interpretation) are manifestly beside, and in some sort, against the Law. But if his proofo was from the equity of two speciall precepts, those specials are examples: and the Defendant his words are of one of Gideons acts: Which example we have propounded, to proove, &c. And the Rejoynder himselfe, in this same page, calleth the other act of Gideon, an Instance, in the same sense: I believe the leues gathered their rule from this instance: and pag. 391. he calleth that which is alledged of Gideon, and the other of Joshua, two instances. In all this charge therefore of anchristian dealing, there is not found any fault at all. But it is too common with the Rejoynder, when he cannot reasonably rejoyne, to breake out into angry words.

2. Of Gideons example, the Defendant himselfe (sayd the Replier, confesseth, that it was by speciall command from God: and that it is not every way imitable. The Rejoynder affirmeth this to have beene the Def his objection, rather then his confession. Be it so: His objection therefore answereth it selfe; and toucheth not our Argument, which did not conclude any thing unlawful that is by God specially commanded, but onely the waye...
what is ordinary unlawfull by the generall rule of his Word. He 2. telleth us, that the lewes hold it lawfull to make use of the wood of a tree, under which an Idol hath beene placed. And so doe we hold it lawfull to make use (for asire in colde weather) of the wood of an Idol; which is more, I believe (addeth the Rej.) they gathered the rule from this instance. If they did gather any special rule of ordinary use from hence, it was when the Vase was over their eyes. For there is a generall rule, in the light of nature, to the contrary: Quod ex concessione speciali factum est, non debet trahi in consequentiam. The Def. therefore did not well to imitate them in his blinde gathering.

3. He citeeth out of P. Martyr, that God herein sheweth, that the usurpation of an Idol, doth not dispose him of his Lordship over all things, but that they may be turned to his service. But P. Martyr doeth manifest his meaning to be, that such things may not so be turned to Gods service, without Gods speciall appointment.

For (answering the generall Law which maketh to the contrary) he sayth: God made such Lawes as these for us, and not for himselfe. Wherefore he could use things dedicate to Idols, unto his owne burnt offerings. So Pelicanus: It was in no wise lawfull, unless God had enjoyed it. 4. For that which was mentioned of a not imitable example, that spake the Defendant (sayth the Rejoynder) onely of Gideons sacrificing under an Oake. Which is true: but the reason of this imitablenesse, is the same in both of Gideons acts: justly therefore, both were taken as confessed not imitable.

3. Of Ioshua 6. 19. it was added by the Replier, that
there is no mention made of things, (much less Ceremonies) appropriated unto Idolatry; and that in probability, the vessel spake of, were melted, and only the metal brought into the Lords' treasury. The Rej. opposeth 1. That some of this treasury (in all likelihood) was appropriated to Idols. Be it so: for that some there was a double answer given, God special command, and that it was melted, or passed through the fire. But here the Rej. answerseth 1. That it doeth not appear, they were to be melted. As if the Defendant his Argument did prove well his opposition (as he saith it doeth) if consutation of it doeth not appear in the text he alledge: surely proofs should be fetched from that which at least appeareth, and not from that whose contrary doth not appear. But it doeth appear, that this was the order appointed for such things, Numb. 31. 22. 23, and from thence Interpreters gather so much of these things, Joshua, 6. So Tobias, they did melt all metals that could be melted, they were melted by fire, and turned into the masse. 2. If this be granted (sayeth the Rejoynder) melting did not make them other things. Yes surely by the Defend. his Learning brought to illuminate our judgements (as he speaketh pag. 562. in this Rej.) be found, namely, only some given the being to everything; as natural, to natureall, artificiall, unto artificiall; ceremoniall, unto Ceremoniall. For by this reason, melting of the vessels, made them cease to be the same things either artificiall, or ceremoniall. And hereby the Def. his instance falleth to the ground: as not proving any Ceremonies abused unto Idolatry, to have beene by Joshua retained.

4. Our
4. Out of the former premises, the Replier conclud- ded that the Defendant had "wretched penny of Scripture proofs", for retaining of human unnecessary Ceremo-
nies, notoriously known to have beene, and be abused unto Idolatry. This was his meaning, according to the 

ture of the question. Here the Rejoynder first oppos-
seth, that two instances from the holy Scripture, right tak-
ken, are proofe enough. Which is very true: but that same 
nightly taken, was here wanting, as hath beene sufficien-
tly declared.

In the second place, to supply the Defendant his pen-
uery, the Rejoynder bringeth abundance of instances, 
out of his olde store. 1. Kneeling, bowing, prostrating, lfit-
ing up of the eyes, and of the hands, shouting, and dancing 
for joy. But these we absolutely deny to be human inven-
tions. The Rej. knew this: and therefore by preventi-
on, replieth: so say these are not human inventions, because 
they partly spring out of natural light, is as much as to say, 
they are not, because they are human inventions: for what are 
human inventions, but such as spring out of natural light? 
What? the Crosse, and Surplice; the Cornerd-Cap, 
and tippet; the Bishops Rochet, and Coap; with a thou-
sand such like; which whoesoeuer will equal, or (in reg-
ard of naturalnesse and willfull invention) liken unto 
lifting up of eyes and hands, &c. in prayer, must for that 
time, lay aside right natural invention, and judgement. 
I think it would trouble all the Graduates in England to 
find out that natural light, from whence Bachelors of 
Art, Masters of Art, Bachelors and Doctors of Divinitie 
received their several kindes of Hoods; even as much as 

to
to finde out light of nature; for all the several habits of
Monkes. But (sayth the Rejoynder) all came from na-

turall light, better or worse, more or lesse agitased. Iu
tas
mens long haire, and womens short, which nature is selfe
reacheth to be uncomely (according to the Apostles light)
came from the light of nature. It is naturall to a childe,
for to sucke the dugge; and after to put the hand to the
mouth; and after to creepe or goe: Is it like naturall to
sound a certaine distinct sound upon a Trumpet? to dance
a certaine Round, or Galiard, after every Fidle? It is nat-
urall for a childe to signifie his discerning of those that it
is used to, by some such sound as Dad and Mam: but not
to make Verses in a certaine number.

After these, the Rej. instanceth in sitting, or lying along,
leaning on the left side; covering of the head and face, in wor-
ship; dividing of a beast in covenant-making; erecting of Al-
sars upon hills; erecting of religious monuments; Trophees of
victory, in Temples; set days for Solemne worship; Wine and
victuals for mourners; Marriage feastes, &c. But in all these,
he was so set upon number, that he cleane forgot weight,
and pertinency to the question in hand. For the questi-
on is of Scripture-proofes, for such Ceremonies, as man hath
devised, without necessary use, in the worship of God, notori-
ously knowne to have bee ne, and be abused unto Idolatry. For
there is not one of these instances, which doeth agree to
this question. 1. It cannot be prooved out of scripture,
that sitting, or lying, was a lawfull religious Ceremony,
appropriated unto Gods worshop. The Rej. his proofes
are onely from superstitious Rabbiners, who are no more
witnesses of true lawfull Ceremonies, for the olde Te-
ament,
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1. As for vayling and covering the head and face, in worship, I know not out of what place of Scripture it can be proveed a religious Ceremony, except (perhaps) from 1. Corinth. 11. 4. Every man praying or prophesying, having his head covered, nourisheth his head. He quoteth Jerome on Eze. 44. Where these words are found: We must not have our heads shaven as the Priests and Worshippes of Isis and Serapis had. According to the Seventy Interpreters, we learne that our haire is to be suffered to grow out so long, that the skin be covered, and appeare not naked. Or verily that the Priests must always cover their heads, according to that of Virgil, Furpureo velare comas, &c.

But this is a violent interpretation. Will this help the Rejoynder? He quoteth also P. Martyr, on 1. King. 19. 13. where he sayth, that Moses and Elias, not being able to endure the glory of Extraordinary apparitions, covered their faces; adding, that some thinke they did it of modesty, which he doeth not reject, will this help?

3. For dividing of beasts, in covenant-making, he bringeth Gen. 15. and Jer. 34. But in the first place, it is manifest, that God did immediately, and extraordinarily appoint it; and that in such a manner, as can never be shewed in any idolatrous use among Heathens, much lesse before Abrahams time. In the second, there seemeth onely to be an allusion of phrase: because in all the Solemn Covenantes which we read of in the History of the Jewes, made, or renewed, we never finde any mention of this manner, though circumstances of farre lesse moment are recorded distinctly. But if it was a real act,
it is most likely, that the question then in hand, being
about the freedome of Abrahams Children, which be-
longed to that Covenant confirmed unto Abraham,
Gen. 15. they were by the Prophet directed, to use the
same kinde of sacrifice. Howsoever, it cannot be pro-
ved a meere human Ceremony: nor yet a meere Ce-
remony: because it was a sacrifice, as all grant. Beside,
to ground so large a conclusion upon one darke phrase
is fitter for the Patrons of Purgatory (who allege there-
fore, trial by fire, and baptizing for the dead) then for the
Rejoynder.

6. Erecting of Altars, was not in use after the Law
by the Rej. his owne confession. Before, it was no more
a human Ceremony, then sacrificing was.

7. Of Monuments, and the ways of solemnity, enough
hath beene sayd in the third Argument. For Trophies
brought into Gods house, Calv. sword is produced
which was no Ceremony of worship. For then Dav
would not have taken it away, for civill use; as heath.
1 Sam. 21.

8. Mourning and Marriage feast, have no new
religious Ceremonies. Iuuius in deed (in his notes
Deut. 26. 14.) calleth some cost about the dead, religio
but in his Analysis of the same place, he expounde
himselfe, to meane religiosum, humanum, aut superstiti
sum. And religious is often used for all offices of the
obligation.

Norwithstanding all this weaknesse, and want of
these instances, the Rej. doth so triumph in them, t
he doubteth not to pronounce them enough to com
Concerning ancient Fathers.

1. The Replier beginneth thus: I had thought verily, that the Def. would have brought some pregnant testimonies out of the Fathers, though he could finde none in the holy Scriptures. Then belike (sayth the Rej.) you know that there might pregnant testimonies be brought out of them. And so it is: though their doctrine, in generall, were against such Ceremonies, yet from their practise, so pregnant testimony may be brought for divers superstitious Ceremonies, that the Church rueth the pregnancy of them unto this day.

Baronius, ad ann. 44. in the end, bringeth many examples; and from them concludes: It was lawfull to apply those things which the Gentiles had abused in superstitious worship, and purged from uncleannesse by holy worship unto pious uses, that Christ to the greater dishonour of Satan, might be honoured with those things whereof Satan himselfe sought to be worshipped. By the same reason whereby the Temples of the Heathenish gods were landably turned into the Churches of Christians, other rites also of the Gentils cleansed by our prayers, are rightly turned to holy use. And ad ann. 58. about the middle,
midle, he hath, upon the same examples, these words: What wonder is it, if holy Bishops did consent, that those us
ited customs of the Gentiles, from which it was impossible
to draw them utterly, even after they were professed Chris-
tians, should be changed into the worship of God? Venerable an-
tiquity changed superstition into religion, and brought to pass
that what was spent upon Idols, should be carefully converted
into the worship of God. From hence it came, as Polidoro
de Invent. in the preface, saith, that A vast forest of Jew-
ish Ceremonies, did by little and little, invade and possess the
Lords field.

A true reason, and centurie also of these practices, is given by Doctor Jackson (Originall of unbeli-
ese, Sectio, 4. chapter, 23.) in these words: To cut
strip our adversaries in their own pollicies, or to use means
bused by others, to a better end, is a resolution so plausible
Worldly Wisdom (which of all other fruits of the flesh, is in
the most part, the hardiest, and last renounced; that almost
sect or profession in any age, but in the issue mightily over-
ched or intangled themselves, by too much seeking to circum-
vent or goe beyond others.

A notable example we have of this policy, in Greg-
aries direction unto Augustine the Monke, then in Eng-
land, lib. 9. ep. 71. which was, that sacrificing of Oxen
with feasting in the Idol Temples, should be turned in
to slaying of Oxen for fasting about those Temples, made
Christian by holy-water.
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2. In that which the Replier collected out of the Defender his allegations, it is confessed, ther is little or nothing to the purpose. The Rejoynder therefore, accusing the Replier, for picking the Defender his purse, undertake to restore it unto him againe, by making this new collection: 1. If the celebritie of the Feast of Easter was held by many to be lawfully kept on the same day which the Jews superstitiously (as then) observed. 2. If they, avoyding Pagan Feasts, and Feasts, did freely instinste other. 3. If superstitions habits were lawfully retayned. 4. If Circumcision, after it became a meer human Ceremonie, was lawfully used: Then the auncie Ant Fathers and Churches were of opinion, that godly men may lawfully use some human Ceremonies, abused by others. But this is a meer empty purse (not worth the picking) which the Rejoynder sticketh into the Defender his pocket, as his owne. For 1. It hath not in it our question, of Ceremonies devised by man, not necessarie, notoriously known to have been abused unto Idolatrie, or Superstition. 2. In the first instance ther is onely many noted, from whence cannot be concluded, in a kinde of generalitie, the Fathers and Churches opinion. 3. Easter was by them that kept it, not held as a meer human invention, but as Apostolical tradition, as all knowe. 4. Easter was not invented by men, but onely by men superstitiously continued. 5. The second Argument stilles it self. For if they so carefully avoyded Pagan Feasts, and Feasts, though they might have pleased many professed Christians, and drawn on other by retayning of them, it seemeth, they held them unlawfull, because of the Idolatrie wherwith they had been defiled. 6. We absolutely
absolutely denie, with all Divines, that Circumcision, after the Date of it, was fully expired, which was in the Apostles time, was ever lawfully used as a religious Ceremonie. 7. Concerning ceremonialibus habitibus, the Defender bringeth no proof at all. The Rejoynder allegeth Tertullian, de Corona milit. as allowing the use of a white linen garment, he meaneth for a Ceremonie: whereas Tertullian onely sheweth, that our Saviour did lawfully use a linen towell, in washing his Disciples feet, Joh. 13, notwithstanding linen garments had been abused to Idolatry.

In the 2. place, he referreth us to B. Jewell his Defence, for our bellyfull of instances. And it is true, that godly learned man (par. 3. cap. 5. div. 1.) allegeth divers instances, and Authorities: nether would he have omitted that of Tertullian, if he had esteemed it. But (because it is necessarie) I will set downe the examination of them, which I finde in certayn papers of Mr. Brightman (one Author of the Abrigement) nether ungodly, nor unlearned; wherby it shall appear, that they doe not fill our Bellies, but that we can well digest them.

The learning of it, will answer for the length, to every studious Reader.
M. Brightman's Answer

to

B. Jewels Allegations,

for the Antiquity of Distinct Ceremonious apparel used by Ministers in their Ministration.

Justin Martyr preached the word of God in a Philosophers habit, which was his ordinary garment, such as our Students at University and Innes of Court weare, no Surplice nor any such ministringe attire. But concerning the Bishops brouch, which M. Jewels with John the Evangelist did weare, as if he had bene a Bishop of the Jews, I takest, it was no material brouch, but a figurative speech one ly. For Polycrates describing John first by the singular love our Lord bore him, in whose bosome he leaned at his last supper, then of the great holines wherein this noble disciple excelled, he consented not himselfe to declare the same properly, but allegorically said of him, ὃς ἔγινον ἱερεὺς τῷ πέμπτῳ πιθομένῳ [which was the Priest that carried the brouch], not that he ever used any such thinge, but that he expressed by his holy conversation the force of that [Sanctitas Iehovæ] written in that golden plate, which the high Priest carried in his bonnes. For shall we thinke John was a Priest, meyster of Aarons family, nor of the tribe of Levi? or were the holy thinges
things of the Temple not so much as to be seen by the people of the Jews at Jerusalem, nowe exposed to the view of the Gentiles at Ephesus? Would the Jews have borne this prophetic
vinge of their highest mystery, by a man of another tribe
among the heathen, and by a Christian? Besides, the Apostle
canons by common consent had decreed the legal cerem. should not be
used by the Christians. Acts. 15. And Paul saith Circum-
fing to be falling from the grace of Christ. Gal. 5:2. Would
John then bringe a Ceremonie of the Levitical Priesthoode into
the Church? D. Fulke was not of that judgement that the
words in Eusebius are to be taken literally, but by that figura-
This figurative speech therefore should not have been turned
into a material brough, much less into a longe Priest's garment
as the Rhenish doe, who have bastered out this πεπλακόν, and
shaped it into ἱδίγια. Apoc. 1:13. These words then make
nothing for any garment at all.

Aquinas in indifferentie what apparel be worn is one
of that in common life, nor in Ecclesiastical and administering
function. Truly it nothing pertaines to that citie, what
habit or fashion any one should have, so it be not against
the word, and that faith whereby we come to God.

Whence it never Compelled the very Philosophers
when they became Christians to change their garment
or manner of diet, but only to lay aside their false opi-
nions. De civit. lib. 19. c. 19. As for proper administering of
par dall be speaketh not one word of it, neither doe I finde ther
was any in his time.

I had not Hilary to consider his wordes, but the spoiles
he, quae mult impedie Religiones, sed falsa dogmata murrce compellit.
the Gentiles in persons, places, learning and such other things, may be many ways divided to the ornament of the Church, without borrowing any Ceremony from them, to be used in the service of God. For this is not so spoyle them as the Israelites did the Egyptians, who had the Word of God for their warrant, but as Achan did Jericho, full dearly to his cost, and of the whole hosome of Israel. 136. 7.

Hierom hath the words you cite, lib. 1. adv. Pelag. pag. 416. much urged by Bellarmine and the Papists for their apparel, and no less vehemently pressed by our men, for curs, but duly considered, without cause. The Candida vestis Hierom speaks of, was no peculiar garment of the Ministers, but the ordinary clothing of the common people, in former time generally used by all, and daily, but afterwards only by those of the better sort, and upon Festivall days. So Aulus Gellius

Weither of Africanus: That when he was guilty, neither was his beard shaven, nor his white garment off, nor was he of the common attire of the guilty. The Ambassadors of Rhodes comming to Rome, were first scene in white, but finding things contrary to their expectation, they were forced presently with a viler garment to compasse the houses of Princes. Liv. decad. v. lib. 5. pag. 254. Yes, the very mariners and passengers in a ship of Egypt, seeing Augustus to passe by, shewed themselves in white, and crowned. The same Augustus was angry when he saw a company in mourning, and therupon made a law, That none should sit among the mourners. From thence grew a difference among the Citizens, not heard of in former ages, whereby some were called Candidate, some Pullari: Candidari, not such as sued for offices, as in times past, but the Citizens of better rank;
ranke: Pullati, the lowest of the people; and the vulgar multitude: both, from the colour of their garments which they used. Tertullian saith of the manifolded servants (who upon their first enfranchising appeared in their gowns, that is, the common vesture of the Citizens) If thy servant be free and honoured with the brightness of the white garment, and the grace of the gold ring, and the name of a Patron, & with the tribe and table. Ye see the Papists themselves (as Baronius) allege to this purpose [Simeon Metaphrastes] in the Acts of [Indes and Domna], where it is said of the multitude, Some wicked ones were present in white and magnificent garments, celebrating the feast of their owne ruine, but Indes onely was in blake. And of Honofrius [qui alba induit vestimenta] lest be should be discovered to be a Christian put on white. For the devoutest Christians began to take themselves to darker colours, as more modest and decent, especially after the Monkes once began to grove in credit. It is plaine out of Hierome himselfe, that [Candida vestis] was no garment belonging to the Minister alone in divine service, but an honest, decent, and cleanly vesture, of posed to a soule, lustish, and ragged habit. For the Pelagian condemned glorious garments, as he there saith, When you addde, the shew of garments, and ornaments is contrary to God. In confusion where he demandeth, But wherein is that against God, if I have a cleaner garment. And then presently after the words you cite, Looke to it Clarks, take heede O Monkes, Widoewes, and Virgins you are in danger, unless the people see you in fou apparrell. If they nothing of Secular, against whom war is proclaimed, and enmity against God, if they use fit apparrell.
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apparel. By which it is evident, he defended comely, honest attire, such as was common to Monks, Widows, Virgins, & homines sæculi] not proper to any office of the Mini-

ster. So in Eccl. 9. 8. expounding what [Candida vesti-

menta] be, he saith, Beware thou put not on at any time polluted garments, because sinners have mourned in ob-

scure garments, but put on the light, and not cur-

sing. If [Candida vestimenta] should be only Ministers apparel, then Solumon exhortation is only to Ministers, and they are the men he willeth to be merry, and always to have on their Surplices, not only in their Ministerial duty. In his 

precipits to Nepotian he adviseth, Avoid sad garments as well as white, Ornaments, as well as Spots, one favour-

eth of delights, the other of too much glory. Would he have willed him to avoid white garments in common life, (for make it a Ministerial garment, and then you have Hier-


crom counsell against it) had they not beene usall? In divine service therefore, the Ministers used the white garment of the people, but in ordinary life, Hierome thought a meaker clothing fitting, and so some devote, as Nepotian, and such like practised, though others differed nothing in their attire from the Laity. 3. Theres no set Mini-

tering garment in Hieromes time, and therefore [Candida veltis] was no such. For Calestinus, who was not Bishop till after Hieroms death, writeth thus to the French Bishops con-

cerning apparel in divine service, among whom this super-

fition began to spring, Wee are to be distinguished from the common sort by doctrine and not by garment, by conversation, and not habit, by the purity of minde, not by apparel. For if we study innovation, we tread that
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that which our Fathers delivered us under foot, to
make way for idle superstitions. Wherefore, the weak
mindes of the Faithfull must not be led to such things,
they must rather be instructed then played withall. We
must not blind their eyes, but helpe their mindes with
wholesome precepts.

I knew Marianus Victorius, in that Nepotian whose
died, being laid his garment to Hierome, which he had in
the ministr y of Christ, Hierom, ad Heliod. de morte
Nepotian. As also out of that formentioned place against
the Religions, thinkes he hath found their Albe, Pl.m.t, Ca-
missa, Casula, and I know not what. But Nepotian's garment
was no other then what St. John showed, only as he was
man humble: and of modest, and meanest attire in ordinary
life, so in matters of his Ministry, he was fine, mete, and mag-
ificent; [Solicitus in vertice Altare, n parietae abique
ligine, in pavimenta terfa, &c.] and therefore to doubt
that action arraying himselfe with out any note of pride and
the best man of the people, he might well veste the
 garment to Hierome, who had l been never so mean would
have esteemed it for the damours sake. But observe, Nepotian
ministryings garments was none of the Church goods, but pro-
duced at his owne cost. It is objected also that Stephanes Li-
of Rome in Cyprions time, ordained peculiar ministering ga-
ments, as it is recorded by Polyd. de Invent. lib.6.c.12. and Isi-
dor. writing de Stephano. Unto which you may add de Ge-
tian if you will, de consecrat. dist.1. Vestimenta Ecclesia
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Though Stephanus flourished before Antichrist was hasted, yet he is too young to be a lawful Author of any such garments.

Besides, who seeth not, by that alleged out of Cælestone 1600 years at least after Stephen, that decree of Stephen to be a mere forerun? Was it a Novel in so bring in any such apparel in Cælestone's time, and yet had prescription of such antiquity? But the Century Writers have discovered the forgeries by many arguments, that I marvel any man of learning should seek any strength from such a rotten foundation.

Hierome is also alluded in Ezek. 44. By which we learn to enter the holy of holies, not with commune and defiled garments, but to hold the Sacraments in a clean conscience and garments unpolluted.

Where first he interpreth the garments to be a clean conscience. And secondly that he requireth for the outward garments, is only they be clean without any note of difference between the Ministers garment and the peoples.

So little after, Divine Religion hath one habit in the Ministry, and another for ordinary use.

To admit these words spoken not of the Priest in the Temple, but of Christian Ministers, this [alter habitus] was a better garment for the time of publick duty, as Neposian had, or any of the like assurance from that of the assembly. Thus was much for the clere.

Chrysostome when he saith, [This is your dignity, stabi-

lity crownèd, not that you walk through the Church in

white coate. Hom. 83. in Mat. necessarily required

the same interpretation. For this most white coate was no
other then the better sort of people did usually wear, as well in other Countries, as at Rome, as bash bene shewed by the Embas sadours of Rhodes, and the Shipmen of Egypt. One, the Bishops in humility, in thought, is too sumptuous for daily use, and reserved it for the time of their publick function.

And therefore Sisinnius a Novatian Bishop, living in Constantinople at the same time with Chrysostome, and cloth ing himselfe not only in his Ministry, but for his ordinary, in white, was demanded by one, διά τι ἐπισκόπου ἐν Φοίνιξ ἀστεία, where it is so to be observed, 
The was an unwonted garment in ordinary use for a bishop, so for other men: and unwonted in ordinary use, not in dreams, in which the Bishop was allowed without any grudge, such dignities of apparel as was then received by men of his place.

That of Chrysostome, hom. 6. ad popul. Antioch, is [palea.] I have troubled you with many wordes, but the trueth is so overswayed with prejudice, that so my poore power I would disburden it a little if I can.
Concerne the Defender's Reasons:

1. The Defender's first reason (by the rejoynder his interpretation) is, that by our assertion, she may not use human Ceremonies as used unto Idolatry and superstition, she may use none at all. Now t. The Replier granted the conclusion, being understood of human significant Ceremonies, and thereunto the Rej. opposeth nothing, but that there is the same reason of all other Ceremonies, and that one Didaclage doth not grant this of sitting at the Lord's Supper, though he confesseth it to be a human significant Ceremonie. But both these answers are void of truth. For Circumstances of Order and Decency, which are sometime called Ceremonies, and here understood, are neither meer human institutions, nor unnecessary (which is part of the question) but commanded of God, as often hath been shewed. Neither doeth Didaclage any where confesseth sitting at the Lord's Supper, to be a human Ceremonie. 2. It seemeth very strange to me, that appointing & using of human significant unnecessary Ceremonies, notoriously known to have been, and be abused unto Idolatrie, should be fetched from Christian libertie.
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the Scripture, and what I could finde written of it by Divines: and therout observed much against these Ceremonies (as is alleged in the first general Argument, which the Rejoynder was not hasty to come unto; in eight or nine years) but nothing euyther for their imposing, or their using.

The Rejoynder meaneth by the Church (in England) the Convocation house; and by Christian libertie, their contentiousnesse, in Abridging Gods people of that libertie which Christ hath left unto them. So that, as in some parts of Germanie, and Polonia, the Noble men stand mightiillie for the Liberte of their Countrie; And yet when the course of things is well weighed, that libertie is onely licence for them to oppresse the common people, or Boores; whome they keep under as slaves, or little better; whose goods they take from them upon every slight prætence; whose lives (in some places) can scarce satisfy them for the life of a stagge, if they shoot one, spoiling their corne, even so, this Christian libertie is onely for our Convocation-house to oppresse the Congregations of Christ, as they doe.

2. The Defender his second reason, was such, as the Repl. could finde no conclusion in, but that something abused, may afterward be rightly used: which he granted. The Rejoynder addeth, that his reason did conclude this, some human Ceremonies, from the Law of Shadows. He layd in deed, among other instances, that a Man or Woman, legally unclean, might be legally cleansed or purged. And can he conclude from Men and Women, to human necessary Ceremonies? He may as well conclude, that he
cause in a fretting leprosy, the leprous man's head may not be cut off, nor his body burned; the reason for his infected garments were not to be burnt, nor the hair of his head and beard cut off.

The Replier also granted that Surplices might be turned into under garments for poor people; and wooden Crosses given them for firing.

The Rejoynder answereth that this is no use of Ceremonies, as Ceremonies. As if he himself did allway speak formally!

The sentence immediately going before, was of things abused: And so this addition was of those things which are made Ceremonies. Yet if that be true, which the Rejoynder affirmed pag. 570. that a Surplice, as a Ceremony, is in the kind of a Garment, then it must needs follow, that this Ceremony may be given to the poor for a garment.

And if he flie to use as necessarie to make a Ceremony, as he doeth in his Definition of a Ceremony, it may be as well questioned, whether a shirt be a garment out of use when it is off a man's body? For a garment is a Ceremony, by the Rejoynder his Definition. And so it may be questioned, whether any shirt, or other garment was made, or washed, when no man had it on? His 2. answer, that M. Parker calleth them Devils, and jarring on the same stringe, would fright men from burning of Idols, as he did in Germanie, whoe when men were burning of wooden Idols, bored a hole in one, into which he stopped some gunpowder; so that the Idol being in the stove to burne, the gun-powder brake the
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Srov together with the windows of the room, in pices; and that was imputed by some to the Idol, or Saint, and by others, to the Devil. But (sayth the Rejoynder) from hence it followeth, that there is a change of Law: because the Iewes might not convert the master of Ido's to their private use. And so much we grant; urging only the equity of those Laws. Then (addeth he) the Abrogation hath abused the World, in alleging those Laws, as binding Christians now, as much as they did the Iewes. But with this our-cry no man will be troubled, that noteth how they are to be understood only according to their question, of human unnecessary Ceremonies, as they are such. For the Second Commandement doth bind us as much as it did the Iewes; and so the equity of particular Lawes, as they illustrate the contents of that Commandement, bind us as much, though not in every other particular so much, as they did the Iewes. The summe is; those lawes bind us as much from all religious use of human unnecessary Ceremonies, used or abused in Idolatrie, as they did the Iewes.

3. In the 27. Sect. the Replier could finde no shew of reason, beside meer affirmations. The Rejoynder findeth this Argument: If two other ways of reforming Ceremonies, beside Abolition, may be used; then abolition is not the onely way. But two other ways, (namely changing or correcting) may be used. Ergo.

To this shew of reason, the answer is easy: 1. If those two other ways be understood as partial and insuficient, then the Proposition is false: if as sufficients by themselves, without abolition, then I deny absolutely the Assumption.
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sation, as being a meer affirmation of that which is in question, according to the Repliers observation.

2. Either this is understood of all Ceremonies abused, or onely of some? If of all, our Reformation is to be blamed, which hath used abolution without any necessitie. If of some onely, the Defender ought to have told us, which they are, or by what marke we may know them? And omitting this, he saith neyther Argumentation, nor certain affirmation in this Section.

4. The last Reason is, because Popetie and Popish Rites are not to be esteemed of equal abomination with Paganisme, and Paganish Rites. The Rejoynder bringeth it to this: that the Id. latrie of Papists, and Pagans, considered in themselves are not like. The Replier answered, that though this were true every way (as it is not) yet in this they may agree, that both alike are to be detested and abandoned. You speak monsters (answereth the Rejoynder) because, if they be not aligk detestable, they are not alike to be detested: and Abandoning hasb no degrees. But

1. The substance of this assertion was wonte to be accounted no Monster. For D. Fulke (Rejoynder to Brislow, pag. 288.) maketh open profession of it, not onely in his owne name, but of other Divines: This we say; that Popish Images, although they be not the same that were the Images of the Heathen, yet they are as abominable Idols, as theirs; and the worshiping of them, as much to be abhorred of all true Christians, as the worshiping of the Images of the Gentiles.

2. When the Replier spake of like detestation, he did not mean to equal the ballance unto a hayre, or halfe an Ace;
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an Ace ; but according to usual speach. Heaubs hole in the fourth degree, are sayd to be alike hote, though there may be found some difference. Willfull disobe.
dience is sayd to be as the sinne of Witchcraft ; and Subter.
nesse as Idolatrie. 1. Sam. 15.

Yet there may some difference of degree be found be.
twixt these sinnes. Monsters threfore here was too ex.
cessive a word.

3. Abandoning I take to be all one with putting or
casting away : and one thing may be cast into the bot.
tome of a ponde, when another is cast into the bottome of the Sea. It hath threfore degrees.

To the Repliers assertion, that we are by the Scrip.
tures warned to flie as well, and as furre, from Popish, as
from Paganish Idolatrie, the Rejoynder (with some litiga.
gion about Rev. 18.) consenteth : but addeth that it is
not necessarie to flie from every human thing he should
have added unnecessarie Ceremonie, which eyther Papists or
Pagans have Idolatrously abused. Now this is the
maine question of this whole chapter : and thefer no
heer to be discussed. Onely this : the Defender in this
Section, founding himself upon a disparitie betwixt Po.
pish and Paganish Idolatrie, seemeth to grant, that
they were equal, then we were to flie from the Cer.
emonies abused in Popish Idolatrie : and this grant the
Rejoynder doeth not well to recal.

The Replier not being willing to spend time about the
comparison betwixt Popish, and Paganish Idolatrie, re.
ferred the Defendant to the Abridgement, and Mr. Pa.
ker. Hereupon the Rejoynder taketh upon him to an

...
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...what is found in them, about this comparison. In which discourse, because many things before answered are repeated, to ease my selfe, and the Reader, of tedious labour, I will onely note the maine grounds of his answers, pertaining directly to that comparison, and then set downe some plaine testimonies of our divines about it; because he partly denieth, and partly shiftest off Mr. Pakers quotations. His principall ground of answer is, that the Papistes doe not sinne against the first Commandement, in worshipping a false God; but against the second only, in worshipping the true God, in a false manner. This he produceth (pag.618.) as Doctor Ames his judgement: this he repeateth, pag. 614. and 630. But this is not so. For the wiser of the Heathen, knew well, that there was but one true God, Creator of all things, and the ruler of the Papists, worship creatures, more devoutly as divine objects, then those Heathen were wonte to doe.

The case is plaine, and plentifully confirmed by our Divines, in every dispute against Papist Idolatry. Doctor Ames hath not one word to the contrary: but this he hath for it, Bellar. Envy. tom. 2. 238. The Gentiles worshipped the creatures in Idols, after the same manner almost that the Papists doe. For so they answer upon August, in Isa. VIII. 96. We do not worship a stone, nor devils: Whom ye call Anges doe we Worship, the Vertues of the great God, and his Ministries. And Maximus Madurensis, in the same Aug. 43. ep. Certainly, Who is mad, or void of sense, that be will once doubt, whether there be more Gods then one. Now we invocate the vertues of this one God, under many names, diffused thro:row the frame of the Whole World.

Tttt3
Another
Another ground of the Rejoynder is, that the Papish Idolatry may be, in some respect, as great a sinne, but not simply so great Idolatry. pag. 622. &c. To which I answer briefly, that there are such sinnes accompanying Papish Idolatry, as make it as detestable, as if it were one simply. As for example, the worst of the Heathens Idolatry was, that they sacrificed men unto their Idols: and the Papists burning of so many godly Martyrs, for the maintenance and promoting of their Idolatry, may be equalled thereto, in horror of sinne.

The third ground which the Rejoynder buildeth on, is, that Ahab's Baals were worse than Aaron's or Jerobeam's calves, &c. pag. 629. About this, Calvin shall answer, Hym. 1 de Fig. Idol. Although I yield, that the Idolatry of the Gentiles of old, and of the Papists now, do differ; yet they cannot deny, that God did as severely forbid that wicked worship of Bethel, as all other superstitions which were set up in other places. But I say, that all they who truly feare and worship God, ought with so much the more detestation, and bitter hatred be against the Masse (by how much the more grossly it violates, and prophaneth the holy institution of Christ) then if it had not been so Diademiter contrary to it. Calvin meth heere to utter greater Monsters, then those were which the Replier even now was accused for.

Un to Calvin I will adde the sentences of some others, about the question: because Mr. Parkers marginal quotations are not so easily found. Beza, Epist. 1. The Papists
pi's have turned one Sacrament into that horrible Idolatry, which is not found of among the Gentiles, and of the saile of the to d have mad: it the Table of Devils. When I leave Breach: worship, there is no such kind of Magicall Idolatry under the Sunne as that of the Cross. Against, there is no greater Idolatry in the World, then that Which was, and is committed in the Worship of the Cross. The Lords Supper is changed to the Papists into that abomination, the like whereunto there never was, nor can ever be devised for excelse Beneese.

Ab Antonia indisserens, nulla est, sub Carno, post Maria et Mammam, sanctae Mariae, quae est illa Crucis ignora. Eodem Beca, de Nota Ecclesiae, estis medem, Non est illa executior, in orbe terrarum, Idolatria, quamque suit, et est in Crucis adoratione. Eodem Beca, alio autorum: Cena Domini mutata est (De Erasimci in Odhneren, quoniam quam ullum executior, neque existit, neque potest postea execeretur, pag. 4 ante form. Quam

Blissed Bradford, in his ep. to the Lady Vane, hath these words sealed with his blood: There was never thing upon the earth, so great, and so much an adversary to Gods true service, to Christ's Death, Passion, Priest-hood, Sacrifice, and Kingdom, to the Ministry of Gods Word and Sacraments; to the Church of God; to Repentance, Faith, and all true godliness of life, as the Mass. Doctor Whitakers, de Sacram. pag. 58. Pogish alteration built on the fiction of transubstantiation, is the fourest of all Idolatry. These testimonies concern the Mass, and the Cross. It were ease to add others, concerning divers particulars: as Sadeel, ad. Mon. Bur. Ar. 58. Pray for us most holy table-cloth or handkerchief of God What Idolatry is this? Was there ever the like among the Gentiles? But for particulars, I refer the studious Reader, unto our Divines: and among them, in this pointe, I reckon Doctor Jackson, in his Original of Unbeliefs, sect. 4.
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Cap. 22. &c. where the title is, Of the Identity, or Equivo-

lency of Superstition, in Rome Heathen, and Rome Christian,

and cap. 18. he bringeth pregnant Instances, as among

other, of Virginius, the Patron of pleasant Company;

Gustenus, the Warden of pudding-makers; and of S. Chris-

topher, and S. George, men of the Painters or Heralds making

and yet adored as Gods. Nay alloweth of S. David Linsey,

denyng any difference to be between Heathenish and Roman

Idolatry. I will onely add the words of Tostinian, de

Grig. Templ. pag. 54. Thus some goe about to lessen the Idol

of Papists in comparison of that which was among the Hea-

thenes, is (that I say no more) most childishly done. Is not their

Idolatry plainly recalled, the names onely changed?

Yet it shall not be a mistke, to give some reason of the

which our Divines lay. And this (for the present) is at

hand: The Heathen Gods (take them at the worst) were

workes of cunning Artificers, made of silver, golde, or

some precious thing curiously wrought, sumptuously ad-

orned, representing a Majesty. But the Papists Male-

god is made by every sacrificing Idiot, of a bready sub-

stance, by uttering of a word, without forme or beauty.

The Heathen knew, their Idols were not Gods: and the

greatest estimation they had of them, was, a certaine Di-

vinity might lodge in them. The Papists believe their

bread (or Hoste of Hostes) is very God, not by acciden-
tall residence of some Divinity in it, but as Christ him-
selhe is God. The Heathen set their Idols in Temples,

and consecrated Places, to be adored. The Papists hav-
ing lifted up their god, and adored him, devour him.

Will any man spoyle (much lesse eate, hearken said one

hon
A fresh suit against Ceremonies.

how his bones crack, when he swallowed him downe)
his god? sayth the Prophet, Mal. 3, 8. Upon such considera-
tions Cosier, a Jesuite, (Enchirid. cap. 8.) confesseth,
that if the substance of bread remain in the Sacrament, then
the idolatry of Papists is more intolerable, than the Egyptians
was in worshipping of an Ox, or a Crocodile.

This may suffice for the 28. Section: but that the Rej.
will needs have us take notice of some sharpe phrazes, and
sentences he passeth upon us. To passe by therefore his
prescribing of Heliebore, for Mr. Parker (which in us he
would call skurrility,) if it were spoken of a Prelate, though
in all intellectuels, and morals, much inferiour to M. Par-
ker) to omit (I say) this, and such like singe reproaches, he gathereth a bundle together, pag. 628.

The first is, that we have wrought the faithful servants
of Christ, out of the love and estimation of many. By faith-
full servants of Christ, he must needs meane Conformists,
as they are Conformists; and that Generally: for if he
except any kinde of them, they will cast upon him that
imputation, which he layeth upon us: you say unto other
men; and a loose off; we are more holy, or more faithful than
you, &c. Now 1. let any man consider, if it be any faith-
fulnesse to Christ, to observe and urge those religious
Ceremonies, which he never commanded, but rather
forbidden, as hath beene proved? 2. Those which are
in other things faithfull, we goe not about to worke out
of the love and estimation of others, but them out of
the love and estimation of unfaithfull conformity. May
not a man speake against Non residency, if some honest
man be come to it? But it becommeth not the Rej. to

V v v v

speake
speake of bringing Christ's servants out of love and esti-
mation with many, while he writeth in defence of those
courses, which have brought thousands of them out of
house and home, into so extreme misery, as our Pre-
lates could possibly bring any, and more then they bring
the servants of Antichrist into.

The second is, that we have brought the publike prayers
into contempt. Because (forsooth) we would have pub-
like prayers free from those contemptible fashions which
are taken out of the Masse booke.

Thirdly, wee have brought the preaching of the Gospel, by
any conformed Ministers into dis grace. As if we did not re-
joyce in the preaching of the Gospel, even by Frier Paul,
or Fulgentius &c. at Venice!

Fourthly, we have brought the Sacrament to be of lesse
esteeme then the gesture. Which is the proper fault of our
Prelates, and those who deny the Sacrament to all that
cannot bring their consciences to kneeling, though
Christ hath invited them to his Table.

Fifthly, we question, whether it be lawfull for one to mar-
ry with one that conformeth to the Lames. Now of this que-
tion I never heard any newes, before the Rej. proclai-
med it. It may be, that some, observing how divers
godly women, having given themselves in marriage
some Ministers, upon a great estimation of that calling
without making just difference of the persons, have wa-
ned others to use more discretion. But this I am full
of, that all subscribers, doe testifie under their hands, that
all whoe refuse to conforme, may lawfully have the
Baines and Marriages forbidden; because it is provi-
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in the Service-book, that none shall marry, except they communicate, wherto is annexed kneeling, and that none shall either communicate, or marry, except first they be Bishoped, or Confirmed.

Sixthly, we question whether it be lawful to hear a conformable Minister, if another may be heard; or safe to rely upon their Ministry? which questions he seemeth to invent, and teach, rather than receive from us, except, he meaneth by relying, taking all for good that they say, or doe.

Seventhly, we have appropriated the surnames of Christians, the title of Syncere, the very name of the Church, the Brethren, the Godly, unto our selves.

From all which flanders we are so free, that I doubt not to say (according to my conscience) that among those which live under the tyranny of the Pope, and doe not utterly separe from him, through ignorance, there be many Christians, Syncere according to their knowledge, belonging to the true Catholike Church, and so to be accounted our Godly Brethren. But on the contrary part, Our Prelates, appropriating unto themselves the name of the Church of England, really proclaime us (by their extreme hostile courses) to be farre from the account of their Christian Brethren. If some time some of us, call those among the godly that consent with us, the Brethren, the Godly, &c. the Rejoynder should not have excepted against it, at least in this roule of accusations, in the first front whereof, he syleth and surnameth Conformists, the Faithfull Servants of Christ.

V V V V 2

S E C T.
S E C T. 29. 30.

Concerning our Confessions, and Practises.

IN the 29. Section, onely Calvin, Martyr, and Zip. perm, are brought in as witnessing something against us. But their judgements have beene so declared before, that it would be a tedious repetition, to insist on them againe.

In the 30. or last Section, a contradiction being sought for in vaine, betweene our conclusions and our confessions and practises, the Replier thought it sufficient to dispatch at briefly, in a few questions, to which the Rejoynder answers; but so, as he bringeth little or nothing that requireth a new consulation.

The first question was about Temples, Bells, Table cloths (objected by the Defendant) whether they have such idolatry put upon them by Papists, as the Crosse hath. The Rejoynder answereth, that if they have as much as the Surplice, that will serve the same. It would indeed, in part; though not in whole. But that cannot be proved. His second answer is, that such a Crosse as ours was never abused at all in Popery. Which is a Metaphysicall conceit, sufficiently before confuted. His third is that Temples and Bells were as well abused. But the question was of such idolatry. His fourth is, that the white linen Altar cloth was as much abused as the Surplice.
But the question was of the Cross. And 2. The Papists Altar-cloath, differeth much from the Table-cloath which we allow of.

2. The second was, if the Defender his owne heart did not tell him, that there is a civil use of the things fore-named, which cannot be imagined of the Cross? The Rejoynder granseth a civil use of Bells; though not of Churches, or Communion table-cloathes: Adding, that ther may be a civil use of some Crosses, though not of Transient Crosses (such as ours) and also of Wafers. But he attended neyer to those wordes of the Replier: If his owne heart doe not tell him; nor to those: such things. For his bringing in first of termes, which involve the use together with the things, and that use also immediate, which is but mediati, in Churches, and Communion table cloathes; with his contrarie changing of such Crosses as ours, into some Crosses, and Wafers Gods into Wafers, declare both. Concerning the difference, enough hath been sayd in the first part of this Fresh-suit, in the head of Ceremonies.

3. The third was, what Superstition was in the meer signification, given by Durandus unto Bells, and Bell-ropes, which is not to be found in our Cross and Surplice? The Rejoynder heer answereth nothing; but onely noting many more superstitious significations to have been then conceited, of diverse things, and also of Bells, then we have in our Ceremonies. But the question was onely of the weight, not the number of superstitious significations.

4. The 4. was, whether the Pagans use of Bay-leaves

V V V V 3 (objected
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(objected by the Defender) about 1000. yeares past, doeth cast such a reflexion upon our civil use of Bay-leaves, as Popish Superstition doeth upon our Ceremonies? The Rejoynder his answer consisteth only in 
wordes; save that he equalleth the Countries (of Papists) to those of ancient unknown Heathens; the time (before or after Baptisme) unto a 1000. yeares distance; the place (crowne of the head and fore-head) unto soe-removed and unknowne Landes. Heer againe he neglecteth that item of the repliers: If his owne heart doeth not 
tell him?

5. The fift was, what sense the Defender had, to finde fault with us, for not altering the situation of Churches? Nay (sayth the Rejoynder) what face have you, to say, that he did finde fault with you, for not doing it! Surely the plaine countrey face, of taking the Defend. 
his wordes, as they stand in your Rejoynder, pag.645. Nor doe you alter the situation of your Churches, and channels toward the East.

6. The 6. was, if it be all one, to call a Ship, by the name of Castor and Pollux (Act. 28.11.) and to use a reli-
gious Ceremonie, in Gods worship, taken from those 
Idolls? No, sayth the Rejoynder. Which is enough to 
show the vanitie of the Defender in comparing the names 
of Wensday, Thursday, Friday, unto Ceremonies taken 
from Poperie.

7. The 7. was, whether it be one thinge to change 
Coapes into Cushions, and to use a Masse-vestiment, in 
Gods worship? The Rejoynder sayth nothing worth 
the repeating.

8. The
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8. The last question was, if it be not a kind of slander, to say, that the Church of Geneva imposeth a round Wafer-cake, like the Papists, to be used in the Lords Supper. And if it be not a wide leap, to bring in the practise of Geneva, for an instance of the Non-conformists practise, in England? The Rejoynder answereth it. Yes, it is a slander to impute unto Geneva a round Wafer-cake, like the Papists: but addeth, that the Defender did not so. If he doeth not, what mean those wordes of his: at least the Church of Geneva is not ignorant, what the round Wafer among the Papists did signify? Or what consequence made the Defender from Geneva Wafer-cake, to Ceremonies abutted unto Idolatrie, if the Geneva Wafer-cake be not like unto the Papists?

In the second place, the Rejoynder confesseth, that the bread used at Geneva, is a large square Cake, which is broken in sundry parcels, unto the Communicants: and yet he addeth, that it is a Wafer-Cake, as thin, as thin may be. Where it is something, that he confesseth their bread not to be like the Papists, neyther in extensive quantitie, nor yet in Forme and Figure. But yet I am perswaded, he wrongeth that Church, in making their Cakes as thin as the Papists Host. For the Papists Host is a starchy or summe crust, distinct from cibus, panis, bread fitting for food, by our Divines censure of it: And it is not credible, that the Church of Geneva should retayne such a grote corruption. But (sayth the Rejoynder) you allow their Ceremonie of Wafer-bread. Nothing lesse. We never read, nor heard from them, that they made any Wafer fashion a Religious significant Ceremonie. This
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Wafer was first baked in England. And if they did, they are old enough, let them answer for themselves.

But (addeth he) even unleavened bread hath been abused. Neither allow we of any Ceremonious leaving out of leaven: nor can it be proved of the Geneva Church. As for that which was added by the Replier, of custome herein praving against Farells, Calvins, and Virets advise; it is confessed by the Rejoynder that these Divines had brought in a custome of using common bread; but after some knaves working upon the reliques of the former custome, brought in unleavened bread: which is enough for to confirme that which the Replier spake (as the Rejoynder sayth) at random.

To the second part of the question: whether it be not a wide leape, to bring in the Practise of Geneva, for an Instance of the Non-Conformists practise in England? The Rejoynder answereth, that it is an abuse, unrule lightnesse, eagernesse after squibs, and scornes, which brought the Replier out of his geares: All this it pleaseth him to lay upon this one phrase (a wide leape) a little after he had commended Hellebore unto M. Parker, with many such Drugges unto others. And what is the cause? Forsooth, because this Geneva Wafer-cake was given as an instance of our Confessions, and not of our Practise. But this is as wide, as if it had been confessed to belong to our Practise. For no such Confection of ours can be shewed. It had been fitting to object nothing unto us as Confessd, but that which we have eyther in practise, or in writing allowed. Neither in deed was it the Defender his meaning to make all the rest of his instances our Practise.
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For and this onely our Confession: but he stumbled upon this in the ende, as a thing that must have some place among his objections; because it had been objected by others: and the Rejoynder having begunne his booke with the accusation of Scurrilitie, finding him to be taken, had no other way, but with this shew of a distinction, to venture some falt phrases, like unto that, 

\textit{Ita ultima primis consentient.} \ i.e. That both endes might agree.

A POSTSCRIPT.

Some Reader may inquire whence came this new writing about Ceremonies? And he may please to be informed, that after the Abridgement was printed, a great silence followed in England, about these matters (as if enough had been sayd on both sides) until D. Morton, then B. of Chester, not thinking it honest, to silence Ministers, for Ceremonies, before some answer was given unto their reasons they (stood upon) undertook with great confidence to give a full Answer to all which was objected.

This answer being printed, was divers years neglected, as containing little or nothing, that had not formerly been confuted.

\textbf{Xxxx} But
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But afterward (when silence was interpreted in such sense, as if it had been a yeelding content, it was by some thought sitting, that a breif Reply should be opposed.

This the Bishop thought not worthy of his owne Rejoynder; but was contented to put it off unto D. Ferges, as a friend to him, engaged in the cause, and wanting nyether will, nor witte, nor wordes, no credit.

And he went about it, with all his might. But finding more rubbes in the way, then he had thought of after he had spent about nine years, in Rejoyning, that which was written in some foure weeks, by Special Command (procured he knoweth by whome was compelled to shrill forth his imperfect worke, full of such passionate suffe, as it may be) upon more liberalation, he himself would have recalled.

Upon these out-cries, it was necessarie to speake gaine for a good cause, lest diffamation should prey against it.

But what good (will some say) can be expected from this writing, when the cause appeareth different inure little or none for the publique: Because in our Bishops courtes, Will. and Power, have justiled on Reason.

But yet Gods word is not bound. And if we may needs be oppressed by them, is it not worth a lit inke and paper, to demonstrate, that it is in a good cause?

By this means, our consciences are justified; or
afflictions made more tolerable; our oppressors though more angered, yet must of necessity be lesse insulting; and our names shall suffer lesse, though our bodies and outward estate endure more: and Posterity shall not say, that (for our owne ease) we betrayed the cause, by leaving it more prejudiced to them, then we receyved it from our Fore-fathers.

FINIS.
THIRD PART

AN ADDITION

Of the two last reasons of the former reply, unto which no answer hath, as yet, been rejoyned.

THE REPLYER

Being not onely willing, but desirous, (for the manifestation of the truth) that the Rejoyner, should try his strength to the utmost.
CHAP. V. Sect. 1. ad X.

The Authors of the Abridgment framed a strong Argument against our Ceremonies from the rules of Ceremonies prescribed in the Word, P. 43. &c. with this Argument when the Defendant was not able to grapple, as it stood in the parts combined, he thought good to sever some parcels of it, and try what he could say to them apart. Thus out of this one Argument he hath taken that which he calleth our first: and out of the same he hath made up this fifth: and yet he hath quite left out a great part of the sinewes wherewith that one reason is knit together in the Abridgement.

The argument is taken from the scandal, or offence which the imposing and using of these ceremonies do bring unto divers sorts of men.

The Defendant here maketh great flourishing in nine whole Sections, defining, deviding, and subdividing a scandal, as if he would make all cleare before him: but at the end of all this preparation, he maketh no application of these Rules unto the matter in hand at all: but unely, telleth his Reader, Pag. 134. That these divisions and subdivisions will expedite all difficulties, so that out of them he may collect the true and false sense of Scriptures al-
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lidged. It were sufficient therefore either to deny this power to be in his divisions: or else to sett downe as many other subdivisions of scandall (which were esie to doe) and then tell him that these will expedite the controversie, and that from them lice may collect the errors of his answer. But I will notwithstanding briefly shew my opinion concerning some of these disputes.

The definition which he onely alloweth of as accurate is that a scandall is a wilful offence against Christians, in provoking of them unto any damnable error or sinne, by any sensiblly external means: Sect. 1. Wherein notwithstanding many faults may be found. For 1. every scandall is not wilful, except the word be taken more largely then use of speech will allow. 2. Every scandall is not against Christians. 3. A scandall is not onely by provoking to sinne, but also in hindring from good. 4. What doth he meane to put in the word damnable? the occasioning of any sin, sufficeth to make up a scandall.

Among his subdivisions, the first thing I except against is, Section 5. Where he distinguisheth to between persons and causes, either determined or undetermined, that in matters determined by the Church (as he teacheth) obedience is to be given without respect of scandall: and only in matters undetermined there is a charitable consideration to be had of other mens consciences. This is a new and a tickle point of Divinity, touching the tenderest part of our spirits, even our consciences, and other mens also. It ought therefore either not to have beene propounded, or else to be well confirmed either with testimonies, or with reasons drawn out of Scripture. But alas the Def.
thrusteth it upon us without any such warrant. The peace of the Church (sayth he) is to be preferred before the grievance, i.e. scandal of any sort of men. As if the peace of the Church did not more consist in avoiding of scandals, than in observing of humane Ceremonies: it is not the peace of God which is broken by a charitable care of avoiding offences, but by rushing into them.

A scandal in the nature of it is spiritual murder. Now suppose a Superior should command a thing in itself indifferent, whereupon murder were like to follow, as to run a horse, or a cart, in a certain way, at a certain time, when it may be unwitting to the commander, little children were playing in the way, would any man's conscience serve him to doe it?

Avoiding of scandal is a main duty of charity. May Superiors at their pleasure appoint how farre I shall shew my charity towards my brother's soule? Then surely an inferior cannot by count may crease the determinations of the high Court of Heaven.

The Superiors have no power given them for destruction, but onely for adification. If therefore they command scandals, they goe beyond their commission: neither are we eyed therein to doe as they bid, but as they should bid.

If determination by Superiors were sufficient to take away the sinne of a scandal. Then they doe very ill that they doe not (so farre as is possible) determine all things indifferent, that so no danger may be left in giving of offence by the use of them. Then the Church of Rome is to be praised in that she hath determined of so many

A 3
indifferents; then Paul with the other Apostles might have spared a great deale of labour in admonishing the Churches how they should avoyd offences about some indifferent things. A farre shorter way had beeene either to determine the matter finally, or else to have given order that the Churches should among themselves determine it at home.

But say that the Archbishop of Corinth (for now I suppose such a one) had called his Convocation, and with consent of his Clergie had determined that men might, and for testifying of liberty should, at a certaine time eat of such and such meats which men formerly doubted of: would not yet the Apostle have given the same direction he did? would not good Christians have had care of their brothers consciences? Can the determination of a superior be a sufficient plea at the bane of Gods judgement seat, for a man that by venue or force thereof alone, hath done any action that his conscience tellleth him will scandalize his brother?

Lastly, I would faine know whether those superiours doe not give a great scandal, which take upon them determinately to impose unnecessary rites which they know many good men will be scandalized by?

The second notorious flaw which I finde in the Defendant his subdivisions, is sect.9. where he granteeth that much indulgence indeed is to be used in things indifferent towards weake persons, whose infirmity proceedeth only from simple ignorance: but that only till such tyme as the doctrine concerning such things have beene sufficiently declared: because a scandal doth alwais presuppose a men weake-
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Weakenesse for want of due meanes of knowledge. For 1. Paul had sufficiently declared that it was lawfull for him to take wages, yet he would not, 1. Cor. 9. he had given sufficient reasons for the lawfulness of eating all kind of meats, yet he abstained, and so counselled others, for feare of scandal, Rom. 14. 1. Cor. 9. 2. There can be no certaine set time for all sorts of men when they are sufficiently taught. 3. Who is this Def. that he dare judge so many of his fellow servants, that in such indifferencies as our ceremonies are held to be, they take offence not upon weakenesse, but upon presumption? 4. What authority have our Prelates to obtrude unnecessary Ceremonies upon the Church, which must be declared before they can be used? Is it fit that the people should be troubled with the declaration of mens inventions, when they are hardly brought to heare willingly the maine things of the Gospell? 5. Is it not more agreeable to the wisedome of God, Exo. 21. 33. to fill up the pit, then to set one by for to warne the passengers they fall not into it? 6. There was never yet sufficient declaration of this doctrine of Ceremonies throughout England. In many places there is no preaching at all. Many preach so, that they declare nothing almost to the people but their owne folly. Many are ashamed, or at least unwilling to declare unto the people mens devices. Many declare them so corruptly that the scandal thereby is not removed but increased. And among those that goe about with some good mind to declare this kind of doctrine, there is almost as great variety of declarations as there is of declarers; while some will have them signify.
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Significant some not: some say they are good and profitable to edification, and others condemning them as altogether unsfit, declare them to be tolerable for avoiding of a greater mischief: Some will have them only civil, and others Ecclesiasticall: some excuse all but the cross, and some extoll the cross above all. Are not such declarations (think you) likely to inform well the consciences of poor men who doubt more whom they should take for a good Declarer, then they did at the first of the things themselves?

SECT. X.

Among the instances of scandal arising from the Ceremonies, that which in the Abridgment hath the third place is sett first by the Def. viz. that the superstitious Papist will be hardened in the liking of his notorious religion, from which he seeth hee borrow our ceremonies, and increase in his hope of the full restoring of it again. To this the Def. answereth, that our rites are not the ceremonies of Papists, because they are purged from superstition. But 1. that they are not purged from all superstition hath sufficiently been declared before. 2. This plea of transubstantiating of Ceremonies by the breath of our Convocation, is a mere shift, contrary not onely to the language of all our Divines, and to that which every mans senses doe tell him, but also to the publick profession of the Church of England, in the preface to our service-book, as it is cited by him, pag. 127. For then we are told, 1. that an abatement is made of the extra...
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Popish Ceremonies: All therefore are not abolished, but some remaine. And which be they, if these in question be not? 2. That *some of the old Ceremonies doe remaine.* What sense can be given of these words, if our Ceremonies be not the same with those which were of old among the Papists? if it were meant of old ceremonies not used among the Papists, then they doe not remaine, nor are retained, but restored. 3. That none are devised anew; therefore they must needs be taken from the Papists, or from the Fathers: but of the Fathers surplice or kneeling at the communion, no instance can be given: and as for the crosse, the Def. himselfe will not defend, I thinke, all that use which the Fathers put it to. 3. The Papists owne words doe sufficiently manifest how they are hardened by the imposition and use of our ceremonies. For as it is shewed in the Abridgement p.25. they seek to justifye their superstition by this, that we have borrowed our ceremonies from them. And some of them thence conclude (as there is shewed) that our Governors like well of their superstition Beside *Gregorius,* a principall Jesuit faith, that in these ceremonies our Ministers are as *Apes of Popish Priests,* *Apol. pro Gregor. 7. p. 8.* and in his defence, *tom. 2. lib. 4. cap. 16.* faith, that our Convocation house in imposing these Ceremonies, doe crosse the judgement of our best Divines. Lastly, the respect of that Popish superstition wherewith our people were then generally infected, was the chiefe, if not the onely cause why these ceremonies were retained by our first Reformers. See more of this in M. Parker, p. 2. 6. sect. 10.

*SECT. XI.*
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**SECT. XI.**

The second instance is, that the profane will draw many arguments to base himselfe in his contempt of all Religion. The Defense, asketh, from whence? I answer, from hence: 1. That Religious rites are invented by men, and appointed to be used in God's worship, even after the same manner that God's Ordinances are, or at least were of old: 2. That trifles are urged to the increasing of contention: 3. That many place such holines in these things which they know to be mens devises: 4. That other ceremonies are cryed down, as if they were against Religion, which yet are every way as good as these: 5. That religious men are more molested for these toys, than they are for their profaneness.

**SECT. XII.**

The third instance of scandall is in weak brethren, who will be drawn to yeeld unto the ceremonies against their consciences, or else doubtfully; and some also will grow to dislike some Ministers for these things, and so be hinder'd from profiting by their ministry. To this the Defense answereth in many words: but the summe of all he faileth is, that these are not weak brethren, because they have bene diligently catechized by Non-conformists. But 1. the Corinthians no doubt were diligently catechized; & yet there were many weak among them. 2. The Defense hope taketh order (or else he may be ashamed) that all his Diocess be diligently catechized; yet I think he will
will not say but there are many weak soules in that circuit: 3. The Catechizers he speaketh of have had enough to doe, to teach the people the maine points of Religion, as for instructing them concerning the lawfullnesse of humaine ceremonies, they left that to those that impose them, or to their servants: 4. After long teaching & sufficient knowledge, there may be still a weaknesse in regard of some things, through many circumstances required unto strength, beside bare knowledge. Lastly, we confess, that (upon supposition that the Def. his doctrine be found in these points) we are yet weak in these points, as we are also in some other, wherein our adversaries are so strong, that they can bear many Churches and such like things, upon their shoulders, without feeling any burthen of them, which we cannot. See M. Park. cap.6. sect.18.

S E C T. X I I I.

The fourth instance is thus sett downe in the Abridgement, pag.50. As there is danger in the use of these ceremonies in all Congregations, so especially if they shall be brought backe againe unto those, where they have beene long out of use, In this case Calvin, Brentius, Bucer, Hemingius, Beza, Grinaeus and other great Divines esteeme them wicked and unlawfull.

To all this the Def. giveth no answer: but onely taketh occasion to make a frothy comparison betwixt the lawes and power of particular Congregations, and the whole Convocation house. Which because it neither
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Pertaining to the present purpose, nor containeth any thing of moment, I leave as I found: though it may be easily proved, that many particular Congregations can tell better what is fitting for their edification in some things, than all our Nationall Convocation. Nay, I dare boldly say, there is no Towne of note in all England, but twelve men may be chosen out of, which would finde our Canons more to the edification of all the Congregations in England, then those are, which B. Banyf. with his Clergie, concluded.

SEC. X. IIII.

A first instance, or rather an enlargment of the former is, in respect of the Ministers who have formerly refused the ceremonies, for whereas the Minister is bound to lead his people forward unto perfection, and to provide by all good means, that his ministry be not defiled by any means he shall draw them back againe unto the liking of superstition; or at least not to dislike it so much as they have done, and give them evident occasion to blame his Ministry, and to call in question the truth of all his doctrine.

Here the Defen. commeth upon them with open mouth, avouching peremptorily, that this is false, presumptuous, irreligious, partial, and pernicious pretense: and all this he will prove. If he can, we shall the easiely beare these great words. But why is it false? forlooth, because most of the Non-conformists have once subscribed the contradicting of which subscription is no less a matter of discreditt then returning unto conformitie. What kind of proofe
proofe is this? because they were subject to another discredit, therefore this is no discredit. Beside it doth not appeare, nor is likely that most of these Ministers did ever absolutely subscribe: neither is it likely; because it is well knowne how easie and how ordinary it was in Queene Elizabeth's dayes, to enter into the Ministry without passing under that gallowes. If the most had, yet how would this prove it a false pretence in the rest? If all had done so, yet this was no act of their Ministerie, nor known it may be to their people, and thence the crossing of it did not so directly tend to the discrediting of their Ministerie, as the crossing of their publick doctrine. Lastly, that which is done before a man be settled in the Ministerie at one time, without any great deliberation, is not of such note as that which a man hath long professed and perswaded by reasons taken from the word of God. By all this it appeareth, that this first accusatation of falshood was rather an adventure as the Def. himselfe calleth it, then a grounded assertion.

He did but adventure neither to call the same plea presumptionous. For he can finde no other reason to beare up this charge withall then, that they seeme to arrogate to themselves a prerrogative proper to the Apostles. How can this be I wonder, seeing they follow herein the direction of the Apostle himselfe, Tit. 2.15. Let no man despise thee. What this prerogative is, he doth not plainly tell us: but compriseth it in two places of Scripture, 1.Cor. 15. Gal. 2.18. the first whereof is nothing at all to the purpose. For the Apostle doth not say as the Def. maketh him, if we be found false witnesses, then is your faith in vaine: but
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but if Christ be not risen, then are we false witnesses, and your faith is vaine: Which also any preacher of the Gospel may say without faihhood or presumption to his people. The second place, if I build againe that which I have destroyed, I make my selfe a prevnicator, is applyable to any Minister that hath taught the truth against Popish superstition. This very doctrine M. Perkins gathereth out of the words. Proculeavimus superstitionem Papistam et.

I hope the Def. doth not think he may build up any superstition, and not be accounted therefore a prevnicator: if he doe, or though he doe not, let him consider where the presumption lyeth.

But why irreligious? because it is persifying in an error, for the preservation of their owne credit. But 1. who taught the Def. to make that which is in question the ground of an accusation in dispute. First, let him prove that it is an error, before he take it so for granted, that upon that ground he will challenge mens reasons as irreligious. 2. It is not their credit, but the credit of their Ministry which they speake of. 3. Is it such an irreligious thing, to desire that certaine ceremonies may not bee imposed upon them, lest their Ministry bee by that meanes prejudiced?

Why partiall? because men should rather yeeld to com. so mitte for the credit of the Church: i. e. for the credit of the Convocation house. Alas, the credit which a great part of that generation doth seek for, is that they may rejoice in our flesh. But suppose they meant sincerely: would the Def. have men discredit and prejudice their Ministry, to bring some credit unto other mens decrees.
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Or doth the forbearing of some ceremonies bring such discredit to the Authorizers of them? Surely then they are more for the honour of mortall men, then for the honour of God. For Gods honour and worship is no ways prejudiced by their absence.

The last charge is pernicious. And here many words are used to give countenance unto that one. The maine ground is, Woe to me if I preach not the Gospel; and Simon trust thou mee? then feed my sheep. Whereupon he gathereth, that it is a pernicious thing for a Minister to put himselfe unto silence. But 1. what is this to the question of discrediting ones Ministry? 2. Although we were most worthy to have these remembrances out of Scripture rubbed upon us yet the Prelates are altogether unworthy and unfit to doe it. Let any man conceive with himselfe B. Bancroft, or any other in the end of the Convocation, after all the Canons were concluded, com-ming forth as Prolocutor, and speaking thus to the Ministers assembled together before him. Atten and brethren, the reverend fathers of this Convocation, as they al-ways meditate on the law of God, and every part of it, both day and night: so especially doe they lay to heart those passages of holy Writ which properly concern their office: as Woe unto me if I preach not the Gospel; and Simon trust thou mee? feed my sheep. Out of these considerations, being carried with a fervent zeal both of preaching themselves in their se-verall places, & also of procuring more faithfull Preachers, & more fruitfulfull preaching throughout the land, they have over and above the institutions of Christ, appointed certaine
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ceremonies strictly to be observed of every Minister: so that
Whoever shall hereafter upon any pretense refuse to observe
the same, they shall be esteemed treacherous, seditious, disor-
dering, exorbitant men, and for that cause by them or in any
suspended and deprived. Now for the preventing of such a
mischiefs your tender mother would have you to understand
by my mouth, that if any man be thrust out of the ministry
for not yeeding to these constitutions, however they may
seeme unto him such as the church can no: lawfull: appoint,
nor be observe, yet as he author of his own silencing: and
therefore you must all be exhorted to consider well of those par-
cells of Scripture which have so much prevailed with your
carefull mother: Woe is me if I preach not the Cofhill: Simon
lovest thou most? seek my sheepe.

Would not he that heard such a speech as this from
a Prelate be forced to call for a basin? and after he had
recovered himselfe he might well give answer in these
words, I heare the word of a deceitfull tongue. Behold thou
art called a Bishop and a priest in this title: thou professeth
thy selfe, thou art a chiefest guide and father of the Church, thou
therefore that teachest another, teachest thou not thy selfe:
Then that fœlest it is a woefull thing not to preach the Cofhil,
does thou neither preach Christ faithfully, nor suffer those that
would? Darest thou by thine owne authority, and for thine
owne pleasure, hinder so many able men from preaching?: in
that professeth the flocke must be fed, does thou thrust out she-
ders, and keep in starvers? Therefore thou art indefensible, O
Prelate, whoever thou art, that condemnest another for that
whereof thou art both beginning and ending.

Thirdly, the Apollites woe, 1. Cor. 9. belongeth to
negli
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negligent, slothful, and careless ministers properly, such as our Prelats know where to find enough, who yet neither seele nor feare that woe from the Bishops which my faithfull preachers are wrapp'd in from time to time.

Fourthly, the Apostle doth not pronounce any woe for not preaching, where imprisonment doth hinder. Now he whose conscience is against the ceremonies, ordoubtest of them, is spiritually imprisonment, so that he cannot by using of them, make his way to the pulpit.

Fifthly, it is a meere jest, though a bitter one, to say, that we have our ministers: when we doe all that our consciences will suffer us to doe, for the holding of our places: and when we have done all that, depart against our wills with sorrow. Non discritis a statione, qui cedet seuis. See M. Parker, p. 1. c. 4. f. 14.

But the Defendant undertaken to prove, that the cause of silencing is not in the Bishops that suspend and deprive us, but in ourselves. He is as it seemeth, a great adventurer: For he commeth forth upon this piece of service with flying colours: know you well what you say (sayth hee) when you lay the cause of your silencing upon the Bishops? Yes surely, very well. For a cause is that which bringeth force or vertue to the being of another thing.

Now the first vertue (or rather vice) which tendeth to silencing of Ministers in this case, is in the Bishops canons: they therefore are the first cause. The second vertue is in the Bishops and their officers, which are executioners of those unconscionable canons: they therefore are the secondarie cause. Non-conformity hath no
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vene in it of it owne nature, nor by Gods ordinance, to bring forth such an effect as the silencing of Gods Ministers is: though it be made an occasion by the per-
verseness of our Prelats. I know well what I say: and will make it good against the Defendants vaine pre-
tences. The case standeth thus: (sayth he) Titus (it had been more proper to say Diotrephes) the Bishop doth deprive Titus a factionous and schismaticall minister, that he may place Sempronius a peaceable and discreet man, in his stead. In this proceeding, the intendment of Titus is not absolutely to de-
prive Titus, as he is a Minister, but as he was factionous: yet so-
onely respectively, that Titus being deprived, he may con-
tinue Sempronius: for the charge of a Bishop is not determinate to appoynte precisely this minister: but inde
definite, to ordaine a minister, so that the course of Gods plow is still preserved and continued. But as for Titus, who will rather be silenced then conformed, it is evident, that the cause of his silencing being his owne refractaries, which is onely personall & proper to him-
selfe, and yet hath no faculty in himselfe to appoynte or admit of a successor: he may be sayd to have properly caused his own suspisition and depravation.

This case needeth no long demurring on: for there is not one sentence in all the length of it, which doth not smell, without any uncasing, 1. are all those factionous and schismatical men, that refuse to conforme? was Hooper such a kynd of man? was Peter Martyr, and Mr. Perkins such, when one at Oxford, and the other at Cambridge, refused to weare the Surplice? was Mr. Goodman, Mr. Deering, Mr. More, Mr. Rogers, and such like heavenly men, the lights & glory of our churches, were
were all these factious and schismaticall? In the presence of God it is well knowne they were not. But our Prelats have this prerogative, they may dub whom they please factious and schismaticall, & after that, there is no redemption, they must be such, be they otherwise never so full of all grace.

2. Are all peaceable discreet men, which are placed in the deprived ministers stead? For the best of them, they are still as great eyesores to our Bishops almost as the other: because they reprove a great deale of Episcopall darkness, by their practices. For the rest, the congregations over whom they are set, cannot finde it, the voyce of all the countrey is otherwise for many of them; yet according to the Prelats measure, who meet (as it seemeth) the vertues and vices of a minister by certaine ceremonies of their owne imposing, it cannot be denied, but the most of them are very peaceable and discreet: Even so as many of the Bishops themselves were knowne to be afore they were Bishops, and shew themselves to be still: for, Episcopatus plures acceptis, quam sectis bonos.

3. What sence can this have, The Bishop depriveth Titius respectively, that he may constitute Sempronius? Doth he know before-hand whom he shall constitute? then there is grosse legerdemain, betwixt him, and that Sempronius. For with what conscience can one seek and the other assigne the place of him that is in possession? This is but some time in those benefices which are fatter, and whose patrons are more foolish. Ordinarily, the vilest minister that is to be found, may succeed in the
in the place of him that is deprived, for ought the Bishop knoweth, or for ought he can doe, except he will endure a quare impedie, which in case of morall unworthinesse, hath scarce beene ever heard of.

4. The charge which he sayth our Bishops have of appointing Ministers, I wonder from whence they have it, or by what conveyance. They say that they themselves are the proper pastors of all the parishes in their Diocesse. It is well, if they have an ubiquituary faculty, and will, to performe the office of pastors to so great a people: but who made them such? Christ & his Apostles never knew of ordinary pastors, having charge of so many Churches. But suppose they did, by whom doth Christ call one of our Bishops? By the Kings conge-deler, the Chapiters nominall election, or by the Arch-bishops consecration? There is none of these that can beare the triall of Scripture, nor of the Primitive Churches example?

5. Is the Bishops power of appointing a minister no wayes determinate to this or that minister? then it seemeth his meer will determineth of the particular person, without any just reason. For if there be certaine causes or reasons which the Bishop is bound to follow in designing of this or that minister, rather then another, then is the Bishop determinate. The Councell of Nice it selfe determined the authority even of Patri-arches in this case: viz. that the Elders should first nominate sixt men επιλεγεται αυτους αυτοι των αξιων: secondly, that the people should elect or choose out of that number, περ χειροτοιαν: & thirdly, that the Bishop should con-
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Sime the elected προειστεραὶ, συνεπιφίλη, ἐπισφεργόμενοι. Socrat. l.x. p.177. What exorbitant power is this then which our Bishops doe now a dayes chalenge unto themselves? All Classickall Divines do consent to that which Iunius setteh downe, Conc. s. 1.2. c.6. n.73. that no Bishop can send or appoint a Minister, sine certa, aut justa ecclesiae postulatione, without the certaine fore-choyce of the Church: Id enim est obtrudere, non mittere, for that were to obtrude him, not to send him.

6. How is the course of Gods plow preserved, whea for the most part the succeeding Minister is thrust upon the people against their wills, and so pernicious contentions arise, of which the Bishop is cause procreant and conservant, by depriving the people of their minister, and obtruding his owne minister upon them, and upholding him in all those courses whereby he grieveth the poore people.

7. As the Minister hath no faculty in himselfe to appoint a successor, so hath not the Bishop neither of himselfe, and by himselfe.

Thus much for the Defendant his case. Whereas he addeth, that Beza and Mr. Cartwright determined with him in case of the Surplice. I answer 1. they did not so for the croffe. 2. they did not so for subscription to either. 3. they did not so but by way of toleration, requiring alto that men did speake against the imposing of the Surplice. 4. Beza was not throughly acquainted with the state of our Church. Mr. Cartwright (as I have C 3 beene
beene certainly informed by his owne sonne) recalled that passage of his booke, and desired that his revoking of it might be made knowne.

I thought good, overseeing the Press, to confirm the Author's report, by a more particular relation which I have received from a person of good credit, set downe in writ as followeth.

Mr. Cartwright being beyond the seas, in printing the rest of his 2. Reply, werein that indulgence is, sent to the Ministers of England, who sought reformation with him, for their opinion of the use of the Surplice in case of deprivation: 22. of whom metreabout: of whom is jointly agreed that it was simply unlawful in any case, but the other three saide otherwise; wherefore it was agreed by all, that each part should write their opinion, and their reasons to him, which they did: but the letter of the nineteen miscarried, and that of the other three was delivered, which being as the letter of the whole, supposed their joint consent had beene, that the losse of the ministry altered the case of the unlawfulness, & so that they were all against him; whereupon be mistrusting his owne judgement, and being much perplexed thereabout, suffered himselfe to be
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Sayd unto what is there written: but afterward understanding the right, he was much more perplexed; yea (as he sayd) more then ever he was, in that to the great prejudice of the truth, he had suffered his conscience to be so defiled, which was forbidden, 1 Cor. 8.7. Which he very sorrowed to many, professing that if he againe put pen to paper about that subject, he would cleare the cause, and blame himselfe, praying them to signifie the same freely in the meane tyme, the which they did, so that it ever since hath been currant among all his friends, and constantly affirmed by them, to all on due occasions, and particularly affirmed to M. Sprint by a Gentleman in the presence of one Nobleman, two Gentlemen, 27. Ministers, and many professors, in his course, in the scanning his booke then about to be printed divers yeares before it was printed, sundry also of those ministers avouched the same, some on their owne knowledge, others upon undoubted testimony, which yet is ready to be avouched in due case of need, and should now be expressed, were not the naming of the avouchers dangerous unto them, and so not to be done without their knowledge, which now cannot be.

For the point it selfe, when a man doth but stand in doubt
doubt betwixt using the ceremonies, and suffering old privation, it must needs be more safe, patiently to suffer himselfe to bee thrust from his ministry, then to retaine it and offend his conscience by using the Ceremonies. For so bee restrained by authority from his lawfull function, because hee will not yeeld to the doing of that which to him is sinne, is no more sinne: the sufferer, then to surcease his publicke preaching whilst he is held in prison, where he wanteth occasion. Thus the use of that is avoyed, which he disalloweth and the blame of leaving his standing, is theirs who cal him from thence, and not his. So no sinn is committed either in the use of that hee disalloweth, or in surceasing deprivation. But to hold his place, and to practive against conscience, is to commit one great sinn at the halt.

Thus having examined the Defend. his adventurous charges of false, presumptuous, irreligious, partial, and pernicious, I finde them all to bee but rash words of dilled per.

S E C T. XV.

In the last place, the Defendant bringeth forth to answere the words of the Apostle, 1. Thess. 5.22. Abstaine from all appearance of evill. But as this argument is not found at all in that page of the Abridgment which he citeth, so in the words or sence which he let eth downe, I dare say it is not used either of them, or any other against the ceremonies. Yet let us heare his answer. The Apostle speakeith (sayth he) of the opinions of privall
private men. But 1. what warrant hath he to restrain a general precept, when the universalitie of it agreeeth with the law? Abstaine from all appearance, sayth the Apostle: i.e. sayth the Def. from some private opinions.
2. Why must appearance of evil be needs understood of opinions only? Two or three interpreters indeed do understand it of doctrine most properly: but the most otherwise; and the word translated appearance, signifying rather an object of seeing then of hearing, leads us rather to the eye, as in actions, gestures, garments, then to the ear in doctrines.
3. For that which he addeth of private mens opinions, there is no circumstance of the text, nor any reason or authority that doth warrant such a gloss.

S E C T. XVII.

Among his accusations wherein he chargeth us with manifold scandals, the first is, that some weak ones by occasion of these differences, stand amazed, and so become more remiss in profession or religion. Where 1. it is to bee observed, that when wee spake of weake-ones. Sect. 12. it was putt off with this pretence, that they were such as we had catechised. Now then, who are these weak-ones? I hope the Bishops provide that people of their Diocesses are well catechised: whence then is this weakness? 2. Differences in matters of circumstance are not wont to breed scandal, untill some authority injoyne uniformity, as we may see in the primitive Churches. 3. If differences be the occasion
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The second charge of Scandal, is in respect of the Separatists. Where 1. I aike, if Gain had made a separation from the Church, wherein Diotrephes lived, whether the Apostle John had beene cause of that Scandal, because he condemned his Abuse of excommunication, Joh. 3. 9. 10.  2. If any separate from churches where Images are retained, who is the cause, they that dislike of Images, or they that retaine them? 3. The dislike of Ceremonies is not the chief cause for which separation is made: but the intollerable abuses which are in Ecclesiastical Courts, by which it commeth to passe, that many poore men being troubled at the first for a small thing, afterward are driven to flye the country: and flying with a hatred of such courses, are ready to re-
to receive that impression which is most opposite unto them. The thing itself is plain enough to all indifferent men, that Ecclesiastical corruptions urged and obtruded, are the proper occasion of separation.

S E C T. XIX. XX.

In the next place the Papists are alleged as persons offended by Non-conformity, because they are utterly unpersuadeable to enter into a Church where all ancient rites are professedly rejected. But 1. the refusing of conformity by the Ministers, doth not, I hope, make these ancient rites (much less all) to be professedly rejected by our Church. For then we may plead the profession of our mother as well as the Defendant: which he I am sure will not grant. 2. This assertion which is given as a reason, is evidently false. For in Scotland, France, the Low countries, and such like Churches, where none of these ceremonies are retained, the power of God's word (which doth not depend on humaine Ceremonies) is as effectual to the conversion of Papists, as in England. 3. How doth this agree with that which the Defendant hath so often told us, that our ceremonies are not the same with the Papists Ceremonies: and that the Papists have no great conceit of our ceremonies, cap. 2. sect. 1. 4. If our contentions about these things bee a scandal to the Papist, let them looke to it that cast these apples of contention into the Church, under the pretense of peace and uniformity. 5. One minister without conformity, as old M. Athijs of Ratidell, who was at first silenced for his labour, hath converted more Papists then
The greatest scandal of all (sayth the Defend.) is against the Church. Now this Non-conformists are made guilty of two ways: 1. comparatively in this section, & then absolutely in the next. The comparative accusation is, that we for avoiding of offence to wards our brethren, grievously offend our mother, in that wherein we owe obedience unto her. Where 1. the question is taken for granted, for we deny that we owe obedience in the ceremonies to any man or society of men. 2. If our mother be somewhat angry, that is not presently a scandal by his definition, sect. 1. but when she is provoked to a mortall error. Now what mortall error do we provoke the Church to? Our desire and scope
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Scope is, that the Ceremonies should be either wholly removed, or else left free to use or disuse: this is no mortal error, I hope. The event by accident is the silencing, depriving, excluding, and making of us for Non-conformity: This indeed is a great error and sinne of the Prelates: but as was formerly shewed, the beginning of it is in their irregular Canons, and the ending of it, in the cruel executions.

3. By applying our selves to the will of the Prelates in these Ceremonies, we should, though not anger, yet greatly scandalize them, by confirming them in a sinne of making their owne will a rule to the Churches, even in mysticall ceremonies of superstitious worship, contrary to their and our daily prayer, Thy will be done.

4. The convocation doth not carry herself like a mother toward us: neither doe we acknowledge any such honour to belong unto it. As for the faithfull congregations of England, the greatest part of them would willingly be rid of these burdens.

The rest of this Section is nothing pertinent: yet two things may bee noted in it. 1. An error that the number of Jewish Professors was great, and the converted Gentiles few, Acts 15. 2. A grosse assertion, that after the doctrine of Indifference in eating of meats, was made publicke by the Church, then to have sought by abstaining to avoid the offence of some, had beene to the prejudice of Christian liberty and to the scandal of the Church.

The other accusation of contempt, is only objected Sect. 22. and varnished over with a few glowing words Sect. 23. and therefore may well bee answered with contempt. But hee that will see a full refutation of this, let D
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him read Mr. Parker chap. 5. sect. 11. 12. I am wearie of 
wrastling with the winde: yet one unworthy and un-
christian taunt I cannot passe by, that hee upbraidd th 
the Ministers with, living upon voluntary contribu 
ition, and feare of offending their maintainers. For 1. when 
as he confesseth, he hath no windowes to look into 
mens consciences by, what rule of religion will permit 
him to cast upon his brethren such a suspicion contrary 
to their profession, and speaking against 
their consciences for gaining of a poore contribution? 
Is there not farre more cause to thinke, that great livings, 
and worldly honors (one of the choicest darts that Sa 
tan hath in his quiver, and therefore tried against our 
Saviour himselfe when all other failed, Mat. 4. 8, 9.) is it 
not more likely I say that these promotions beare more 
sway in the mindes of our great Prelates, then a poore 
supply of necessaries with others? 2. Neither all, nor 
the most part of them against whom he writeth did 
live upon contributions. Though they need not have 
beene ashamed thereof if they had: seeing not onely the 
primitive Pastors did so, but even in our time, Mr. Perkins 
and other such lights of our Church, have with that 
kynde of life done more good then all our Cathedrall 
men with their great revenues. 3. Who are the cause 
that many are forced to live upon contribution? have 
not the Loirerers of Cathedrall Churches ingrossed a 
great part of that maintenance whereby labouring Pre 
chers should be maintained? Doe not our Pluralists and 
Non-residents carry away the fat of the greatest livings, 
& leave scarce a Serving-mans wages to their Curats, Io 
that
that either they must be supplied by contribution, or else by begging? Nay, do not the people in divers places take it for a great courtesy at the Non-residents hands, if he will take his Tithes and suffer them to procure and maintain to themselves an honest minister in his place? have not our honourable Parliament offered to provide some competent maintenance for the Ministers, if the Clergie would forbear their sinfull excesses? 4. Why should the Ministers depend so much upon contribution, if they had such accommodative consciences, as this Def. surmiseth of them? Some of them with serving the time, and the addition of Simony, might come to be Bishops: and the rest might be preferred by their means to some certaine incomings.

CHAP. VI. Sect. III.

Now we are come to the sixt and last generall Argument, viz. that the imposition of these ceremonies is opposite unto Christian liberty. Here the Def. observeth first, that the state of this question is about liberty from the necessary observation of such things as are in their owne nature indifferent. This (saith he) the Objector implyeth. But I answer, the Objector doth not imply it: he speaketh of ceremonies lawfully appointed by man, that these are to be used as things indifferent. Neither if one private Obj. had granted it, ought it therefore to be set downe as the received state of the question, seeing the Abridgment, which in the defence is chiefly opposed, doth everywhere deny the ceremony to be in their owne
owne nature indifferent. But let that passe and examine his resolution. There be two kinds of necessities incident unto humane precepts and ordinances, in the case of indifferencie: one is necessity of obedience to the commandement, which cannot properly prejudice Christian liberty: the other is doctrinal necessity: when any of those properties which are essential unto divine ordinances are attributed unto a humane constitution: as 1. immediately to bind the conscience 2. to be necessary means to salvation 3. to hold it altogether unalterable by the authority of man: this is a presumption and prevarication, not only against Christian liberty, but also against the sovereignty of God himselfe. But what meaneth this new distinction betwixt necessity doctrinal and obedientiastall? doctrinal before pag.3. was opposed unto ceremoniall: now unto obedientiastall: both without logick, or sound reason. 2. He should have told us what kynd of necessitie obedientiastall he meaneth: for Bellar. de pont. rom. l.4. c.17. utter the same pretence of obedience, and alledge the same places of Scripture for it: and yet is confuted by Junius, Whitsakers, and our Divines. 3. If there be doctrinal necessity, in all those humane constitutions, which have properties attributed unto them essentiall unto divine ordinances, then our ceremonies in controversie not only have such a mysticall signification attributed unto them as is proper unto Divine Ordinances; but also that they are imposed as parts of Gods worship. 4. For the three properties, which the Def. mentioneth, they are such as Papists in imposing of their ceremonies (which yet by the judgement of all our Divines deprive men of Christian liberty) doe die.
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As for immediate binding of mens consciences; no learned Papist useth such a phrase. Azorius a Jesuit insit. mor. parte 1. lib. 5. cap. 6. saith expressly, that humane lawes doe not bind, directe, proxime, & perse: directly, immediately, & of themselves. Bellarmine allo. de Rom. pont. l.4. cap. 20. ad arg. 9. saith as much: Leges humanae non obligant sub pena mortis, nisi quatenus violacione legis humane offenditor Deus, i.e. they doe not immediately binde mens consciences. For necessity to salvation, the same Bellarmine de verb. non script. c. i. e. saith plainly, That those things which are simply necessary unto salvation are set downe in Scripture; and that the rest are not simply necessary. And it is plaine enough that they doe not hold them altogether unalterable by that authority which brought them in: for beside, that no reasonable man can deny so manifest a truth, they have altered many ancient Rites, is all the learned know. So that the Defendant his distinction is proved nothing else but a confusion, common to him with the Papists, to our ceremonies and theirs.

S E C T. I V. V.

In the 4. Section, the Def. objecteth to himselfe under the name of the Abridgement, the words of the Apostle, 1. Cor. 7. 35. This I speake to your profite, not that I might cast a snare upon you, shewing that the imposition of necessity upon things indifferent, is a very snare of mens consciences. Now though these words are not in the Abridgement, yet because as D. Whitakers saith, de pont. cap. 4. qu. 7. aures hic locus est, nonest a libertatis viamex. This
This is a golden charter of liberty; therefore it is worthy of due consideration. The summe of the Def. his answer is, that to impose a necessity where God hath left a liberty, is indeed a snare: but this necessity is not taught in our Church. I answer it is taught in our church (now a dayes) that ecclesiastical canons do bind mens consciences. It is taught in our church that mas wili is a sufficiet reason for these Canons about Cer. It is taught in our church, that Sacraments may not be administered, or God publickly served without these cerem: that Ministers called and allowed of God, for these ceremonies must be silenced; that they are to be excommunicated ipso facto, and accursed which oppose themselves unto them. It is taught also, that though a man doubteth in his conscience of the lawfulness of them, though evident scandall will follow upon the using of them, yet they may not be omitted. If this be not necessity enough to insnare a mans conscience, I know not what then is.

In the first Section, two places are objected out of the Abridgement, viz. Gal. 5.1. Col. 2.20. and one of them after a fashion answered. The first answered is, that the Apostle there speaketh onely of Jewish rites, which is Bellarmines answer just, de eff. Sacr. c. 32. loquitur Paulus de servitute Judaica, qua servierant illi sub antiqua lege. The second answer is, that the Apostles meaning was of such an observation of these ceremonies as had an opinion of necessity, overthrowing the new Testaments, and establishing the old. So Bellarmin. ibid. Illi cum circumcisi velletum, excidabant a gratia Christi, & simul obligabant se ad omne legem servandum: quod prorsus erat redire ad statum veteris.
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We on the other side with Daniel against that place of Bell. say, generall y Paul's dictum & preceptum: the words are generall, belonging to all parts of Christ's liberty, though principally ther applied to one.

Now the servitute from which Christ hath made us free is not only in those things which the Def. speaketh of, but also as 1un. cont. 3. l.4.c.17. n.19. & 21. sheweth in subjection of our consciences unto elements of man's appointing, Gal 4. 10. and unto the will of men, 1. Cor. 7. 23. which place Beza well noteth, is to be understood of superstitions which some doe foolishly call indifferent things. It is not only therefore a freedome from Jewish Ceremonies, but also and even therefore as D. Whitakers gathereth from all humane ceremonies that binde or presse our consciences, Whit. de rom. pont. q.7. c.3. ad 5. But it is in vaine for me to alledge our Divines in this question: the Abridgement alledgeeth diverse, whom the Def. would not vouchsafe an answer.

One thing here the Def. noteth, that in the Abridgement mysticall and carnall are unsoundly confounded. But I say, this is unsoundly collected: for these two are joyned together there onely in respect of Jewish worship, and that which imitatest it: And therefore it is to no end to instanced in the Sacraments instituted by Christ, of cleere signification, and accompanied with the promise and lively working of the Spirit. The same poore instance hath Bellarmine de cult. l.3. c.7. for signif- icant ceremonies.

But is savourerst of the Besh (sayth the Def.) to call our ceremonies carnall. Why so I pray? the Jewish ceremonies deserved
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deserved that name, you your selfe say, even when they were in force: and surely ours devised by man, abused by idolaters, without necessary use, destitute of all promise and spirit, are farre more worthy to be called carnall, then Gods owne Ordinances. Those were onely carnall because in comparison they were externall, hea-vie, dull things: but ours are more heavie and dull, and beside they are sinfully carnall, as hath beene proved.

But what soudnesse doth this favour of, that the Def. sayth generally of the Jewish Ceremonies, they signified first and primarily outward and carnall promises, shadowing heavenly things onely under a second veile? I will not ex-agitat this assertion,because it is in the by.

S E C T. V J.

Here an objection is fained out of the Abridg-ment pag. 34. I say fained,because there is none such found in the place quoted. That which is there spoken concerning other Popish ceremonies, is a fixt profe of the second Argument, distinct from the fift, wherto that of Christian liberty doth belong. That also is handled by the Def.c. 3.1.7. and there maintained against him. So that this might well be omitted. Yet be-cause there is some force in the consequence,let us heare his Defence. The objection which he frameth is this: If these Ceremonies do not take away our Christian liberty, and insnare the consciences of men, by their imposition: how shall not the Popish Ceremonies be excusable, and free from accusation in this behalfe? His answer is, that Popish Ceremonies doe infringe Christian liberty, both in regard of their nature,
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nature, and also in regard of their number. And of both these Mr. Calvin giveth witness. I answer 1. for the nature, it hath beene shewed before, that a multiture of Popish Ceremonies have no other nature & necessity allowed unto them by the learned Papists, then ours have by the Defendant himselfe. See for this Bellarmine de effect. febr. c.30. That which Mr. Calvin saith of this point is true, notwithstanding in regard of the conceit which is commonly among the simple Papists, fostered by unlearned Monkes, Friers, and other Priests, for filthy lucre sake. 2. The comparisons which Mr. Calvin uie, viz. That it is held among the Papists a greater wickedness to o. mitt auricular Confession, then to live impiously: eat flesh on fasting days, then to live in fornication; to work on Saints holy days, then to act mischief, &c. Those he gathereth principally fro that practice of the Papists, whereby they punish more severely the breach of their Ceremonies than of Gods Law. Now this is not only practiced by our Prelates, but also maintained by this Defendant, chap.2, sect.12. with such faire prerence, as the Papists may well use for the Defense of their practice. 3. As for the multitude of Ceremonies among the Papists, that maketh their bondage greater then ours; but doth it make ours none at all? Besides, when a few mysticall humaine Ceremonies are admitted, the gate is set open for a multitude: even untill the Convocation will say there be too many. For Bellarmine himselfe will grant that Ceremonies are not to be multiplyed over much. Fatemur Ceremonias non esse nimis multiplicandas, de eff. sacr. c.30. but what is too much, that must be left to the
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to the judgement of the Church or Convocation, faith he, and the Defendant both.

SECT. VII. VJFF. IX. X.

In all these Sections the Def. goeth about to teach us the doctrine which concerneth binding of mens consciences. In the first his conclusion is good and sound, God therefore and not man deth properly and directly binde the conscience of man. It is sufficient therefore to note that it is an improper phrase to say that mens lawes doe binde mens consciences, in respect that God commandeth to obey the just lawes of men: for so, as Ginson observeth, the Phisitions præscrips should also binde a sick mans conscience, in respect of Gods will, whereby a sick man is tied to follow the good and wholesome counsell of his Phisition.

In the 8. Section two of our Divines are brought-in to prove that men are bound in conscience to observe the just lawes of Magistrates, which none of us ever doubted of.

The 9. Section is spent in proving, that Ecclesiastical lawes have as great force in respect of conscience as politick. Which if it bee granted, yet nothing can from thence be concluded for the advantage of ceremonies unlawfully imposed. But 1. it is diligently to be observed, that the Church hath no commission for to make any lawes properly so called: as I have formerly shewed in cap.1. sect.16. 2. The common received opinion of all our Divines is contrary to that which the Defendant heere sayth:
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Faith: as may be scene in Bellarmine de Pont. Rom. 1. 4.c.15. and Junius, Whitakers, with the rest, who writing against Bellarmine do not deny but defend that which he faith, Lutheans & Calvinista omnes docent. 3. The interroga-
tories which the Defendant miniestreth unto us in this
case doth not prove his Asserion. For the Church is a
Society, but not compleat, if it be considered as not com-
prehending Christ the Head and onely Law maker of
it. Breach of peace is not a sinne against an Ecclesiasticall,
but a divine law. Obedience is to be yeelded unto law-
full Ecclesiasticall Governours, when they bring the
charge of Christ whose Minifters they are. See Dr. Whi-
takers de Pont. Rom. cont.4. q.7.c.2. ad 12. The Kings stamp,
As for Apostolicall constitution (to which our canons
are as like as Apples are to Oisters) the same answere
which Doctor Whithakers, cont. 4. q.7.c.3. ad 5. with
other of our Divines giveth to Bellarmine, may serve for
our Defendant.

In the 10. Sect. he setteth downe nothing but that
which he knoweth we all grant.

S E C T. X F.

Against the Accusation of contempt, there was (as
it seemeth) alledged by M. Nic. that by the same
reason that Non-conformity is contempt; bow-
ling, disusing of caps, & such habites prescribed should
be contempt. Here the Defendant first bringeth divers
interpretations out of the Casualists: and then taketh
one
one for granted without rendering of any reason, that he may by it excuse bowling and discharge of cappes. But what if we take hold of another interpretation, esteeming the obligation by the intent of the Law-makers, which was against Popish Recusancie of our Communion-booke, and not against refusal of some few ceremonies contained therein? I speak now of the Statute Law, not of lawless canons. Or what if we should stand upon that interpretation, which fetcheth the obligation from the weight of the matter imposed, which in our ceremonies is very little? Some of these I am sure the Bishops must flye, if they will defend their discharge of the Crossers: which they are bound by our lawes as well to use, as the Ministers are surpluses.

But all this is needless, because there can be no contempt in a conscionable forbearance of unlawful impositions; such as the ceremonies are sufficiently proved to be.

SECT. XI.

Here certaine Divines are brought in witnessing, 1. that superstitious doe dep. i.e. men of Christian liberty: which we deny not, but take their testimonies as making against our ceremonies: because as I have formerly shewed some of these superstitious opinions are inseparable from the imposing and using of them. 2. That Christian liberty doth not consist in the use or discharge of things indifferent: which we also willingly grant. But I would have the Defendant remem-
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... that all freedom is not in the minde & conscience. For where the minde is free, the body may be bound; else Christians should not take so much of this worlds misery as they doe. Now Christ hath left unto us not only an inward liberty of minde and conscience, but also an outward freedom of our bodies and outward man, from such bodily rites in his worship as have not his stampe upon them, and his Spirit and blessing promised unto them. Of this the Defendant faileth nothing at all.

Sect. XIII. XIII.

Concerning the profession of our Church so often brought in, enough hath been said before, now it sufficeth to answer, that no profession whatsoever can make humane significant Ceremonies in God's worship agree with Christian liberty.

As for superstition, which the Defendant doth now the second time most ridiculously object, I have answered in the beginning of this Confutation. Now onely I note: 1. how loosely he describeth that superstition which he calleth affirmative: as if no man could use any thing superstitiously, except he did hold, that without it the faith of Christianity, or the true worship of God could not possible consist. Never was there such a description given by any man that considered what he said.

2. How manfully he concludes our negative superstition, upon this ground, that Christ hath left these ceremonies free, which is the maine question between us and us.
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3. How he mis-repôrteth our opinion, in saying absolutely that we hold a Surplice to have unhollinesse and pollution in it: whereas we hold that it is only made more unfit for God's service then it was before through idolatrous abuse: but yet unto other uses it may be applied.

4. That in stead of Scripture, he bringeth forth the universal practice of men in the Church: which yet hath beene formerly also refused.

5. That he can finde no Divine that calleth opposing of Ceremonies superstition, but onely M. Calvin in one place (peaking rhetorically, as he useth to doe, and not intending any definition or distributio of that vice.

6. How he corrupteth P. Martyr's words, to have some colour for a new accusation. P. Martyr taking thereupon him the person of an adversarie unto Hooper's opinion (with whom notwithstanding afterward he consented, and recalled the counsell which then he gave, as appeareth pag.1125,) saith that if we should refuse all things that the Papists used, we should bring the church into servitude, which assertion is most true, because the Papists abused many necessary things, even Christ's own Ordinances, the observing of which is liberty. Now the Def. would have that precisely understood, and that in the rigour of every word concerning the Surplice.

I have here subjoined apart an Epistle of Zanchius, whose other wayes was somewhat favourable to Bishops: Wherein the Reader may see his judgement concerning superstitious garments.
To the most renowned Queen Elizabeth, 
Defender of the Christian Religion, and most mighty 
Queen of England, France and Ireland, 
Hieronymus sendeth greeting.

Most gracious & most Christian Queen, 
we have not without great grief understood, that the fire of contention about certaine garments, which we thought had beene quenched long agoe, is now againe to the incredible offence of the godly, as it were raised from hell, and kindled a fresh in your Majesties Kingdom, and that the occasion of this fire is, because your most gracious Majesty being persuaded by some, otherwise great men, and carried with a zeal (but certainly not according to knowledge) to retaine unity in religion, hath now more then ever before resolved and decreed, yea doth will and command that all the Bishops and Ministers of the Churches shall in divine service put on the white and linnen garments which the Popish Priests use now in Popergie; yea that it is to be feared, least this fire be so kindled, and cast its flame so farre and wide, that all the Churches of that most large and mighty kingdom, to the perpetuall disgrace of your most renowned Majesty, be set on a flaming fire:
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Seeing the most part of the Bishops, men greatly renowned for all kind of learning and godlines, had rather leave their office and place in the Church, than against their own conscience, admit of such garments, or at the least signs of idolatry and Popish superstition, and so defile themselves with them, and give offence to the weak by their example. Now what other thing will this be, then by retaining of these garments, to destroy the whole body of the Church? For without doubt that is Satan's intent, by casting a seed of dissensions amongst the Bishops. And that hee aimed at the infancy of the Church, by stirring up discord betweene the East and West Churches, about the Passover and other Ceremonies of that kind. Therefore Irenæus Bishop of Lyons, had just cause in his Epistle sent out of France to Rome, sharply to reprove Victor the Pope of Rome, because he out of a kind of zeal, but not according to knowledge, was minded to excommunicate all the Churches of Asia, because they celebrated not the Passover just at the same time, as they at Rome did. For this was nothing but by an unseasonable desire to retain the same Ceremonies in all Churches to rent and tear a piece the unity of the Churches. Therefore so soone as I heard that so great a ruine hanged over the Church of Christ in that kingdom, presently, in respect of that duty which I owe to the Church of Christ, to your gracious Majesty, and to that whole kingdom, intended to write thither, and to try by my utmost endeavor whether so great a mischief might possibly be withstood: some that fear Christ, and with well
well to your Majesty, exhorting me to the performance of this duty. But when I had scarcely begun to think of this course, behold our most illustrious Prince commanded me to doe it, which command of his did not onely spurre me on, who of mine owne accord was already running, but laid a necessity of writing upon me. Wherefore this my boldnesse will seeme the lesse strange unto your gracious Majesty, seeing my writing proceedeth not so much from mine owne will and counsell of friends, as from the commandement of my most Noble Prince, who is one of your gracious Majestyes speciall friends. Now I thought I should doe a matter very worth the paines taking, if first I should humbly admonish your most famous Majestie what your dutie is in this cause: and secondly, if as your humble suppliant I should beseech you for our Lord Jesus Christis sake, to performe the same. I beseech your gracious Majesty to take this my writing in good part, for it proceedeth from a Christian love toward the Church, and from an especiall reverend respect that I beare to your most gracious Majesty. The Lord knoweth all things. Now to the matter in hand.

Whereas the Apostle writing to Timothie, commandeth that prayers be made for Kings, and all other that be in authority, and faith, that the end whereof they be ordained, is, that wee may lead a peaceable and quiet life in all (that is, perfect) godlineesse and honestie, he teacheth plainly enough what is the dutie of Godly Kings and Princes, namely, that they
take care, and bring to passe, that first & above all things, true religion, and the true worship of God, where it is banished, bee restored, and being restored, bee kept pure: all things which smell of impiety being farre removed. Secondly, that men may live honestly, and holily, all kinds of uncleannesse beeing abandoned. Lastly, that publicke peace & holy friendship be maintained among the subjects, all occasions of contentions being, as much as possible may be, taken out of the way.

As the Apostle teacheth manifestly, as we have seene, so all learned men who bee of sound judgement concerning the Magistrats office, doe with one consent affirm, that these be the three chiefe parts of the office of the Prince, and of every godly Magistrate. Which thing being so, I see not how your gracious Majestie can with good conscience, propound againe the garments in question, and other things of that kinde, smelling as yet of Popish superstition, and once banished out of the Churches, to the consciences of the Bishops* to be taken on againe, and so propound them that you should command them by your commandement to receive them againe. For first, this is quite contrary to the first and chiefe part of the Princes office. For if the Magistrate ought to have a chiefe care, that the worship of God be kept pure and without mixture; and if for this cause all things are to be abandoned which may any way either by themselves, or by accident defile this worship: and therefore all things are to be called backe as much as may be, to the rule of God, and to the former and Apostolical, and so the more pure and simple forme of religion: Finally, if as
if as the Apostle commandeth, we bee to abstaine, not onely from all evil, but also from all appearance of evil; to what end, I beseech you most renowned and most godly Queene, shou'd those things be brought againe into the Church of God, by the Princes commandement, which be contrary to the purity of the Apostolical worship, which smell of Popish superstition, which bee neither available to the edification of the godly, nor to order, nor for ornament, except that which is whoorish: which lastly, can bring no profit, but on the contrary, many evils to the Church? It is out of all doubt, that by this law concerning apparrell, all godly men will bee offended, but the wicked will laugh in their face, and hereby be putt in hope to get many more things: as for those of the middle sort, that is, such as be newly converted and turned from ungodliness to godliness, and be not as yet well grounded, they will be in great danger, and if we speake according to mans judgement, they will rather looke back to the old superstition, to which by nature wee are inclined, then fixe and fasten their eyes upon true religion. And therefore this is a decree which will bring no advancement at all to godlines, but may much further ungodlinesse. For though these garments be not evil and uncleanesse of and by themselves, that is, of their owne nature, yet because of the former and late abuse, they are not altogether free from uncleanesse. Certainly it cannot be denied, but that they will at the least, give occasions of many evils and very grievous superstitions. Now the very occasions also of evils are to be shunned. To what end
end then should these be thrust upon the Church, from whom no profit can be hoped, very much evil may come? for this is to tempt God. Your famous Majesty may well remember, that not without cause it was written; Hic est locus, ipsis, salutis, shall be defiled with in: that the Apostle had reason to command, that we should purge out the old leaven, that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump. And that Hosca did not foolishly reprove the Jews, because they translated and brought a young grass (of superstitions) out of Israel into their own garden, that is, the true Church. We ought, most religious Queene, to have nothing at all to do with the Papists in matter of religion, save in those things which they have common with the Apostles. Why, I beseech you, were some kings, otherwise godly, reproved and blamed in the Scriptures, that they had not taken away Churches or Temples for divine service in the mountains, which were built by holy Fathers ere the building of the Temple, in which the Lord was wont to be worshipped? Surely, because the Temple being now built and ordained for divine service, God would not have any footsteps of any other chappell at all to be extant. Therefore also when once the kingdom of Christ was manifested, the Ceremonies and garments of Aaron ought not any more to take place. For this cause the Apostles were upon good ground careful that after Christ's ascension, they should so be taken away, that no reliques of them remained. And if they took them away holy, unholy have the Papists called them back againe. Now whether is the better to follow the godly
godly simplicity of the Apostles, or the ungodly pompe of the Papists, who is ignorant? This recalling of such Popish garments, your gracious Majesty may beleve me, will be a greater evil; then peradventure it may be seen, even to very wise men at the first blush: For me thinkes I see and heare the Monks crying out with very loud voyces in the Pulpits, both confirming their followers in their ungodly religion, by the example of your gracious Majesty, and also saying, What? doth not even the Queene of England also, a most learned and a most prudent Princesse, beginne by little and little to come back to the religion of the holy church of Rome, the most holy and sacred vestments of the Clergie men being taken on againe? we are to be in good hope that the day will come, wherein she will at length, though now they be thought to be dead, recall also all the other Rites and Sacraments of the holy Church of Rome. These and such like words, no doubt, most prudent Queen, the Monkes and Iesuites will use in the Pulpits. For they take all occasions to confirme their superstitions. Therefore to recall these slinking garments, and other rubbish of the Popish Church into the Church of Christ at this time, what is it but to give the Papists an occasion, and the best that may be, to confirme and harden themselves and theirs in their superstitions, and also to helpe them in this business? But let us heare what the Prophet said to Icholaphat King of Iuda, when he helped Ahab; Darest thou helpe the wicked, and love those who hate the Lord? For this thing the wrath of the Lord is upon thee. And what other thing will this be, then even
to call backe the weake from the studie of pure Religion, and to give them a privy warning to looke backe, and returne into Aegipt? It is an easy matter for us weak men, who of our owne nature are prone to superstitition, to slide backe to impiety. Therefore occasions of sliding backe to ungodlinesse, ought to be taken away, and at no hand to be given. And what else, I pray you, meant God in forbidding to plow with an Oxe, and an Asse, to sow the same field with diverse kinds of seeds, and to weare a garment woven of linnen and wollen together? It is an odious & detestable thing with God, that the same field of the Lord should be tilled by ungodly & godly Bishops together; If in the same Church Popish Doctrine be taught with the Doctrine of the Gospell: Finally, if Sacraments, Ceremonies, and Rites, partly Apostolick, partly Popish, be used, and the Church be cloathed with them as with a garment of linsey-wolsey. For what agreement hath light with darknesse? And therfore those things which be not of God, but from them who have defiled Gods worship, are utterly to be cast away, which the Lord himselfe commanded to be done, when hee charged utterly to destroy all things which appertained to those who should give us counsell to follow strange Gods, and to burne their garments, and all their stuffe with fire in the midst of the street, to shew our detestation of such Seducers, & that they might be an execrable thing to the Lord. And who knoweth not that these garments are a part of the housshould stuffe of that Romish Seducers? There shall cleave nothing of the execrable thing, sayth hee, so by
to thy hand, that the Lord may turne from the fiercenesse of his wrath, and multiply thee, as he hath sware to thy fathers, &c. Wherefore to bring these garments, seeing they be household stuffe of Antichrist, into the Church of Christ, what is it else then to provoke God to anger, and to kindle his fury against us? Certaine it is, that he who is a true friend of Christ, will never seek to have the ornaments of Antichrist in his owne house, and much lesse will he suffer them in the Temple of Christ. For who can indure the armes of his enemy in his owne house, and specially in the chiefest roome of the same? And if God will have a thing destroyed and abolished, who are we that we dare build it up againe. But it is Gods will that after the death of Christ all garments of Aaron and Levi should be abolished: and he hath plainly enough manifested every where, that in these our dayes he would have all ungodly and vaine cerem., pompes, deceits, and paintings of the Papists driven away by the shining brightnesse of the Gospell; because these things have no power in them to exulte and increase godlines, but greatly availe to the staining of the same. Neither verily can I see to what other end these garments tend, then in very deed (that I may now come unto the second head) to defile and disgrace the faire face; nay, the whole body of the Church of England reformed according to the Gospell; as if the chaste and honest daughter of a King should be attired with those very garments wherewith some famous and notable whoore used to be adorned, and when she were so clothed, were commanded to goe abroad in the streets. Now
Now who can allow or judge this to be tolerable. Wherefore though for no other, yet for this very cause, such garments ought not to be thrust upon the Church of Christ, because that harlot of Rome hath abused, and doth still at this day abuse them (though in their own nature they be not evil) to evil, and to cover her fornications, or rather to entice men to commit fornication. For all these pompes, and Popish ceremonies are nothing else but whoorish paintings invented and devised for this end, that men might thereby be allure to spirituall fornication. Is it not therefore a filthy and dishonest thing, to have these in the Church of Christ? If the brazen serpent, which had beene ordained of God, and that for the wholesome use of the Israelites, was taken away by godly King Ezekias, because the Israelites had abused it contrary to the word of God: and if Ezekias be highly commended for this so doing, because hee had turned that Serpent into assies, and commanded them to be cast into the running water, that there might never be any print or signe of it extant any more; how much more then are these uncleane garments to be banished out of the Church of God, seeing the Apostles never used them, but the whoore of Rome hath used them in her Idolatrous worship, and to seduce men? For it is a very dishonest thing, that such things as are of themselves indifferent, and have beene long used to the despight and dishonour of God, should be retained in the Church of God, to the hazard of the salvation of godly men. And much lesse that kinde of garments, which is nothing but an invention of men,
or rather of the Divell himselfe, devised to seduce the simple ones: Wee all know what praise those common-wealthes deserve, which make good lawes that the subjects shall not weare out-landish and strange apparet, nor bring it into the Common-wealthes, because it is a corruption of good and honest manners, and of the Common-wealthes themselves.

How then can that counsell which is given to your Majesty, be commended, to witt, that garments un-knowne to the Christian world in that time of the Apostles, and Apostolicall men, should be brought into the Church of Christ. And if an out-landish kinde of attire be not tolerated in well-governed Common-wealthes, how much lesse are Idolatrous, and heathenish garments to be borne with in the Church, where God is to be worshipped in spirit and truth, and where he would have few and very simple Ceremonies? Also if God establisshed by his Law, that a woman may not putt on a mans apparet, nor a man a womans, the one beeing so well of itselfe dishonest, and contrary to nature as the other: Why then should godly Bishops, and the servants of Christ be clothed, or rather shamed and deformed with the garments of godlesse Priests, and slaves of Antichrist? Why should wee not rather, as wee be of a divers religion from them, so also be discerned from them, at least in the performance of such duties as belong unto Gods worship, by outward signes, such as garments be? Verily this was Gods will, and he required of his people.

G
that it should be discerned from the prophane Gentiles; as by other things, so also by a divers sort of apparell, and so should profess by this publicke signe, that it would have nothing to doe with the Gentiles.

And why should not wee doe the same? Are wee not the people of God? abides not the equity of the same commandement? And if the word honest be derived of honour, what honour will it be for the church of Christ to have Bishops attired and disguised with Popish visors in the administration of the Gospel and Sacraments, so as they shall rather be derided then be reverenced any whit by the people? And what commendation shall it be for your gracious Majesty in true Churches, and among true believers, that you permit such trifles to be called back into your Church? Therefore it standeth not with honesty, that holy Bishops be compelled to receive such visors, neither is it indeed a matter worthy of honour and praise, neither deserveth it the name of virtue. For if your Majesty should command that all English men, leaving that ancient, and very grave and comely attire, should weare Turkie coats, or a soildiers weed, as it is called: who would ever approve this decree as honest? And it is much lesse praise-worthy, if godly Bishops be enjoyned, laying aside, or at least changing the honest and ancient apparell, which the Apostles wore, to wit, that common and grave habit, to put on the ridiculous & execrable or accurst garment of godlesse Mass-priests.

Now concerning the third part of the Prince's dutie, there is nothing fitter to trouble the publicke peace of the
the Church then this counsell. For every novelty, especially in religion, either by it selfe, if it be evil, disturbs and trouble a good peace, or if it be good, gives occasion of trouble by accident, by causing contention betwixt evil and good men. But as in things which be good of themselves, of which nature the reformation of the Churches according to the will of God is, we are not to care for the troubling of that ungodly peace, that is of the world (for Christ came not by his Gospell to keep such a peace, but rather to take it away, & to send a sword) so assuredly, by the urging of things indifferent, to trouble the peace of Churches, and to cause strife betwixt good men and bad, yea betwixt godly men themselves, is so wicked, that it can by no means be defended, so that Irenaeus had just cause to reprove Victor Bishop of Rome, for this cause, as hath been said afore. For it must needs be, that at such times the Churches be rent in pieces, then which thing, what is more hurtfull? Many examples in the histories of the Church prove this which I say. How many and how great troubles arose in the Primitive Church, betwixt those who beside the Gospell urged also circumcision and the law, and betwixt those who upon good ground rejected them? And how great evils would this dissention have brought to the Church of Christ, had not the Apostles betime withstood them by that counsell gathered together at Jerusalem, by a lawfull examination and discussing of the cause by manifest testimonies of the Scriptures, and by sound reasons? If your gracious Majesty (as you ought) desire both to be and to see
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to seeme Apostolike, then imitate the Apostles in this matter. Neither lay and impose this yoke upon the neckes of Christes Disciples your selfe, nor suffer it to be imposed by others. But if you see that the Bishops disagree about this matter among themselves, assemble a Synod, and cause this controversie to be examined by the Scriptures. And then looke what shall be proved by plaine testimonies, and strong reasons, propound that to be observed by all, and command by your decree, that that be observed, and so take disagreement out of the Church. For your gracious Majesty ought to be very carefull, that there be no innovation in religion, but according to the word of God. By this means shall a true peace, concord & unity of the Churches be preserved. But if the proceeding be otherwise, what other thing will it be, then to take away unity, and to trouble the Christian peace? And this I may not passe over with silence, that by this novelty of the busines, not onely the publick peace shall be troubled in that kimgdome, but also many else-where out of that kimgdome will have occasion given them to raise new contentions in Churches, and that to the great hinderance of godlines, and the more slow proceeding of the Gospell. For all men know, that the most part of all the Churches, who have fallen from the Bishop of Rome, for the Gospels sake, doe not only want, but also abhorrre those garments, and that there be some Churches, though few in comparison of the former, which doe as yet retaine those garments invented in Poperie, as they very stiffly retaine some other things also, because the reformers of those Churches.
Churches, otherwise worthy men, and very faithfull servants of Christ, durst not at the first (neither judged they it expedient) utterly abolish all Papish things. But as the common manner is, every man likes his owne best. Now I call those things a man's owne, not so much which every man hath invented, as those beside, which every man chooseth to himselfe, receiveth, retaineth, and pursueth, though they be invented to his hand by others. But if there be also annexed the examples of other men, they be more and more hardened in them, and are not onely hardened, but also doe their uttermost endeavour by word and writing, to draw all the rest to be of their minde? Therefor we easly see what the issue will be, if your gracious Majesty admit of that counsel which some doe give you, to take on apparell, and other more Papish things besides. For some men, who be not well occupied, being stirred up by the example of your Majesty, will write booke and disperse them throughout all Germany, of these things which they call indifferent, to witt, that it is lawfull to admit of them, nay that they be altogether to be retained, that Papists may be the lesse estranged and alienated from us, and so we may come the nearer to concord and agreement. As if forsooth the Papists, though we for peace sake admitted of all those things, would ever amend their Doctrine, and banish out of their churches, or at any hand lay down their false and godlesse decrees, manifest and abominable superstitions and idolatries: and there will be some who will answer such booke once dispersed. So of this English fire there will rise a new
a new burning flame in Germanie and France, on which
hot coles the Papists as so many Smiths a forging, will
sprinkle cold water to make the flame the more vehem-
ment. And is not this a goodly benefite? Who there-
fore doth not see that this counsell tends to the trou-
bling of all Churches.

To conclude, that golden sayyng of a certayne learned
man is very true and certayne, and approved by long ex-
perience, that indifferent things, that is, the question
about indifferent things, is that golden apple of con-
tention. So much shall suffice to have spoke of the trou-
bling of publick peace; what should I say of the consci-
ences of private beleevers? It is manifest, that they are
greatly troubled with this commandement, to put on
these linnen garments. For they doe so greatly com-
plain, that their lamenting voyces and grones doe reach
unto, and are heard in Germany. Now how grievous
and distastfull an offence it is to trouble the consciences
of the godly, the holy Scripture sheweth: partly when
it commandeth that we make not the holy Spirit sad,
neither offend the weak ones; partly when it threatneth
griveous punishments against those who feare not to do
these things: partly also when it propoundeth the exam-
pies of the Saints, and specially of Paul, who spokes
thus: If meat offend my brother, Ile eat no flesh, while the
world standeth, that I may not offend my brother. For in
those words he giveth a generall rule, by his example,
taken out of the doctrine of Christ, to wit, that no in-
different thing is to be admitted and ycedled unto,
much lesse to be urged upon others, and least of all to be
commended by decree: if in the admitting, urging, and commanding of it, the minds of good men, and consciences of the faithfull be offended; for a tender conscience, which feareth God, is a thing most precious and acceptable to God. How therefore can that counsell be approved, which would have a law established and proclaimed by the Princes command for the use of garments to be used by Ministers in the ministry. For (to speak many things in few words) if such garments be to be propounded to the faithfull, they are to be propounded either as indifferent, or as necessary: if the latter, wee doe ungodly, because we make those things necessary, which Christ would have to be free: If the former, then are they to be left free to the Churches. But by commanding and compelling, we make things that be free and indifferent, to be necessary, and so fall into the same trespass. Moreover, either they be ordained of God by Moses, or they be delivered by Christ God manifested in the flesh, or they be ordained by the holy Ghost working and speaking in the Apostles, or they are of men, either godly or wicked. Those Ceremonies & Levitical garments, which were ordained of God by Moses, ought all of them to have an end after the death of Christ, as the Scriptures shew plainly, especially the Epistles of Paul to the Coloss. and Hebr. therefore they cannot be revoked and called back without the transgression of Gods will. It cannot be sayd that Christ taught them, because there is no word extant to that end, but rather he taught plainly oftentimes, that all Moses his Ceremonies were ended. And the same
I affirm concerning the Apostles. It remains therefore that they be said to be of men. If they be from godly men, then were they ordained of them, either to edification, or for order and comelines. But they availe not to edification, that is, to further comelines, but rather tend to the overthrow of it, as we saw before; neither for any good order, but rather they tend to disorder, for there is a confusion of godly & wicked Bishops, whereas it is meet and equall, that one of them be discerned from another, even by their garments also. Neither doe they make Christ's spouse comely, as we shewed a little before. Therefore we ought not to yeeld unto them. And such things as have beene invented by men, void of God's Spirit, doe nothing appertaine to us. Lastly, the Apostles used not these garments. For we have no authenticke testimony. Now the church is to be fashioned after the rule of that Apostollical Church in Ceremonies and garments, as well as in Doctrine. What doe we then with these garments in the Church? By whose authority can they be approved? What profit or wholesome use can the Christian people have by them? But on the contrary we have shewed that godlinessse is weakened by them, the pure worship of God is violated, Popish superstition is by little and little called back, the godly be offended, the wicked be confirmed and hardened in their ungodliness; the weak in faith are brought into hazard of their salvation; there are occasions of many evils given; Monkes and other Popish preachers are hereby helped to confirm their followers in their superstition; the wrath of God is provoked against us; those
those things which God would have to be destroyed, are hereby builded againe by us; the whole face of the Church is defiled and disgraced: there is a foule sinne committed against honest and good lawes forbidding the putting on of strange & outlandish garments: and to the whole Church is dishonoured. Besides the publicke peace of the Church, yea of many churches is troubled: one Bishop is set against another, the confidences of the godly are troubled, and the minds of good men are offended, God's spirit is made sad in them, and this apple of contention is cast, as it were, upon the table of the Gods.

Now seeing the matter stands thus, most gracious Queene, not onely I, but all my fellow-ministers, and all the godly prostrate before you, intreat your Majesty, and for Jesus Christ's sake, whom we are persuaded you love from your heart, we humbly beseech your Majesty not to embrace that counsell aforesayd, neither to give care to such counsellors. For these counsellors (most godly Queene) are not for the good of that your church and kingdome, nor for the honor of your Majesty, being they neither serve to the increase of godliness, nor to the retaining of the honesty of the Church, neither to the preservation of publicke peace, but rather very greatly weaken all these good things, which your Princely Majesty ought chiefly to stand for. Let your Majesty rather bend all your thoughts, authority and power hereunto, that first and above all you may have Bishops, who be truly godly, and well exercised in the holy Scriptures, as by the blessing of God you have very many, and that you
you make much of, and give care to them. Secondly, that you be careful that with all diligence they may discharge their office, watching over the flock, teach sound doctrine, confute heresies, drive away Wolves, keep every man in his owne calling, and exhort and stirre up every man to lead a life befitting a Christian. The Elders also and Deacons are to be admonished, that every one be diligent in his owne office, and if need be, they are to be compelled by your gracious Majesties authority, that neither the former by their sleeping and winking at the misdemeanors of the flock, suffer the reins to be loosed to all licentiousnes, and to the lusts of the flesh; neither that the latter, by reason of their immoderate care for their owne private businesses, neglect the poor people of the Church, and omit such other things as belong to their office. For these three sorts of men be the very sinewes of the Church, upon whom the salvation or destruction of the Church doth chiefly depend. Furthermore, your gracious Majesty ought to use great care and diligence, that the Universities, and in them good and godly teachers, be well looked to, cherished, liberally maintained and preserved, for these are as the mothers, and nurses of the Churches, in which and by which those are to be fashioned, borne, brought up and adorned, who being fit, may be called from time to time to rule and govern the Churches. Last of all, such things as cannot be corrected and amended by the word and discipline of the Church, as it is necessary, that according to Gods word they be cut off and taken away by the sword of the Magistrate.
gistrate, so your gracious Majesty is to take care of them: as adulteries, blasphemies, and other capital crimes of that sort. For God hath given the Magistrate the sword for this end, that ungodly seducers, filthy knaves, and unquiet men being retained, the rest may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty. This is the matter (most gracious Queene) whereon you are to spend your thoughts, hereabout are your counsellors to be occupied, here is all your strength to be shewed, namely, that (to end in a word) we all denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, may live soberly, justly, and godly in this present world. For this is the true and fairest garment of all other. For which every man ought to take care, to wit, that having put off the old man with his works, we put on the new man, that is, our Lord Jesus Christ, neither are there any other true ornaments which become Christian Bishops, besides those which the Apostle hath laid downe in his writings to Tim. and Tit. A Bishop must be unreproueable, the husband of one wife, watchings, sober, modest, barmens, apt to teach, not given to wine, no striker, nor given to filthy lucre, but gentle, no fighter, not covetous, one that can rule his house honestly, having children under obedience in all honesty, not forward, not angry, righteous, holy, &c. For garments and ornaments of Aarons high Priest, were types of these true ornaments; those were the shadowes, these be the body. Wherefore let those be gone, and let these abide still. And then at length shall we have the whole Church, and so the Bishops rightly and truly apparelled.

Once
Once again I humbly beseech your gracious Majesty, that thinking no more of those outward garments, you will mind and consider how these true and spiritual ornaments may be retained, put upon, and kept in the Churches. And as I said in the beginning, that according to your gracious Majesty's clemency, you will be pleased to pardon my boldness in writing.

Our Lord Jesus Christ long preserve your gracious Majesty safe and sound to us, and to the whole Church. From Heydelberg, 10. Septemb. 1571.

FINIS.