

CHAPTER TWO

*THAT THE CEREMONIES ARE UNLAWFUL, BECAUSE THEY ARE MONUMENTS
OF BYPAST IDOLATRY, WHICH NOT BEING NECESSARY TO BE RETAINED,
SHOULD BE UTTERLY ABOLISHED, BECAUSE OF THEIR IDOLATROUS ABUSE:
ALL WHICH IS PARTICULARLY MADE GOOD OF KNEELING*

§I. I have proved the ceremonies to be superstitious; now I will prove them to be idolatrous. These are different arguments; for every idolatry is superstition, but every superstition is not idolatry, as is rightly by some distinguished.¹ As for the idolatry of the controverted ceremonies, I will prove that they are thrice idolatrous: I. *Reductivè* [*retrospectively*], because they are monuments of by-past idolatry; II. *Participativè* [*participation*], because they are badges of present idolatry; III. *Formaliter* [*formally*], because they are idols themselves.

First, then, they are idolatrous, because having been notoriously abused to idolatry heretofore, they are the detestable and accursed monuments, which give no small honor to the memory of that by-past idolatry which should lie buried in hell. Dr. Burges reckons for idolatrous all ceremonies devised and used in and to the honoring of an idol, whether properly or by interpretation such. *Of which sort (he says) were all the ceremonies of the pagans, and not a few of the papists.*² If an opposite, writing against us, is forced to acknowledge this much, one may easily conjecture what enforcing reason we have to double out our point. The argument in hand I frame thus:

All things and rites which have been notoriously abused to idolatry, if they are not such as either God or nature has made to be of a necessary use, should be utterly abolished and purged away from divine worship, in such sort that they may not be accounted nor used by us as sacred things or rites pertaining to the same.

But the cross, surplice, kneeling in the act of receiving the communion, &c., are things and rites, &c., and are not such as either God or nature, &c.

Therefore they should be utterly abolished, &c.

1. *Synop. Pur. Theol.*, disp. 19, thes. 30 [*sic* thesis 3]. [*Synopsis*, ed. Bavinck (1881) 162–163.]

2. *Manuduct.*, sect. 2, p. 38. [Cf. *An Answer Rejoined* (1631)].

§2. As for the proposition I shall first explain it, and then prove it. I say, *all things and rites*, for they are alike forbidden, as I shall show. I say, *which have been notoriously abused to idolatry*, because if the abuse is not known, we are blameless for retaining the things and rites which have been abused. I say, *if they are not such as either God or nature has made to be of a necessary use*, because if they are of a necessary use, either through God's institution, as the sacraments, or through nature's law, as the opening of our mouths to speak (for when I am to preach or pray publicly, nature makes it necessary that I open my mouth to speak audibly and articulately), then the abuse cannot take away the use. I say, *they may not be used by us as sacred things, rites pertaining to divine worship*, because without [*outside*] the compass of worship they may be used to a natural or civil purpose. If I could get no other meat to eat than the consecrated host, which papists idolatrise [*idolize*] in the circumgeſtation¹ of it, I might lawfully eat it; and if I could get no other clothes to put on than the holy garments wherein a priest has said mass, I might lawfully wear them. Things abused to idolatry are only then unlawful when they are used no otherwise than religiously, and as things sacred.

§3. The proposition thus explained is confirmed by these five proofs: 1. God's own precept, "Ye shall defile also the covering of thy graven images of silver, and the ornaments of thy molten images of gold: thou shalt cast them away as a menſtruous cloth, thou shalt say unto it; Get thee hence" (Isa. 30:22). The covering of the idol here spoken of, Caſpar Sanctius rightly understands to be that, *with which either images according to the cuſtom of the Gentiles were covered, or gold-leaf with which images of wood were overlaid, or with which men about to ſacrifice to idols were clothed*;² so that the leaſt appurtenances [*accessories*] of idols are to be avoided. When the Apoſtle Jude (Jude 23) would have us to hate the garment ſpotted with the fleſh, his meaning is, *Even the very appearance either of evil or of ſin is to be deteſted, as he ſeems to hint by calling it by the name "garment,"* as our own Rollock has obſerved.³ If the very covering of an idol is forbidden, what ſhall be thought of other things which are not only ſpotted, but irrecoverably polluted with idols? Many ſuch precepts were given to Iſrael, as "Ye ſhall deſtroy their altars, break their images, and cut down their groves" (Exod. 34:13). "The graven images of their gods ſhall ye burn with fire: thou ſhalt not deſire the ſilver nor gold that is on them, nor take it unto thee, leſt thou be ſnared therein:

1. [Meaning to carry around; obviously a scornful remark reſpecting the papal practice of uplifting, displaying, and carrying the elements around to be adored by the people.]

2. Com. in illum locum. *quo aut induebantur ſimulacra gentilitico ritu, aut braſteas quibus lignæ imagines integuntur, aut quo homines idolis ſacrificaturi amiciebantur.* [Cf. Gaſpar Sánchez (Sanctius), *In Iſaiam Prophetam Commentarii*, Section XXX.51 (Lugduni: [1615]) 328C; (Maintz: [1616]) 310–311.]

3. Com. in 1 Theſſ. 5:22 [In *Epiſtolam Pauli Apoſtoli ad Theſſalonicenſes priorem (poſterioſiorem) commentarius Roberti Rolloci* (1598) 210]. *deteſtandam eſſe vel ſuperficiem ipſam mali ſive peccati, quam tunica appellatione ſubinnuere videtur.*

for it is an abomination to the Lord thy God” (Deut. 7:25, 26). Read to the same purpose, Numbers 33:52; Deuteronomy 7:5; 12:2, 3.

2. Secondly, God has not only by His precepts commanded us to abolish all the relics of idolatry, but by his promises also manifested unto us how acceptable service this should be to him. There is a command, that the Israelites should destroy the Canaanites (Num. 33:52), *and destroy all the idolatrous material of those people, to which commandment, says Junius, he subordinates his promise, namely, that the Lord would give them the promised land, and they should dispossess the inhabitants thereof* (v. 53).¹ Yea, there is a promise of remission and reconciliation to this work: “By this therefore shall the iniquity of Jacob be purged; and this is all the fruit to take away his sin; when he maketh all the stones of the altar as chalkstones that are beaten in sunder, the groves and images shall not stand up” (Isa. 27:9).

§4. 3. Thirdly, the churches of Pergamos and Thyatira are reprov'd for suffering the use of idolothites (Rev. 2:14–20), where the eating of things sacrificed to idols is condemned as idolatry and spiritual adultery, as Perkins notes.² Paybody, therefore, is greatly mistaken when he thinks that meats sacrificed to idols, being the good creatures of God, were allowed by the Lord, out of the case of scandal, notwithstanding of idolatrous pollution; for the eating of things sacrificed to idols is reprov'd as idolatry (Rev. 2); and the eating of such things is condemned as a fellowship with devils (1 Cor. 10:20).

Now idolatry and fellowship with devils, I suppose, are unlawful, though no scandal should follow upon them. And whereas he thinks meats sacrificed to idols to be lawful enough out of the case of scandal, for this reason, because they are the good creatures of God, he should have considered better the apostle's mind concerning such idolothites; which Zanchius sets down thus: *It is true, in themselves these are nothing; but they are something with respect to those for whom they are sacrificed, since by these we unite ourselves with those for whom they are sacrificed. Who are such? The demons.*³

For our better understanding of this matter, we must distinguish two sorts of idolothites, both which we find [in] 1 Corinthians 10. Of the one, the apostle speaks from the 14th verse of that chapter to the 23rd; of the other, from the 23rd verse to the end. This is Beza's distinction in his Annotations on that chapter. Of the first sort, he delivers the apostle's mind thus: That as Christians have their holy banquets, which are badges of their communion both with Christ and among themselves; and as the Israelites,

1. *Anal. in illum locum* [Junius, “Analytica Numerorum Explicatio,” in *Opera theologica* (1607) 1.491, line 75]. *evertantque res omnes idololatricas ipsorum ... cui mandato, says Junius, subjicitur sua promissio.*

2. *Expos. upon Rev. 2:14.* [Cf. Perkins, *Works*, volume 3 (1631) 299A].

3. In *Præc. 2*, p. 534 [1617, book 4, 534]. *verum est, per se hæc nihil sunt, sed respectu eorum quibus immolantur aliquid sunt; quia per hæc illis quibus immolantur, nos consociamur. Qui [sunt] isti? Dæmones.*

by their sacrifices, did seal their copulation [*union*] in the same religion, so also idolaters, *join with their idols, or rather demons, in their religious banquets*.¹ So that this sort of idolothites were eaten in temples, and public solemn banquets, which were dedicated to the honor of idols (1 Cor. 8:10).

Cartwright shows that the apostle is comparing the table of the Lord with the table of idolaters;² whereupon it follows, that as we use the Lord's table religiously, so that table of idolaters of which the apostle speaks, had state in the idolatrous worship like that feast (Num. 25:3), *which was celebrated in honor of false gods*, says Calvin.³ This first sort of idolothites Pæreus calls the sacrifices of idols; and from such, he says, the apostle dissuades [*exhorts*] by this argument, *to take part in the banquets of idols is idolatry*.⁴

Of the second sort of idolothites, the apostle begins to speak in verse 23. The Corinthians moved a question, whether they might lawfully eat things sacrificed to idols *at private dinners*, says Pæreus.⁵ The apostle resolves them that *in a private banquet at home*, they might eat them, except it were in the case of scandal; thus Beza.⁶ The first sort of idolothites are meant of [in] Revelation 2, as Beza there notes; and of this sort must we understand Augustine to mean whilst he says, that it were better *to die of hunger, than to eat food sacrificed to idols*.⁷ These sorts are simply and in themselves unlawful. And if meats sacrificed to idols be so unlawful, then much more such things and rites as have not only been sacrificed and destined to the honor of idols (for this is but one kind of idolatrous abuse), but also of a long time publicly and solemnly employed in the worshipping of idols, and deeply defiled with idolatry; much more, I say, are they unlawful to be applied to God's most pure and holy worship, and therein used by us publicly and solemnly, so that the world may see us conforming and joining ourselves unto idolaters

§5. 4. Fourthly, I fortify my proposition by approved examples. And, first, we find that Jacob (Gen. 35:4), did not only abolish out of his house the idols, but their earrings also, because they were *superstitionis insignia* [*signs of superstition*], as Calvin;⁸ *res ad idololatriam pertinentes* [*things pertaining to*

1. *cum suis idolis aut potius dæmonibus, solemnibus illis epulis copulantur*. [Cf. *Novum Testamentum* (Stoer, 1616) 36 verso, n17.]

2. Annot. on 1 Cor. 10:21 [Cartwright, *Confutation*, 400–403.]

3. Com. in illum locum. *quod in honorem falsorum Deorum celebrabatur*. [CR 53 (CO 25), 297; *Commentaries*, III, 2.234.]

4. Anal. in 1 Cor. 10. *Participare epulis idolorum, est idololatria*. [Cf. *Ad Corinthios priorem* (1609) col. 565.]

5. *Ibid. In privatis conviviis*. [Ibid., 569.]

6. Annotationes. *Ibid.* [1 Cor. 10:25]. *domi in privato convictu*. [Cf. *Novum Testamentum* (Stoer, 1616) 37 n3. "... domi cum fidelibus, sive etiam domum ab infidelibus vocati, in privato videlicet convictu..." Cf. *Ibid.*, Rev. 2:14, p. 141.]

7. *De Bono Conjugali*, cap. 16. *mori fame, quam idolothites vesci*. ["emori fame, quam idolothitis vesci?" PL 40.385.]

8. [Cf. CR 51 (CO 23) 468; *Commentaries*, vol. I, 2.237.]

idolatry], as Junius;¹ *monilia idolis consecrata* [*necklaces consecrated to idols*], as Pæreus calls them;² all writing upon that place. We have also the example of Elijah (1 Kings 18:30): he would by no means offer upon Baal's altar, but would needs repair the Lord's altar, though this should hold the people the longer in expectation. This he did, in P. Martyr's judgment, because he thought it a great indignity to offer sacrifice to the Lord upon the altar of Baal; whereupon Martyr reprehends those who in administering the true supper of the Lord, *wish to use papist garments and apparatus*.³ Further, we have the example of Jehu, who is commended for the destroying of Baal out of Israel, with his image, his house, and his very vestments (2 Kings 10:22–28).

And what example more considerable than that of Hezekiah, who not only abolished such monuments of idolatry as at their first institution were but men's inventions, but broke down also the brazen serpent (though originally set up at God's own command), when once he saw it abused to idolatry (2 Kings 18:4)? This deed of Hezekiah Pope Steven does greatly praise,⁴ and professes that it is set before us for our imitation, that when our predecessors have wrought some things which might have been without fault in their time, and afterward they are converted into error and superstition, they may be quickly destroyed by us who come after them. Farellus says, that princes and magistrates should learn by this example of Hezekiah what they should do with those significant rites of men's devising which have turned to superstition.⁵ Yea, the Bishop of Winchester acknowledges, that whatsoever is taken up at the injunction of men, when it is drawn to superstition, comes under the compass of the brazen serpent, and is to be abolished; and he excepts nothing from this example but only things of God's own prescribing.⁶

Moreover, we have the example of good Josiah (2 Kings 23), for he did not only destroy the houses, and the high places of Baal (v. 19), but his vessels also (v. 4), and his grove (vv. 6, 14), and his altars (v. 12); yea, the horses and chariots which had been given to the sun (v. 11). The example also of penitent Manasseh, who not only overthrew the strange gods, but their altars too (2 Chron. 33:15). And of Moses, the man of God, who was not content to execute vengeance on the idolatrous Israelites, except he should also

1. [Cf. Junius, *Opera Theologica* (1607) 1.222.]

2. [Cf. Paræus, *In Genesin Mosis Commentarius* (Frankfurt: 1609) 1809.]

3. Com. in illum locum [1 Kings 18:30]. *uti velint Papiſticiſt veſtibus et inſtrumentis*. [Cf. Melachim; *id eſt, Regum libri duo poſteriores cum commentariis Petris Martyris Vermili in primum totum et ſecundum priora ... Ioannis Wolphii in ſecundi ...* (Heidelberg: 1599) 140v. The example of this work examined is one owned by Princeton Seminary, which lacks the title page. Of the four printings, the 1566, 1571, and 1581 are noted to all run to 451 leaves. The 1599 edition has 424 leaves, the length of the copy in the Luce Library.]

4. *Apud Wolphium*, Com. in 2 Reg. 18:4. [Ibid., 330r.]

5. Calv., *Epist. et Resp.*, p. 79 [Farellus Calvino, June 1540, CR 39 (CO 11), 47].

6. Sermon on Phil. 2:10 [(1841) 2.336–337].

utterly destroy the monument of their idolatry (Exod. 32:27, 20). Lastly, we have the example of Daniel, who would not defile himself with a portion of the king's meat (Dan. 1:8); because, says Junius, it was converted in *usum idololatricum* [idolatrous use]; for at the banquets of the Babylonians and other Gentiles, *there were first-fruits or "advance" offerings which were offered to the deities.*¹ They used to consecrate their meat and drink to idols, and to invoke the names of their idols upon the same, so that their meat and drink fell under the prohibition of idolothites. This is the reason which is given by the most part of the interpreters for Daniel's fearing to pollute himself with the king's meat and wine; and it has also the approbation of a papist.²

§6. 5. Fifthly, our proposition is backed with a twofold reason, for things which have been notoriously abused to idolatry should be abolished: (1) *Quia monent* [because they remind]. (2) *Quia movent* [because they move]. First, then, they are monitory [admonitory; give a warning], and preserve the memory of idols; *monumentum* [a monument] in good things is both *monimentum* [a memorial] and *munimentum* [fortification]; but *monumentum* in evil things (such as idolatry) is only *monimentum*, which *monet mentem* [instructs the mind], to remember upon such things as ought not to be once named among saints, but should lie buried in the eternal darkness of silent oblivion. Those relics therefore of idolatry, *by which succeeding generations, as though by a memorial, may be reminded* (as Wolphius rightly says),³ are to be quite defaced and destroyed, because they serve to honor the memory of cursed idols.

God would not have so much as the name of an idol to be remembered among his people, but commanded to destroy their names as well as themselves (Exod. 23:13; Deut. 12:3; Joshua 23:7); whereby we are admonished, as Calvin says, how detestable idolatry is before God, *whose memory a repentant man wants to be erased so no trace of it may be seen afterward.*⁴ Yea, he requires, *that the memory be erased [abolished; put away] of all those things which were at anytime consecrated to idols.*⁵ If Mordecai would not give his countenance (Esther 3:2), nor do any reverence to a living monument of that nation whose name God had ordained to be blotted out from under

1. Com. in illum locum: *erant præmissa sive præmissa, quæ diis præmittebantur.* [Cf. Junius, "Expositio Prophetæ Danielis" in *Opera Theologica* (1607) 1.776.]

2. G. Sanctius. Com., *ibid.* [Cf. Gaspar Sánchez (Sanctius), *In Ezechielem et Danielelem Prophetas commentarii cum paraphrasi* (Lugduni: Sumptibus Horatii Cardon, 1619). Two volumes in one; each commentary numbered separately. See *In Danielelem Prophetam Commentarii cum Paraphrasi* (1619) cols. 43–45.]

3. Com. in 2 Reg. 23:6. *quibus quasi monumentis posteritas admoneatur* [Melachim; *id est*, 1599 ed., *ibid.*, p. 398r].

4. Com. in Isa. 27:9. *cujus memoriam vult penitus deleri, ne posthac ullum ejus vestigium appareat.* [Cf. CR 63 (CO 26) 456; *Commentaries*, vol. VIII, 2.261.]

5. Calv., Com. in Exod. 23:24. *eorum omnium memoriam deleri [sic aboleri], quæ semel dicata sunt idolis.* [CR 52 (CO 23) 546; *Commentaries*, vol. II, 2.387. The composer of the 1637 text may have transposed the *deleri* from the citation from Isaiah just prior.]

heaven (Deut. 25:19), much less should we give connivance, and far less countenance, but least of all reverence, to the dead and dumb monuments of those idols which God has devoted to utter destruction, with all their naughty [*bad, wicked*] appurtenances, so that he will not have their names to be once mentioned or remembered again.

But, secondly, *movent* [*they move*] too; such idolatrous remainders move us to turn back to idolatry. For *by experience we have verified, that, even after superstitions have been cast out, if any monuments of them be left to remain, not only has the memory of those persisted, but in the end it has obtained that they might be revived*, says Wolphius;¹ who hereupon thinks it behoveful [*necessary*] to destroy *funditus* [*utterly*] such vestiges of superstition, for this cause, if there were no more: *so that both for those aspiring to resume idolatry, hope may be diminished, and for those attempting new things the opportunity and material may be forestalled.*²

God would have Israel to overthrow all idolatrous monuments, lest thereby they should be snared (Deut. 7:25; 12:30). And if the law command to cover a pit, lest an ox or an ass should fall therein (Exod. 21:33), shall we suffer a pit to be open wherein the precious souls of men and women, which all the world cannot ransom, are likely to fall? Did God command to make a battlement for the roof of a house, and that for the safety of men's bodies (Deut. 22:8), and shall we not only not put up a battlement, or object some bar for the safety of men's souls, but also leave the way slippery and full of snares? Read we not that the Lord, who knew what was in man, and saw how propense he was to idolatry, did not only remove out of His people's way all such things as might any way allure or induce them to idolatry (even to the cutting off the names of the idols out of the land (Zech. 13:2), but also hedge up their way with thorns that they might not find their paths, nor overtake their idol-gods, when they should seek after them (Hosea 2:6, 7)? And shall we by the very contrary course not only not hedge up the way of idolatry with thorns, which may stop and stay such as have an inclination aiming forward, but also lay before them the inciting and enticing occasions which add to their own propension, such delectation as spurs forward with a swift facility?

§7. Thus, having both explained and confirmed the proposition of our present argument, I will make me next for [*turn my attention to*] the confutation of the answers which our opposites devise to elude it.

And 1., they tell us, that it is needless to abolish utterly things and rites which the papists have abused to idolatry and superstition, and that it is

1. Ubi Supra [2 Kings 23:6]. *usu compertum habemus, superstitiones etiam postquam explosæ essent, si qua relicta fuissent earum monumenta, cum memoriam sui ipsarum apud homines, tum id tandem ut revocarentur obtinisse.* [Melachim; id est, 1599 ed., ibid., p. 398r.]

2. *ut et aspirantibus ad revocandam idololatriam spes frangatur, et res novas molientibus ansa pariter ac materia præripiatur.*

enough to purge them from the abuse, and to restore them again to their right use. Hence Saravia will not have *pium crucis usum* [*pious use of the cross*] to be abolished *cum abusu* [*along with the abuse*], but holds it enough that the abuse and superstition be taken away.¹ Dr. Forbes' answer is, that not only things instituted by God are not to be taken away for the abuse of them, but farther, *neither must indifferent matters thoughtfully introduced by men always be done away with because of ensuing abuse. The papists have abused temples, and places of prayer, and cathedrals, and holy vessels, and bells, and the blessing of marriage; however, thoughtful reformers have not proposed that such things must be abandoned.*²

ANSWER. (1) Calvin,³ answering that which Cassander alleges out of an Italian writer, *abusu non tolli bonum usum* [*abuse does not take away the good use*], he admits it only to be true in things which are instituted by God

1. N. *Fratri et Amico*, art. 17. ["N. Fratri et Amico," in *Diversi Tractatus Theologici* (1611) 16.]

2. *Irenicum*, lib. 1, cap. 7, 9, 6. *neque res mediæ ab hominibus prudenter introductæ, propter sequentem abusum semper tollendæ sunt. Abusi sunt Papiſtæ templis, et oratoriis, et cathedris, et sacris vasis, et campanis, et benedictione matrimoniali; nec tamen res istas censuerunt prudentes reformatores abjiciendas* [7–6, p. 43]. [The quotation comes from section 6. Section 9 reads: "IX. Atqueita iam paret justas fuisse & idoneas rationes, ex ipsarum rerum intuitu, propter quas Patres Perthenses articulos à Rege propositos, partim potuerunt, partim etiam admittere debuerunt. Nam in rebus illis quædam sunt necessariæ, omnes autem licitæ ac laudabiles: illæ sine peccato contemni non possunt; istæ licitè et laudabiliter admittuntur" (7–9, p. 45). Cf. *The First Book of the Irenicum*, trans. E. G. Selwyn, p. 118–119, 121–122.]

3. *Responſio Ad Versipellem Quendam Mediatorem*, p. 41–44. [Cf. CR 37 (CO 9), 542. Cf. [French] "Response a Un Certain Moyenneur Rusé," *Recueil des Opuscules* (Geneva: Stoer, 1611) 2191–2192. "Similarly, what is alleged of an Italian writer, that abuse does not take away good use, will not be true if one holds to it without exception: because it is clearly commanded to us to prudently watch that we would not offend the infirm brothers by our example, and that we should never undertake what would be illicit. For Saint Paul prohibits offending the brothers in eating flesh that was sacrificed to idols [1 Cor. 10:28], and speaking to this particular issue he shows a general rule that we are to keep ourselves from troubling the consciences of the weak by a bad or damaging example. One might speak better and more wholesomely if he were to say that what God himself ordains may not be abolished for wrong use or abuse that is committed against it. But even here, it is necessary to abstain from these things if, by later human ordinance, they have become corrupt with error, and if their use is harmful or scandalizes the brothers.

"Here I marvel how this "Reformer," after granting that superstitions sometimes have such strong popularity that it is necessary to remove from the realm of man those things once ordained by public authority (as we read of Hezekiah doing with the bronze serpent), finally does not consider even a little that his shrewdness is a horror to the ways of good action: as if in defending supportable rituals, he would oblige that all superstitions should be considered as safe and whole because they are weighty. For what is there in the papacy now that would not resemble the bronze serpent, even if it did not begin that way [Num. 21:9]? Moses had it made and forged by the commandment of God: he had it kept for a sign of recognition. Among the virtues of Hezekiah told to us is that he had it broken and reduced to ash [2 Kings 18:4]. The superstitions for the most part, against which true servants of God battle today, are spreading from here to who knows where as covered pits in the ground. They are filled with detestable errors that can never be erased unless their use is taken away. Why, therefore, do we not confess simply what is true, that this remedy is necessary for taking away filth from the church?" See the translation of this tract by Raymond V. Bottomly, *The Confessional Presbyterian* 8 (2012) 264.]

Himself, not so in things ordained by men, for the very use of such things or rites as have no necessary use in God's worship, and which men have devised only at their own pleasure, is taken away by idolatrous abuse. *Pars tutior* [*The safer part*] here, is to put them wholly away, and there is, by a great deal, more danger in retaining than in removing them.

(2) The proofs which I have produced for the proposition about which now we debate, do not only infer that things and rites which have been notoriously abused to idolatry should be abolished, in case they be not restored to a right use, but simply and absolutely that in any wise they are to be abolished. God commanded to say to the covering, and the ornaments of idols, "Get thee hence" (Isa. 30:22). It is not enough they be purged from the abuse, but *simpliciter* they themselves must pack them and be gone. How did Jacob with the earrings of the idols; Elijah with Baal's altar; Jehu with his vestments; Josiah with his houses; Manasseh with his altars; Moses with the golden calf; Joshua with the temples of Canaan; Hezekiah with the brazen serpent? Did they retain the things themselves, and only purge them from the abuse? Belike [*Suppose*], if these our opposites had been their counselors, they had advised them to be contented with such a moderation; yet we see they were better counseled when they destroyed utterly the things themselves, whereby we know that they were of the same mind with us, and thought that things abused to idolatry, if they have no necessary use, are far better away than a-place [*in place*]. Did Daniel refuse Bel's meat because it was not restored to the right use? Nay, if that had been all, it might have been quickly helped, and the meat sanctified by the Word of God and prayer. Finally, were the churches of Pergamos and Thyatira reprov'd because they did not restore things sacrificed to idols to their right use? Or, were they not rather reprov'd for having anything at all to do with the things themselves?

§8. (3) As for that which Dr. Forbes objects to us, we answer, that temples, places of prayer, chairs, vessels, and bells, are of a necessary use, by the light and guidance of nature itself; and matrimonial benediction is necessary by God's institution (Gen. 1:28); so that all those examples do except themselves from the argument in hand. But the Doctor intends to bring those things within the category of things indifferent;¹ and to this purpose he alleges, that it is indifferent to use this or that place for a temple, or a place of prayer; also to use these vessels, and bells, or others. And of matrimonial benediction to be performed by a pastor, he says there is nothing commanded in Scripture.

ANSWER. Though it be indifferent to choose this place, etc., also to use these vessels or other vessels, etc.; yet the Doctor, I trust, will not deny that temples, houses of prayer, vessels and bells, are of a necessary use (which exempts [*exempts*] them from the touch of our present argument); whereas, beside that it is not necessary to kneel in the communion in this place more

1. Ubi Supra [Forbes, *Irenicum*].

than in that place, neither to keep the feast of Christ's nativity, passion, etc., upon these days more than upon other days, etc. The things themselves are not necessary in their kind; and it is not necessary to keep any festival day, nor to kneel at all in the act of receiving the communion.

There is also another respect which hinders temples, vessels, etc., from coming within the compass of this our argument, but neither does it agree to the controverted ceremonies. Temples, houses of prayer, vessels for the ministrations of the sacraments, and bells, are not used by us in divine worship as things sacred, or as holier than other houses, vessels, and bells; but we use them only for natural necessity—partly for that common decency which has no less place in the actions of civil than of sacred assemblies. Yea, in some cases they may be applied to civil uses, as has been said;¹ whereas the controverted ceremonies are respected and used as sacred rites, and as holier than any circumstance which is alike common to civil and sacred actions, neither are they used at all out of the case of worship. We see now a double respect wherefore our argument infers not the necessity of abolishing and destroying such temples, vessels, and bells, as have been abused to idolatry, *viz.*, because it can neither be said that they are not things necessary, nor yet that they are things sacred.

§9. Nevertheless (to add this by the way), howbeit for those reasons the retaining and using of temples which have been polluted with idols be not in itself unlawful, yet the retaining of every such temple is not ever necessary, but sometimes it is expedient, for farther extirpation of superstition, to demolish and destroy some such temples as have been horribly abused to idolatry, [as] Calvin also² and Zanchius³ do plainly insinuate. Whereby I mean to defend (though not as in itself necessary, yet as expedient *pro tunc* [*for that time*]) that which the reformers of the Church of Scotland did in casting down some of those churches which had been consecrated to popish idols, and of a long time polluted with idolatrous worship. As on the one part the reformers (not without great probability) feared, that so long as these churches were not made even with the ground, the memory of that superstition, whereunto they had been employed and accustomed, should have been in them preserved, and, with some sort of respect, recognized; so, on the other part, they saw it expedient to demolish them, for strengthening the hands of such as adhered to the reformation, for putting papists out of all hope of the re-entry of Popery, and for hedging up the way with thorns, that the idolatrously-minded might not find their paths. And since the pulling down of those churches wanted [*lacked*] neither this happy intent nor happy event, I must say that the bitter invectives given forth against it, by some who carry a favorable eye to the pompous bravery of the Romish

1. *Supra*, cap. I, sect. II [see part three, chapter one, §II, p. 143].

2. *Com.* in Deut. 12:2. [Cf. Calvin, *Commentaries*, vol. II, 2.357.]

3. In 4 *Præc.*, col. 709. [Cf. *Opera* (1617), book 4, col. 709.]

whore, and have deformed too much of that which was by them reformed, are to be detested by all such as wish the eternal exile of idolatrous monuments out of the Lord's land. Yet let these Momus-like¹ spirits understand that their censorious verdicts do also reflect upon those ancient Christians of whom we read, that with their own hands they destroyed the temples of idols;² and upon Chrysostom, who stirred up some monks, and sent them into Phoenicia, together with workmen, and sustained them on the expenses and charges of certain godly women, that they might destroy the temples of idols, as the Magdeburgians have marked out of Theodoret.³ Likewise upon them of the religion in France, of whom Thuanus records, that *templa confractis ac disiectis statuis et altaribus, expilaverant* [*they had pillaged the temples, the statues and altars broken in pieces and scattered*];⁴ lastly, upon foreign divines,⁵ who teach, that not only *idola* [*idols*], but *idolia* [*idol-temples*] also, and *omnia idololatria instrumenta* [*all idolatrous materials*] should be abolished.

Moreover, what was it else but reason's light which made Cambyses to fear that the superstition of Egypt could not be well rooted out if the temples wherein it was seated were not taken away; so that *offended by the Egyptians' superstitions, he ordered the temples of Apis and the rest of the gods to be demolished: he even sent an army to the very renowned temple of Ammon, to take it by assault*, says Justinus.⁶ And is not the danger of retaining idolatrous churches thus pointed at by P. Martyr: *Curavit, etc. Jehu* (he says) *took care to have the temples of Baal overthrown, lest they should return any more to their wonted use. Wherefore, it appears, that many do not rightly, who, having embraced the gospel of the Son of God, yet, notwithstanding, keep still the instruments of Popery. And they have far better looked to piety who have taken care to have popish images, statues and ornaments, utterly cut off. For, as we read in the ecclesiastical histories, Constantine the Great, after he had given his name to Christ, by an edict provided and took order that the temples of the idols might be closed and shut up;*

1. [Momus was a Greek god of ridicule who, for his criticism of the gods, was banished from heaven; hence, someone who is hyper-critical.]

2. Magdeb., cent. 4, cap. 15, col. 1538–39. [Cf. *Quarta Centuria, Ecclesiasticae Historiae* (Basil: Oporinum, 1560) col. 1538–1539.]

3. Cent. 5, cap. 15, col. 1511. [Cf. *Quinta Centuria, Ecclesiasticae Historiae* (Basil: [1560]) col. 1511.]

4. [Cf. Jacques Auguste de Thou, *Historiarum Sui Temporis*, Tom. 2, lib. 34 (Aureliani: 1626) 226B. The reference to Thuanus fell at the top of page 24 of part three in the first edition, and there was no marginal note (the citations for next reference to Danæus and Polanus occur at the top of the page in the margin). Either Gillespie failed to provide a citation or the printer omitted it in the composing of the type.]

5. Danæus, *Politices Christianæ*, lib. 3, p. 229 [Vignon, 1596, “idola, & idolia”]; Polanus, *Synagma Theologiæ Christianæ*, lib. 10, cap. 65. [Cf. vol. 2., 1609 ed., col. 4489B. “idola & idololatriæ instrumenta.”]

6. Epist. Hist., Lib. 1. *offensus superstitionibus Ægyptiorum, Apis cæterorumque Deorum aedes dirui jubet: ad Ammonis quoque nobilissimum templum expugnandum, exercitum mittit.* [Cf. Marcus Junianus Justinus, *M. Iuniani Iuliani Epitoma Historiarum Philippicarum Pompei Trogi*, ed. Franz Rühl (Lipsæ: B. G. Teubneri, 1886) II.]

*but, because they did still remain, Julian the Apostate did easily open and unlock them, and thereafter did prostitute the idols of old superstition to be worshipped in them: which Theodosius, the best and commended prince, animadverting, commanded to pull them down, lest they should again any more be restored.*¹

But because I suppose no sober spirit will deny that sometimes, and in some cases, it may be expedient to raze and pull down some temples polluted with idols, where other temples may be had to serve sufficiently the assemblies of Christian congregations (which is all I plead for); therefore I leave this purpose and return to Dr. Forbes.

§IO. As touching matrimonial benediction, it is also exeemed [*exempted*] out of the compass of our present argument, because through divine institution it has a necessary use, as we have said. And though the Doctor, to make it appear that a pastor's performing of the same is a thing indifferent, alleges, that in Scripture there is nothing commanded thereabout. Yet plain it is from Scripture itself, that matrimonial benediction ought to be given by a pastor; for God has commanded His ministers to bless His people (Num. 6:[22–27]), which by just analogy belongs to the ministers of the gospel; neither is there any ground for making herein a difference between them and the minister of the law, but we must conceive the commandment to tie both alike to the blessing of God's people. Unto which ministerial duty of blessing, because no such limits can be set as may exclude matrimonial blessing, therefore they are bound to the performance of it also. And if farther we consider, that the duty of blessing was performed by the minister of the Lord (Heb. 7:6), even before the law of Moses, we are yet more confirmed to think, that the blessing of the people was not commanded in the law as a thing peculiar and proper to the Levitical priesthood, but as a moral and perpetual duty belonging to the Lord's ministers for ever. Wherefore, notwithstanding of any abuse of matrimonial benediction among papists, yet, forasmuch as it has a necessary use in the church, and may not (as the controverted ceremonies may) be well spared, it is manifest that it comes not under the respect and account of those things whereof our argument speaks.

§II. Lastly, Whereas the Doctor would bear his reader in hand, that in the judgment of wise reformers, even such things as have been brought in use by men only, without God's institution, are not to be ever taken away, for

1. Comm. in 2 Reg. 10:27. [Cf. *Melachim; id est, Regum libri duo ...* (1599) 258r. Margin: "Erroris & superstitionis reliquias omnes tollendas." Text: "Curavit verò Iehu templa Baalis euerti, ne amplius redirent ad pristinum vsum. Quare non videtur à multis rectè fieri, qui cum Euangelium filii Dei sint amplexi, attamen instrumenta Papatus vtcunque conseruarunt. Et illi multò melius pietati consuluerunt, qui simulachra, statuas, & ornamenta Papistica funditus curarunt excindi. Etenim, vt legimus in historiis Ecclesiasticis Constantinus Magnus cùm Christo nomen dedit, edicto cauit, vt idolorum templa clauderentur, sed quoniam adhuc permanebant, facillè Iuliano Apostatæ fuit ea reserare, ac denuò in eis idola veteris superstitionis colenda prostituere. Quod Theodosius laudatissimus princeps animaduertens, ea dirui præcepit, ne amplius resituerentur. Sic Iehu modò fecit, quòd nollet amplius ad ea loca idololatrias conuenire."]

the abuse which follows upon them; let reformers speak for themselves:¹ *Also we are not rejecting the ancient ceremonies, which it is permitted to practice indifferently, since they are in accordance with the Word of God; but let not superstition and vicious abuse constrain us to abolish them.* This was the judgment of the wisest reformers: that rites which were both ancient and lawful, and agreeable to God's Word, were notwithstanding of necessity to be abolished, because of their superstition and wicked abuse.

[§12.] 2. Our opposites answer us, that beside the purging of things and rites abused by idolaters from the idolatrous pollution, and the restoring of them to a right use, preaching and teaching against the superstition and abuse which has followed upon them, is another means to avoid that harm which we fear to ensue upon the retaining of them.

ANSWER. (1) This is upon as good ground pretended for the keeping of images in churches: *But they say immediately, We teach that these images are not to be worshipped. As if, in fact, says Zanchius,² God had not formerly more diligently done the same thing through Moses and the prophets, than we are doing. So then why did he even want all images abolished? Because it is not enough to teach by word that an evil thing must not be done; but the slight obstacles, the incentives, the causes, the occasions of evil doing must be abolished.* It is not enough, with the scribes and Pharisees, to teach out of Moses' chair what the people should do, but all occasions, yea, appearances of evil, are to be taken out of their sight. *Those things affect more powerfully, and affect more, which fall upon the eyes than those which fall upon the ears. And so Hezekiah had been able to warn the people not to worship the serpent, but he preferred to break it in pieces and completely remove it from visibility, says one well to this purpose.³*

(2) Experience has taught to how little purpose such admonitions do serve. Calvin, writing to the Lord Protector of England of some popish ceremonies which did still remain in that church after the reformation of the same, desires that they may be abolished, because of their former abuse, in time of Popery. *For what were those ceremonies, he says, other than just so many panderings which would induce unfortunate souls to evil?* etc.⁴ But because he

1. Calvin, *Responso Ad Versipellem Quendam Mediatorem*, p. 413. *Nos quoque priscos ritus, quibus indifferenter uti licet, quia verbo Dei consentanei sunt, non rejicimus; modo ne superstitio et pravus abusus eos abolere cogat.* [Cf. CR 37 (CO 9), 540.]

2. *De Imaginibus*, col. 402 [cf. *Opera*, 4.402]. "*At (inquiunt) statim, docemus has imagines non esse adorandas. Quasi verò non idem olim fecerit diligentius Deus, per Mosen et prophetas, quàm nos faciamus. Cur igitur etiam volebat tolli imagines omnes? Quia non satis est verbo docere non esse faciendum malum; sed tollenda etiam sunt malorum offendicula, irritamenta, causæ, occasiones.*"

3. Tho. Naogeorgus [Kirchmeyer] in 1 John 5:21. *Efficacius enim et plus movent, quæ in oculos, quàm quæ in aures incidunt. Potuerat et Hezekias populum monere, ne serpentem adorarent [adoraret], sed maluit confringere, et penitus è conspectu auferre, et rectius fecit.* [Thomas Naogeorgus (Kirchmeyer), *In primam D. Ioannis Epistolam annotationes, quæ uice prolixi commentarij esse possunt* (n.p., 1544) 147r-147v. There is an example of this small volume at the Beinecke Rare Books & Manuscript Library, Yale University.]

4. Calvin, *Epist. et Resp.*, p. 86. *Quid enim, he says, illæ ceremoniæ aliud fuerunt, quam totidem*

saw that some might answer that which our formalists answer now to us, and say, it were enough to warn and teach men that they abuse not these ceremonies, and that the abolishing of these ceremonies themselves were not necessary; therefore immediately he subjoins these words: *Now if the question of caution is brought up, they will admonish men, namely, not to strike at them now, etc. But who does not see that they are no less hardened, so that nothing can be gained by that unhappy caution.*¹ Whereupon he concludes, that if such ceremonies were suffered to remain, this should be a means to nourish a greater hardness and obfirmation² in evil, and a veil drawn, so that the sincere doctrine which is propounded should not be admitted as it ought to be.

In another epistle to Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, he complains that external superstitions were so corrected in the Church of England, *that innumerable residual shoots remain, which are constantly growing.*³ And what good, then, was done by their admonitions, whereby they did, in some sort, sned [*prune; cut off*] the reviving twigs of old superstition, since forasmuch as they were not wholly eradicated, they did still shoot forth again? If a man should dig a pit by the way-side, for some commodity of his own, and then admonish the travelers to take heed to themselves, if they go that way in the darkness of the night, who would hold him excusable? How then shall they be excused who dig a most dangerous pit, which is likely to ruin many souls, and yet will have us to think that they are blameless, for that they warn men to beware of it?

§13. 3. We are told that if these answers which our opposites give get no place, then shall we use nothing at all which has been used by idolaters, and by consequence, neither baptism nor the Lord's supper. But let Zanchius answer for us, that these things are by themselves necessary, so that it is enough they be purged from the abuse.⁴ And elsewhere he resolves, that things which are by themselves both good and necessary, may not for any abuse be put away. *But if the matters are indifferent in their own nature and by the Law of God, and thus are such as can be omitted without damage to salvation, even if they were established for good use at first; if, however, we see them afterwards turned into destructive wastefulness; piety toward God and charity*

lenocinia quæ miseris animas ad malum perducerent? etc. [Calvin to Somerset, CR 41 (CO 13), 86; *Traçts and Letters*, 5.193.]

1. *Jam si de cautione agitur, monebuntur homines scilicet, ne ad illas nunc impingant, etc. Quis tamen non videt obdurari ipsos nihilominus, nihil ut infelici illa cautione obtineri possit.*

2. [Stubbornness; confirmed in evil.]

3. *Ibid.*, col. 136. *ut residui maneant innumeri surculi, qui assidue pullulent.* [Calvin to Cranmer, CR 41 (CO 13) 683; *Traçts & Letters*, 5.357.]

4. Zanchi, *Com.*, Col. 2:17. [Cf. Hieronymi Zanchii, *Theologici Clarissimi In D. Pauli Apostoli Epistolæ ad Philippenses, Colossenses, Thessalonicenses et duo prior capita primæ Epistolæ D. Johannis* (Neustadii Palatinorum: Harnisius, 1601) 419. "At igitur tollenda etiam Cœna Domini, & Baptismus? Resp. Non est simile exemplum, quia hæc per se sunt necessaria in Ecclesia, illa non. idèd satis fuit cœnam, &c. repurgasse, &c. festa necessaria retinere." Cf. *Opera*, 6.310.]

toward one's neighbor demand that they be done away with, etc.¹ He adds, for proof of that which he says, the example of Hezekiah in breaking down that brazen serpent; which example does indeed most pregnantly enforce the abolishing of all things or rites notoriously abused to idolatry when they are not of any necessary use; but it warrants not the abolishing of anything which has a necessary use, because the brazen serpent is not contained in the number of those things, *which we cannot do without*, says Wolphius,² answering to the same objection which presently I have in hand. Now, that the ceremonies have not in themselves, nor by the Law of God, any necessary use, and that without hazard of salvation they may be omitted, is acknowledged by formalists themselves; wherefore I need not stay to prove it.

§14. Besides these answers which are common in our adversaries' mouths, some of them have other particular subterfuges, which now I am to search. *We must consider*, says Bishop Lindsay,³ *the ceremony itself* (dedicated to, and polluted with idolatry) *whether it be of human or divine institution. If it be of human institution it may be removed, etc.; but if the ceremony be of divine institution, such as kneeling is—for the same is commended by God unto us in His Word—then we ought to consider whether the abuse of that ceremony has proceeded from the nature of the action wherein it was used; for if it be so, it ought to be abolished, etc. But if the abuse proceed not from the nature of the action, but from the opinion of the agent, then, the opinion being removed, the religious ceremony may be used without any profanation of idolatry. For example, the abuse of kneeling in elevation, &c., proceeds not only from the opinion of the agent, but from the nature of the action, which is idolatrous and superstitious, etc., and, therefore, both the action and gesture ought to be abolished. But the sacrament of the supper, being an action instituted by God, and kneeling being of the [its] own nature a holy and religious ceremony, it can never receive contagion of idolatry from it, but only from the opinion of the agent: then remove the opinion, both the action itself may be rightly used, and kneeling therein, etc.*

ANSWER. I. Since he grants that a ceremony dedicated to and polluted with idolatry, may (he answers not the argument which there he propounded, except he say *must*) be abolished, if it be of human institution, he must grant from this ground, if there were no more, that the cross, surplice, kneeling at

1. *De Imaginibus*, Col. 403. *Si vero res sint adiaphoræ suâ naturâ et per legem Dei, eoque tales quæ citra iacturam salutis omitti possunt, etiam si ad bonos usus initiò fuerunt institutæ; si tamen postea videamus illas in abusus perniciosos esse conversos; pietas in Deum, et charitas erga proximum, postulant ut tollantur, etc.* [Cf. *Opera* (1613) book 4, col. 403.]

2. In 2 Kings 18:4. *quibus carere non possumus.* [Melachim; *id est*, 1599 ed., *ibid.*, p. 330r.]

3. *Proc. in Perth Assembly*, part 2, p. 120. [Lindsay, *Proceedings*, second pagination (1625 ed.) 120–121. Lindsay's work is a reply to David Calderwood's *Perth Assembly* (1619). The parts are not numbered. The second part begins with "The Examination of the oath discussed" (1–13), followed by two sections on Superintendents (14–24), with the remaining five sections devoted to answering Calderwood's objections to kneeling (24–152). This citation falls within the section, "The Doctrine of Papists, touching the honour of Images" (76–130).]

the communion, etc., having been so notoriously abused to idolatry, must be abolished, because they have no institution except from men only.

But 2. Why says he that kneeling is a ceremony of divine institution? which he pronounces not of kneeling, as it is actuated by some individual case, or clothed with certain particular circumstances (for he makes this kneeling whereof he speaks to be found in two most different actions, the one idolatrous, the other holy) but kneeling in the general, *per se*, and *præcise ab omnibus circumstantiis* [*absolutely aside from all circumstances*]. Let him now tell where kneeling thus considered is commended unto us in God's Word. He would possibly allege that place [in] Psalm 95:6, "O come, let us worship and bow down: let us kneel before the Lord our Maker;" which is cited in the Canon of Perth about kneeling; but I answer, whether one expounded that place with Calvin,¹ in this sense, *that of course the people prostrated themselves before the ark of the covenant, because the expression is held to concern legal worship*: whereupon it should follow that it commends only kneeling to the Jews in that particular case; or whether it be taken more generally, to commend kneeling (though not as necessary, yet as laudable and beseeming) in the solemn acts of God's immediate worship, such as that praise and thanksgiving whereof the beginning of the psalm speaks—whether, I say, it be taken in this or that sense, yet it condemns not kneeling, except in a certain kind of worship only. And as for kneeling in the general nature of it, it is not of divine institution, but in itself indifferent, even as sitting, standing, etc., all which gestures are then only made good or evil when *in actu exercito* [*in the exercised act*], they are actuated and individualized by particular circumstances.

3. If so be, the ceremony is abused to idolatry, it skills not how [*it makes no difference*]; for, as I have shown before, the reasons and proofs which I have produced for the proposition of our present argument, hold good against the retaining of anything which has been known to be abused to idolatry; and only such things as have a necessary use are to be excepted.

4. The nature of an action, wherein a ceremony is used, cannot be the cause of the abuse of that ceremony; neither can the abuse of a ceremony proceed from the nature of the action wherein it is used, as one effect from the cause; for *nothing can be a sufficient cause of sin to a man, except only his own will*.²

5. The abuse of kneeling in the idolatrous action of elevation, proceeds not from the nature of the action, but from the opinion of the agent, or rather from his will (for *principium actionum humanarum* [*the beginning of human beings' actions*] is not opinion, but will, choosing that which opinion conceits to be chosen, or *voluntas præunte luce intellectus* [*will with the light of the intellect preceding*]). It is the will of the agent only which both makes the

1. Com. in illum locum. *ut scilicet ante arcam fæderis populus se prosternat, quia sermo de legali cultu habetur*. [Cf. CR 60 (CO 32), 31; *Commentaries*, vol. VI, 1.35.]

2. Aquin., 2^a 2^æ quest. 43, art. 1. *nihil poteſt esse homini causa ſufficiens peccati, except only, propria voluntas*.

action of elevation to be idolatrous, and likewise kneeling in this action to receive the contagion of idolatry. For the elevation of the bread *materialiter* [*physically*] is not idolatrous (more than the lifting up of the bread among us by elders or deacons, when, in taking it off the table, or setting it on, they lift it above the heads of the communicants), but *formaliter* [*according to set form*] only, as it is elevated with a will and intention to place it in state of worship. So likewise kneeling to the bread *materialiter* is not idolatry (else a man were an idolater who should be against his will thrust down and held by violence kneeling on his knees when the bread is elevated), but *formaliter*, as it proceeds from a will and intention in men to give to the elevated bread a state in that worship, and out of that respect to kneel before it.

6. What can he gain by this device, that the abuse of kneeling in the Lord's supper proceeded not from the nature of the action, but from the will of the agent? Can he hereupon infer, that kneeling in that action is to be retained notwithstanding of any contagion of idolatry which it has received? Nay, then, let him say that Hezekiah did not rightly in breaking down the brazen serpent, which was set up at God's command, and the abuse whereof proceeded not from the thing itself, which had a most lawful, profitable, and holy use, but only from the perverse opinion and will of them who abused it to idolatry.

§15. But the comparing of kneeling to the brazen serpent is very unsavory to the Bishop; and wherefore? *The brazen serpent*, he says, *in the time it was abolished, had no use: that ceased with the virtue of the cure that the Israelites received by looking upon it; the act of kneeling continues always in a necessary use, for the better expressing of our thankfulness to God.*

ANSWER. I. Both kneeling, and all the rest of the popish ceremonies, may well be compared to the brazen serpent. And divines do commonly allege this example, as most pregnant to prove that things or rites polluted with idols, and abused to idolatry, may not be retained, if they have no necessary use; and I have cited before the Bishop of Winchester, acknowledging that this argument holds good against all things which are taken up, not at God's prescription, but at men's injunction. J. Rainold argues from Hezekiah's breaking down of the brazen serpent, to the plucking down of the sign of the cross.¹

2. Why says he that the brazen serpent, in the time it was abolished, had no use? The use of it ceased not with the cure, but it was still kept for a most pious and profitable use, even to be a monument of that mercy which the Israelites received in the wilderness, and it served for the better expressing of their thankfulness to God, which the Bishop here calls a necessary use.

3. When he says that kneeling continues always in a necessary use, we must understand him to speak of kneeling in the act of receiving the communion; else he runs at random; for it is not kneeling in the general, but kneeling in this particular case, which is compared to the brazen serpent. Now, to say

1. Confer. with J. Hart, cap. 8, div. 4, p. 509. [1609 ed.].

that this gesture in this action is necessary for our better expressing of our thankfulness to God, imports that the Church of Scotland, and many famous churches in Europe, for so many years have omitted that which was necessary for the better expressing of their thankfulness to God, and that they have not well enough expressed it. And, moreover, if kneeling is necessary in the Lord's supper for our better expressing of our thankfulness to God, then it is also necessary at our own common tables. Though we are bound to be more thankful at the Lord's table, and that because we receive a benefit of infinite more worth, yet we are bound to be *tam grati* [as grateful], as well thankful at our own tables, albeit not *tanta gratitudine* [with so great a gratitude]. If, then, the same kind of thankfulness is required of us at our own tables (for *increase and diminishing of degree, by more and less, does not change the kind of the thing*),¹ that which is necessary for expressing of our thankfulness at the Lord's table must be necessary also for the expressing it at our own. When I see the Bishop sitting at his table, I shall tell him that he omits the gesture which is necessary for the expressing of his thankfulness to God.

4. Did not the apostles' receiving this sacrament from Christ Himself well enough express their thankfulness to God? yet they kneeled not, but sat, as is evident, and shall be afterwards proved against them who contradict everything which crosses them.

5. God will never take a ceremony of men's devising for a better expressing of our thankfulness than a gesture which is commended to us by the example of His own Son, and His apostles, together with the celebration of this sacrament in all points according to his institution.

6. How shall we know where we have the Bishop and his fellows? It seems they know not where they have themselves; for sometimes they tell us that it is indifferent to take the communion sitting, or standing, or passing, or kneeling; yet here the Bishop tells us that kneeling is necessary.

7. I see the Bishop perceives that no answer can take kneeling at the communion out of the compass of the brazen serpent, except to say it has a necessary use; this is the dead lift, which yet helps not, as I have shown. All things, then, which are not necessary (whereof kneeling is one), being notoriously abused to idolatry, fall under the brazen serpent.

§16. Paybody also will here talk with us, therefore we will talk with him too. He says, that God did not absolutely condemn things abused to idolatry, and tells us of three conditions on which it was lawful to spare idolatrous appurtenances [*accessories*]: 1. If there were a needful use of them in God's worship. 2. In case they were so altered and disposed, as that they tended not to the honor of the idol, and his damnable worship. 3. If they were without certain danger of ensnaring people into idolatry.²

1. *intentio et remissio graduum secundum magis et minus, non variant speciem rei*. [Maxim, magis et minus, non variant speciem: greater and less do not change the nature of a thing. See p. 212.]

2. *Apol.*, part 3, cap. 4, sect. 15–17 [pp. 371–374].

ANSWER. I. Either he requires all these conditions in every idolothite and idolatrous appurtenance which may be retained, or else he thinks that any one of them suffices. If he requires all these, the last two are superfluous; for that which has a needful use in God's worship, can neither tend to the honor of the idol, nor yet can have in it any danger of ensnaring people into idolatry. If he think any one of those conditions enough, then let us go through them: The first I admit, but it will not help his cause; for while the world stands they shall never prove that kneeling in the act of receiving the communion, and the other controverted ceremonies, have either a needful, or a profitable, or a lawful use in God's worship. As for his second condition, it is all one with that which I have already confuted,¹ namely, that things abused to idolatry may be kept, if they are purged from their abuse, and restored to the right use. But he alleges for it a passage of Parker,² where he shows out of Augustine, that an idolothite may not be kept for private use, except, 1. *All honor to the idol be overthrown with a most evident destruction.* 2. That not only his honor be not despoiled, but also all show thereof.

How does this place (now would I know) make anything for Paybody? Do they keep kneeling for private use? Do they destroy most openly all honor of the idol to which kneeling was dedicated? Has their kneeling not so much as any show of the breading God's honor? Who will say so? And if any will say it, who will believe it? Who knows not that kneeling is kept for a public, and not for a private use, and that the breading idol receives very great show of honor from it? He was scarce of warrants when he had no better than Parker could afford him.

His third condition rests, and touching it I ask, what if those idolatrous appurtenances are not without apparent danger of ensnaring people into idolatry? Are we not commanded to abstain from all appearance of evil? Will he correct the apostle, and teach us that we need not care for apparent, but for certain dangers? What more apparent danger of ensnaring people into idolatry than unnecessary ceremonies, which have been dedicated to and polluted with idols, and which, being retained, do both admonish us to remember upon old idolatry, and move us to return to the same, as I have before made evident?³

§17. Now, as for the assumption of our present argument, it cannot be but evident to any who will not harden their minds against the light of the truth, that the ceremonies in question have been most notoriously abused to idolatry and superstition, and withal, that they have no necessary use to make us retain them. I say, they have been notoriously abused to idolatry. 1. Because they have been dedicated and consecrated to the service of idols.

1. Supra, sect. 9 [p. 158].

2. Parker, *Of the Cross in Baptism*, cap. 1, sect. 7, p. 10. *Omnis honor idoli, cum appertissima destructione subvertatur.*

3. Supra, sect. 6 [p. 154].

2. Because they have been deeply polluted, and commonly employed in idolatrous worship. For both these reasons does Zanchius condemn the surplice, and such like popish ceremonies left in England, because the whore of Rome has abused, and does yet abuse them, *to attract men to whoring. For all those pomps, and popish ceremonies, are nothing other than meretricious deceits, contrived to this end, that men may be attracted to spiritual prostitution.*¹ O golden sentence, and worthy to be engraven with a pen of iron, and the point of a diamond! For most needful it is to consider, that those ceremonies are the very meretricious bravery and veigling [*seductive*] trinkets wherewith the Romish whore does faird [*make-up*] and paint herself, whilst she propines [*proposes*] to the world the cup of her fornications. This makes Zanchius to call those ceremonies the relics and symbols of popish idolatry and superstition.²

When Queen Mary set up Popery in England, and restored all of it which King Henry had overthrown, she considered that Popery could not stand well-favoredly without the ceremonies; whereupon she ordained, *that all feast days be celebrated, the ceremonies of the former age be re-established, nearly-grown boys previously baptized be confirmed by bishops.*³ So that not in remote regions, but in his Majesty's dominions—not in a time past memory, but about fourscore years ago—not by people's practice only, but by the laws and edicts of the supreme magistrate, the ceremonies have been abused to the reinducing and upholding of Popery and idolatry. Both far and near, then, both long since and lately, it is more than notorious how grossly and grievously the ceremonies have been polluted with idolatry and superstition.

§18. I cannot choose but marvel much how Paybody was not ashamed to deny that kneeling has been abused by the papists.⁴ Blush, O paper, which art blotted with such a notable lie! What will not desperate impudency dare to aver [*assert*]? But Bishop Lindsay seems also to hold that kneeling has been abused by the papists only in the elevation and circumgstation of the host, but not in the participation; and that Honorius did not command kneeling in the participation, but only in the elevation and circumgstation.⁵

ANSWER. I. *A liar should at least have a good memory.*⁶ Says not the Bishop

1. *Epiſt. ad Regin. Elizab. Epiſtolar.*, lib. 1, p. 112 [*Operum Theologicorum*, v. 8, *Epistolarum Libri Duo*, lib. 1., p. 111–112]. *ad alliciendos homines ad scortandum. Sunt enim pompæ iſtæ omnes, et ceremoniæ Papiſtiſæ, nihil aliud quàm fuci meretricii, ad hoc excogitati, ut homines ad ſpiritualementem ſcortationem alliciantur.* [Cf. Zanchius to Queen Elizabeth, *The Zurich Letters, Second Series*. Parker Society (Cambridge: University Press, 1845) 345.]

2. *Ibid.*, p. 111. [*Zurich Letters*, 341–342.]

3. *Sleid.*, *Com.*, lib. 25, p. 481. [*ut*] *dies omnes feſti celebrentur, ſuperioris ætatis ceremoniæ reſtituantur, pueri adultiores antè baptisati, ab episcopis confirmentur.* [1561 ed.]

4. *Apol.*, part 3, cap. 4 [p. 357ff].

5. *Proc.* in Perth Assembly, part 2, p. 118, 119. [*Proceedings*, 2nd pagination (1625) 118, 119.]

6. *Saltem mendacem oportet esse memorem.* [An old proverb found in most languages:

himself elsewhere of the papiſts, *In the ſacrament they kneel to the ſign*,¹ whereby he would prove a diſconformity between their kneeling and ours; for we kneel, he ſays, *by the ſacrament to the thing ſignified*. Now if the papiſts in the ſacrament kneel to the ſign, then they have idolatrouſly abuſed kneeling, even in the participation; for the Biſhop dare not ſay that, in the elevation or circumgeſtation, there is either ſacrament or ſign.

2. Why do our divines controvert with the papiſts, *de adoratione eucharistiæ* [*about the adoration of the eucharist*], if papiſts adore it not in the participation? for the hoſt, carried about in a box, is not the ſacrament of the eucharist.

3. In the participation, papiſts think that the bread is already tranſubſtantiated into the body of Chriſt, by virtue of the words of conſecration. Now, if in the participation they kneel to that which they fauſely conceive to be the body of Chriſt (but is indeed corruptible bread), with an intention to give it *latria* or divine worſhip, then in the participation they abuſe it to idolatry. But that is true; *ergo* [*therefore*], etc.

4. Durand ſhows, that though in the holy days of Eaſter and Pentecoſt, and the feſtivities of the bleſſed Virgin, and in the Lord's day, they kneel not in the church, but only ſtand (because of the joy of the feſtivity), and at the moſt do but bow or incline their heads at prayer, yet *in præſentia corporis et ſanguinis Chriſti*, in preſence of the bread and wine, which they think to be the body and blood of Chriſt, they ceſe not to kneel.² And how will the Biſhop make their participation free of this idolatrous kneeling? The Rhemiſts ſhow us, that when they are eating and drinking the body and blood of our Lord, they adore the ſacrament, and, humbling themſelves, they ſay to it, *Lord, I am not worthy; God be merciful to me, a ſinner*.³

5. As for that which Honorius III decreed, Dr. White calls it the adoration of the ſacrament,⁴ which, if it is ſo, then we muſt ſay, that he decreed adoration in the participation itſelf, because *extra uſum ſacramenti* [*outside its uſe as a ſacrament*], the bread cannot be called a ſacrament. Honorius commanded that the prieſt ſhould frequently teach his people to bow down devoutly when the hoſt is elevated in the celebration of the maſs, and that they ſhould do the ſame when it is carried to the ſick. All this was ordained in reference to the participation. *That has been eſtablished for the uſe*, ſays Chemnitz, ſpeaking of this decree, *that is, when the bread is conſecrated and when it is taken to the ſick, that it might be exhibited and*

"mendacem memorem eſſe oportere" (Quintilian, *Inſtitutes*, IV, 2). Cf. *The Inſtitutio Oratoria of Quintilian*, Volume 2. Loeb Classical Library {1921} IV.2.92, page 100.]

1. *Ibid.*, p. 22. [Lindsay (1625 ed.) ſecond pagination, 22.]

2. *Ration.*, lib. 5, *Tit. de Prima et lib. 6, Tit. de Die Sancta Paſc.* [Cf. Guillaume Durand, *Rationale Divinorum Officiorum* (Lugduni: 1592) libri 5, chapter 5, "De Prima," page 459; libri 6, chapter 86, "De ſancto die Paſchæ," page 710.]

3. Annot. on Matt. 8, ſect. 3; and on I Cor. 11, ſect. 18. *Domine non ſum dignus, Deus propitiuſ eſto mihi peccatori.* [Cartwright, *Confutation*, pp. 37, 413.]

4. *Way to the Church*, Answer to ſect. 51. [Cf. John White, *Works* (London: 1624) 208].

received.¹ So that that which was specially respected in the decree, was adoring in the participation.

[§19.] Lastly, here we have to do with Dr. Burges, who will have us to think, that adoration in receiving the sacrament has not been idolatrously intended to the sacrament in the church of Rome, neither by decree nor custom.² Not by decree, because albeit Honorius appointed adoration to be used in the elevation and circumgeſtation, yet not in the act of receiving. And albeit the Roman ritual appoints that clergymen coming to receive the sacrament do it kneeling, yet this was done in veneration of the altar, or of that which ſtands thereupon, and not for adoration of the hoſt put into their mouths.³ Not by cuſtom; for he will not have it ſaid, that kneeling in the time of receiving was ever in the church of Rome any rite of, or for, adoration of the ſacrament, becauſe albeit the people kneel in the act of receiving, yet I *deny*, he ſays, *that they ever intended adoration of the ſpecies, at that moment of time when they took it in their mouths, but then turned themſelves to God*, etc.

ANSWER. 1. As for the decree of Honorius, I have already answered with Chemnitz, that it had reference ſpecially to the receiving. 2. When clergymen are appointed in the Roman ritual to receive the ſacrament at the altar kneeling, this was not for veneration of the altar, to which they did reverence at all times when they approached to it, but this was required particularly in their receiving of the ſacrament, for adoration of it. Neither is there mention made of the altar as conferring anything to their kneeling in receiving the ſacrament; for the ſacrament was not uſed the more reverently becauſe it ſtood upon the altar, but by the contrary, for the ſacrament's ſake reverence was done to the altar, which was eſteemed the ſeat of the body of Chriſt. It appears, therefore, that the altar is mentioned, not as concerning the kneeling of the clergymen in their communicating, but ſimply as concerning their communicating, becauſe none but they were wont to communicate at the altar, according to that received canon, *It is lawful, however, only for the miniſters of the altar to go to the altar and communicate there*.⁴ The one of the Doctour's own conjectures is, that they kneeled for reverence of that which ſtood upon the altar; but I would know what that was which, ſtanding upon the altar, made them to kneel in the participation, if it was not the hoſt itſelf?

Now, whereas he denies, as touching cuſtom, that people did ever intend

1. *Exam. Conc. Trit. de Euchar.*, can. 6, p. 86. *Ad uſum illa inſtituta ſunt, ... quando ſcilicet panis conſecratur, et quando ad infirmos deſertur, ut exhibeatur et ſumatur*. [1861 ed., 323; trans. Kramer (Concordia Publishing Houſe, 1978) 2.268. Gillespie has *inſtituta* for *conſtituta*.]

2. *Of the Lawfulneſs of Kneeling* [London: 1631], cap. 21, p. 65. ["Sect. 19" miſſing, 1637; 1660.]

3. *Ibid.*, p. 69.

4. *Concil. Laodicæn*, can. 19. See alſo *Conc. Tolet.* 4, can. 17 [sic 18]. *Solis autem miniſtris altaris liceat ingredi ad altare et ibidem communicare*. [NPNF2 14.158. Mansi, 2.587; 10.624; "... eo videlicet ordine, ut ſacerdos & levita ante altare communicent, in choro clerus, extra chorum populus."]

the adoration of the species, I ANSWER: 1. How knows he what people in the Roman church did intend in their minds? 2. What warrant has he for this, that they did not in the participation adore the host, which was then put into their mouths? 3. Though this which he says were true, he gains nothing by it; for put the case, they did not intend the adoration of the species [*visible form*], dare he say, that they intended not the adoration of that which was under the species? I trow [*trust*] not. Now, that which was under the species, though in their conceit it was Christ's body, yet it was indeed bread; so that, in the very participation, they were worshipping the bread. But 4. What needs any more? He makes himself a liar, and says plainly, that after transubstantiation was embraced, and when all the substance of the visible creature was held to be gone, they did intend the adoration of the invisible things, as if there had been now no substance of any creature left therein, whereby he destroys all which he has said of their not intending the adoration of the species.¹

§20. Last of all, for the other part of my assumption, that the ceremonies have no necessary use in God's worship, I need no other proof than the common by-word of formalists, which says they are things indifferent. Yet the Bishop of Edinburgh and Paybody have turned their tongues bravely, and chosen rather to say anything against us than nothing.² They spare not to answer, that kneeling has a necessary use. They are most certainly speaking of kneeling in the act of receiving the communion; for they and their opposites, in those places, are disputing of no other kneeling but this only. Now we may easily perceive they are in an evil taking, when they are driven to such an unadvised and desperate answer. For 1. If kneeling in the act of receiving the Lord's supper is necessary, why have themselves two [i.e. the two of them], written so much for the indifferency of it? O desultorious levity [*shifting inconstancy*] that knows not where to hold itself! 2. If it is necessary, what makes it to be so? What law? What example? What reason? 3. If it is necessary, not only many reformed churches, and many ancient too, but Christ Himself and His apostles have, in this sacrament, omitted something that was necessary. 4. If it is necessary, why do many of their own disciples take the communion sitting, in places where sitting is used?

What need I to say more? In the first part of this dispute I have proved that the ceremonies are not necessary, in respect of the church's ordinance; howbeit if it were answered in this place, that they are in this respect necessary, it helps not, since the argument proceeds against all things notoriously abused to idolatry, which neither God nor nature has made necessary. And for any necessity of the ceremonies in themselves, either our opposites must repudiate what has unadvisedly fallen from their pens hereabout, or else forsake their beaten ground of indifferency, and say plainly that the ceremonies are urged

1. Ubi Supra, p. 71. [Burges, *Lawfulness of Kneeling*, 71–72].

2. Ubi Supra, p. 118. [Lindsay (1625 ed.) second pagination, 118.]

by them, to be observed with an opinion of necessity, as worship of God, and as things in themselves necessary. Look to yourselves, O formalists, for you stand here upon such slippery places, that you cannot hold both your feet.

CHAPTER THREE

THAT THE CEREMONIES ARE UNLAWFUL, BECAUSE THEY SORT US WITH IDOLATERS, BEING THE BADGES OF PRESENT IDOLATRY AMONG THE PAPISTS

§1. It follows according to the order which I have proposed, to show next that the ceremonies are idolatrous, *participativè* [*by participation*]. By communicating with idolaters in their rites and ceremonies, we ourselves become guilty of idolatry; even as Ahaz, was an idolater, *eo ipso* [*for that very reason*], that he took the pattern of an altar from idolaters (2 Kings 16:10). Forasmuch, then, as kneeling before the consecrated bread, the sign of the cross, surplice, festival days, bishoping, bowing down to the altar, administration of the sacraments in private places,¹ etc., are the wares of Rome, the baggage of Babylon, the trinkets of the whore, the badges of Popery, the ensigns of Christ's enemies, and the very trophies of AntiChrist: we cannot conform, communicate and symbolize with the idolatrous papists in the use of the same, without making ourselves idolaters by participation.

Shall the chaste spouse of Christ take upon her the ornaments of the whore? Shall the Israel of God symbolize with her who is spiritually called Sodom and Egypt? Shall the Lord's redeemed people wear the ensigns of their captivity? Shall the saints be seen with the mark of the beast? Shall the Christian church be like the AntiChristian, the holy like the profane, religion like superstition, the temple of God like the synagogue of Satan? Our opposites are so far from being moved with these things, that both in pulpits and private places they use to plead for the ceremonies by this very argument, that we should not run so far away from papists, but come as near them as we can. But for proof of that which we say, namely, that it is not lawful to symbolize with idolaters (and by consequence with papists), or to be like them in their rites or ceremonies, we have more to allege than they can answer.

§2. For, first, We have Scripture for us. "After the doings of the land of Egypt, wherein you dwelt, shall ye not do: and after the doings of the land of Canaan, whither I bring ye, shall ye not do: neither shall ye walk in their ordinances" (Lev. 18:3). "Take heed to thyself that thou be not snared by following them ... saying, How did these nations serve their gods? even so will I do likewise. Thou shalt not do so unto the Lord thy God" (Deut. 12:30).

1. [The 1637 edition has "administration" in italics.]