A Brief Discourse Concerning the unlawfulness of the COMMON PRAYER WORSHIP.

AND

Of Laying the Hand on, and Kissing the Booke in SWEARING.

By a Reverend and Learned Divine.

2 Kings 18. 4. Her removed the high places, and brake the Images, and cut down the groves, and brake in pieces the brazen Serpent that Moses had made: for unto those days the Children of Israel did burn incense to it: and he called it Nehushtan.

Printed in the Year. &c.
To the Reader.

The following discourse falling into my hands, my affection to the Labouring Truths here in argued for, and my concernment for the Information of them, that I am ever way bound to be a well wisher to, quickly made me sensible, that to keep it in a private hand, would be a more Culpable Concealment of a Treasure, then to bury Gold; especially since the Golden-mouth’d Ancient hath long since convinced, that to Conceal the Truth, is to betray it; That this Lamp of the Sanhedryr then may give Light unto the whole House; the Press hath been improved to Communicate it; blessed be GOD for the Advantage which the Church now Enjoys above former Ages, in so dexterous an Instrument of all Knowledge and Goodness, as that of Printing is become. I shall forbear to declare unto the world, the name of that worthy Person unto whom we are beholden for this Elaborate Composition; only that it hath for its Author, a Learned and Pious Minister: I

A. A.
To the Reader.

Should he think to occasion him any trouble: And shall request the Reverend Author to pardon me not asking his consent in thus disposing of his Manuscript, and I am sure he will not be offended with me, when he shall bear that many hundred have been thereby Established in the present Truth.

T. P.

Sir.

Simplicity of Occasions and discourse will not permit me to return an explicit Answer to every one that shall send Questions to me. But as for your selfe I have preceded you to reply to them, and Endeavour your satisfaction. And inasmuch as the Enquiries which you have Communicated to me, are both Weighty and Controversial, I have thought it Opus pretium, to spend some hours in searching into the Controversial subjects, being also ready (as I am bound) to give a Reason of my perturbation to such as shall in Seriousness demand it of me.

Your first Question is thus Proposed:

What are the Reasons why you judge it unlawful to be present at, or to partake in the Common prayer worship?

Answer. My first Reason is, from the Original of the Common prayer Book, which with the Ceremonies and worship prescribed therein, I find to be in great measure Papish and Heathenish. Some have cruelly Complained of Nonconformists, because they affirm that the English Liturgy is taken out of the Pope's Missal Books. It is true, that as the Missal Book is taken in a more strict sense, a great part of the English Liturgy is not to be found therein. But as the Missal is not for the whole Roman Liturgy (and so it many Times is, a part being put for the whole.) It cannot be denied, but that the Common prayer Book is from thence derived. There are things, (as prayers for the Dead) in the Roman Liturgy which are not Translated into English.
not very Little is le in the English, which is not to be going to the other. This is particularly cleared up by the Learned Author of the Book called Altare Domestica, which goeth under the Name of Diodonius, but Mr. David Calderwood was the true Author. Also there are many Treatises in English, which may be consulted concerning this matter; particularly a Book called Parallels between the Mass-Book and the Liturgy, and the Antiquities of the Scripture, which goeth under the Name of Dampier-Hamilton. And Mr. S. de Milto on Ecclesiastical Names of the Nine Positions p. 64, 65, and a Discourse on Liturgies by H. D.

If you would have a distinct account of the Original of the Common prayer Book, you must know, it was Coll. ed out of three Superstitions Books. The first part of Polish prayer is borrowed from the Papists' Breviary. The Order of Sacraments, Matrimony, Burials &c. is taken out of the Ritual. The Order of Confessionation, Epistles, Collects &c. is gathered out of the Roman Missal.

Hence the English Liturgy has been well approved of by Papists. A Jesuit being asked how hee liked the Service at Pains, gave this Answer, I have nothing against it, but that it is done by your Clergy. When Secretary Walpole had in Policy caused two papist Intelligencers then in England to have a view of London and Canterbury Service, they were so marvellously taken with it, saying the Pope had been informed, for their Service was very like his own; and they thereupon Endeavoured that the Pope Bull might be recalled. Pope Pius V. was willing to ratify the Common prayer Book by his Authority, if Queen Elizabeth would have so retained it. Dr. Carria (a papist Bigot) speaks very favourably of the English Liturgy, because hee saith there is nothing in it expressly contrary to theirs.

It is very Strange that any of our Liturgicians should have the face to deny these things. But some of them have ingenuously acknowledged the Truth of what we affirm. Here that has written Mr. George Herbert's Life declares that hee disliketh not the English Liturgy, but for being taken out of the Mass-Book. It is (which hee taken out as Gold from dross.) The wise Reformers knew Rome would cry Schism, Schism, and therefore they wisely lawfully could keep, being laboured to give offence. This was a great objection, that the Form of our Liturgy is taken from Antichrist. Dr. Cave to Answer, if We are sorry that their weakness takes offence at that we will hold it a sin to be in the Church of England, namely that we have so sparingly and at it was unwillingly dissented from the Church of Rome, for fear of Antichrist; they mean her. Exem. p. 85 Likewise, Dr. Boyle and Mr. Womack who have written in defense of the Common prayer Book, pretend that it is a daughter of the Roman Catholic Church, but they say, why should the Child be beaten for the Parents' fault? To whom it has in bin well replied, why should not Magus and Sorcerers both put out of their books together. A great Episcopalian owns that the Roman Liturgy is like a Levitical House; only see before that the Compilers of the Common prayer Book, have picked and scraped and plastered the House. But Hee should have considered that the Hebrew's of the Levitical House ought to be cast into an unclean place. And that the Levitical Business out off, therefore we may have no communion with it. But Enough of these Alle. порite. I shall further confine this Argument by two Royal Testimonies. The one is that of King Edward 6. who when the Papists were in Donning the Reformed Book, took up Arms against the King, because of his Embittering the English Liturgy. Hee wrote this to them, it seemeth unto you a New Service, but it is indeed no other but the Old the same words in English which were in Latin, saving a few things taken out, which were so faintly that he doubted if he had them in English. If the Service of the Church was good in Latin it remaineth good in English. For nothing is altered but the words which was spoken with igno- rance and to let you understand this is said for you. See Mr. Foxe Acts and Monuments Vol 1. p 667.

Another Testimony is that of King James of Famous Memory, who in his Speech to a Nati II. Assembly Anno 1599 Preached GOD that he was King in the Sincere Church in the world; and since then the Church of England, for their Service is an ill said Mass; since then Geneva is unfitted. For they are able to and Yule be Easter and Christmas and so on. Wherewith have they any such? But what need of words? Let such as have any Hab- itancy about this matter compare the Papist Missal &c. with the English Liturgy, and they will be convinced. For if we want any respect upon an Idol, cannot the clear of the Sin of Idolatry. But the Mass Book is an Idol; and Hee that wisheth to be a Prayer, or Joyneth with a Prayer
When the same words are repeated often over like Easter, for example, many readers of the Book of Common Prayer find it tedious. The book contains prayers and services that are repeated frequently, such as the Lord's Prayer and the Doxology. Some of these repetitions are seen as a way of emphasizing the importance of the prayers and the connection between the different parts of the service.

Reason 1: From the matter of the Common Prayer Book

There are many things contained therein which cannot be justified under this head; it is easy to produce and insist on many particulars which might be improved as so much

Reason 2: From the matter of the Common Prayer Book

The words are repeated often over like Easter.
many arguments. Hence that the English Liturgy is a book unsuitable, and to unlawful to be made use of in the worship of God.

FOR.

1. Some things appointed therein are now in the Judgment of sober and judicious Persons extremely ridiculous. How many odd and senseless Translations of the Holy Scripture have been found therein?

Rom. 12. 9. Is Translate this, bee changed in your Speech. John 2. 10. When men bee drunk, Luke 1. 33. Thus, This is the sixth Month which is called Baren. And Gal. 4. 21. that after in Arabia was born on Jerusalem. With many more, the like absurdities.

But these things are to proofs, that the Bishops in their late debate with Mr. Tuckey, Mr. Manton &c. have yielded wo have them altered, so that the new Edition of the Common Prayer Book is like to bee a little reformed. Nevertheless, they will not Content to have the Corrupt Translation of the oldly correct. Still those words in Psalms 18. 9. as R. ad, Or Rede their Pot bee made but with Thems, fo let Indigent, get them, as a thing that is raw. What nonsense is this?

And in the Liturgy, the writings of the Prophets and the Acts of the Apostles, and the Book of Revelation, are called Sigillate. Moreover, there broken tallpods and Shrubs of prayer as Mr. Cornewright calls them, which the Priest and People Tots between them like Tennis Balls, seem extremely ridiculous toatters by... Therefore such things ought, not to bee in the solemn worship of God, who will not hold them guiltless to take his Name in vain.

2. The Common Prayer Book is guilty of violating the Sacred Word of God. Sometimes the words of Scripture are thereby obliterated, and others put in their room, e. g. In the Cancellers, the Authors have changed those words in the Fourth Commandment, The Lord blessed the Sabbath day into the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day. Sometimes the Liturgy makes hold directly, and in vertex to words of the Scripture. For whereas in Psalm 119. 106 be it said, they were not rebellious against his word, the Common Prayer book falsly they were not subject to the word, which is directly contradictory to the Truth. Or Spak... (notwithstanding his affection for the Liturgy) tol the then Arch Bishop of Canterbury that to read the words, is to charge Wives and Sons with witchhood. The Liturgy taught that the Rod of the wicked fall not come into the list of the Righteous, whereas David only his, but it can not fall there. And sometimes the Common Prayer Book adds to the Scripture. There are three whole verses added to the 16. Psalm. And the 46th Psalm is frequently added to the Scriptures, as if it were in the Bible. Sometimes words are speechlessly stolen out of the Bible. E. g. In the 76. Psalm. The left verse is omitted. So are the spiritual titles, Heavy, Heavy, Heavy, and so know not how often these words pray for the Lord are left out. Amongst men, clipping, and corrupting of Gospels in Trestment, and certainly it is a dreadful thing to add to or take from the Words of God. Rev. 6. 24. Rev. 22. 19.

3. In the Liturgy, The Apostolical books are made Equal with, may be read in the holy Scriptures. In the preces, in the Common prayer Book, it is said, that nothing, is expressed to bee read by the pure Word of God which is evidently grounded on the same. But in the Apostolical Book, fo 1st of the Liturgy appears these: to be read as follows, just as I did it in the Nuptiall Book, amen! a greater proportion than Scriptures, 1st (which have been overuled), of 1st 2nd 3rd and 4th Apocalypyal Chapters, that 258 are omitted. So that these cannot be Equalized with the pure word of God.

In the Conference, as Harpswells, Eleven. The Bishop of Winchell, Speakest so plainely, and saith, the Book of Psalms shall not necessarily bee held: cannot be I personated in our hearts. Nay, the Liturgy advances them above the Scripture by intimating that they are more especially, and can bee left. Spake them many parts of the Holy Canon: and by ordering them to bee read in the Highest Holydays, and many of them twice, three times in one Year. (And that which adds to this is, the lesser, and Legal Prescriptions) and if corruptions are parts so prescribed in the Book of Tobs have been appointed to bee read, as if these things were Divine.

4. Such things are Enjoyed in the Common Prayer Book as (to my Conference) cannot be2p-Faced with but Sin.

To Influence, Ministers are required to give the Holy Communion to all men, Married Persons, whereas Marriage Deeds. is to be accompanied with such Diversifications and Murriments as make persons altogether unfit for a present actual Participation in the Holy Table.

Why then does the Common prayer Book appoint that Ministers to give them the Sacrament, on that very day?

By that Dr. Senior all that may marry may come to the Lords Supper, whereas Marriage is an Ordinance which (and not as Christians only) have a Right unto.
So that by this Prescription many will be put upon making themselves guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord; and eat and drinkDamnation to their own Souls. And this does the Common prayer Book Compell them unto. Notwithstanding it is expressly, and orthodoxly declared, that unworthy Receivers are Torments to themselves Damnation. Art. 24. 

Again, When any man is buried, the Priest must say at his grave. Almighty God has taken to Himself the Soul of your dear Brother. Perhaps the most wicked wretch on the Earth, and that his body is committed to the ground in fire and eternity of hope of a Resurrection to Everlasting Life; Though here, did never truly, nor to such as visibly to the Judgment of Natural Charity, repent of his Sins. What Minister can do this with a good Conscience?

And there are many Superstitions both recommended and imposed in the Liturgy. The putting on of the Ring in Marriage especially the making of that Ceremony to be an Eterntal matter is Superstition. And I do not see how Common prayer worshippers, can cleave themselves from all Superstition when they use those words in the Pontifical Benedictice dei saying, O {A}venientis O Amissarios and Missal Bevis the Lord. And when the Priest is appointed to bless women, and that they may at that time offer their Excommunicated offerings, it is Jewish Superstition. And the Observance of Poppish Holy days, especially such as are dedicated to Saints, I look upon as Highly Superstitious. The like I believe concerning wearing of a Surplice a signification of Purity; when Holy Vestments were in use amongst the Jews, they had an Expiatory Commandment from God about them. Should they have made a Minch or an Epod, or any other Ecclesiastical Garments of their own, they would have been given by God with the sacred Vessils, no more has the Church in these days. It is incumbent on them who offer such power to produce their Christer; which they can never do. Moreover, the Surplice is immediately borrowed from Idolatrous Mas Monget. In the Roman Liturgy, it is ordained that the Priest shall lay service in his Surplice. And he has no power to sanctify bells or water, or any thing else. Except his Surplice bee on. Which made Latimer when the Surplice was puke from him in his degradation, in an holy Scotch to say, Now I can make no more holy water.

Neither can any Priest make his Breeden God Except he have it on. See Remi Apoph. on 1 Cor. 11. 25. Shall Protestants do thus? Sir Abbot (who was no Fanatic) in his Book of Ansticrit Ch. 11. Sect. 26. States, that all Poppish Garments whereby Ministers are distinguished from the rest of the Church, are a Special part of the Garments of the Bish. And who did the Poppish have the Surplice from? Partly from the Jews indeed, but also from the Hebraism. We have Vestments for the wishippers of Baal, 2 King. 10. 22. Bishop Ryle (that great light in the English Church) who in the defence of his Apology p. 268. quotes and approves these words out of Nicolaus Lapistian. The Priests of Israel used to wear Linen Surpliaces which things seem to be derived from them to our time. For they that a monget at Jerusalem Holy Altars may now suffer the hair of their heads, or their beard to grow, and in their divine service they use linen garments. Thus here. Moreover, the greatest of our Protestant Divines have disdained this Superstition; as Mr. Mair, Brethre, Rulling, Gauleter, Brea, Zangley, Humming, Polamus. And many others.

To say no more of this, Mr. Newkes his Arguments which he proposeth to the Bishop of Chester is not easy to be answered. It was this, All Vestments appropriated to the worship of God, and appointed for the signification of Spiritual duties, by the will of man are unlawful, But the Surplice is to. Engs.

And the sign of the Cross in Baptism is as bad as this. That Cross was an old Superstition: It Crept early into the Church. But the first users of it (to fac. 25. I am able to learn) were the Jews, and gross heathens, viz. Valentinus and Montanus, Mr. Roberts Parley in his Elaborate discourse about the Cross, prove that it is a Sin against all the Ten Commandments, and a breach of the very Letter of the Second Commandment. For men to appoint a Religious ceremony, is a direct violation of the Second Commandment, which forbids all humane inventions in Divine worship, as any part thereof. And the Arguments which are brought against the use of (Oyle, Cream, Salt, Spittle in Baptism) profanely by the Poppists hold as well against the Cross. The Priest may as well take a thorn and prick the Child's forhead with it, to put in mind that Christ was crowned with Thorns, and that Christians must suffer as to Crosses him with any such signification. 

Neither too great a respect is put upon that which was the Surplice.
Prayer: In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

Scripture: Matthew 28:19

Prayer: Our Father, Who art in heaven, hallowed be thy Name, thy kingdom come, thy will be done, on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. Amen.

Reading: Ephesians 2:1-10

Prayer: The Lord's Prayer

Gospel: Matthew 6:9-13

Prayer: Holy Ghost, fill us with thy Spirit, and make us to be the body of Christ and the church of God, and strengthen us in the faith, that as we have received this holy Sacrament, we may receive the same effectually for the true body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.
who lived 160 years after Christ, and that there was no
Book of Prayer used by Christians, for he saith, that the
Minister did pour out Prayers, oun dvως ἑαυτοὺς ἀνατελ-καί,
according to strength and utterance was afforded
to him from Heaven. It is, as clear that in Tertullian's time,
who lived 200 years after Christ there was no Church
Liturgy. For he (Apol. cap. 2.) declares, that Christians
in those days prayed discipw qm a de pçrve, without
the help of a Promptum Form, because from their Herrs.
and that there was no Liturgy in some Churches, or of gen-
eral use in the Church for above 400 years, is manifest
from the words of Socrates, (who lived Anno 430) he saith
There were likewise two Christians found who used the
same words in Prayer. Hist. L. 5. Cap. 21: It is true, that
about the year 350 (plus minus) some Churches in Africa
began to use printed Liturgies, which was occasioned by the
gods ignorance and heterodoxy that many of the Clergy
were then found guilty of. So that the Council of Carthage
Anno 395 Ordered, that Ministers should not use Prayer
compounded by themselves, without consulting their more Able
Brethren. Hence also came in Homer, because many Ministers
were as unable to preach as they were unskit to pray.
In the declining ages of the Church, many Liturgical Books
were composed, sed ab initiis non sunt sic. There are the
Prayer Books of Isidorus, Hacus, Sibbio, Maximus, Berno,
Hilarius, and others, as whoo pleases them consults. See
the Liturgies will be. These things if searched into will
be found the Truth. There are who Pray; that in the
Jewish Church of old, there were Forms of Prayer used be-
cause those which were of Divine Inspiration.

Gedas Judaeus Apella.

I know that some Jewish Doctors tell us, that Ezra and
the men of the great Synagogue appointed 18 Benedictions, yet
and that David appointed an 100 Benedictions. Vide Bux-s-
yer; Synagog. Cap. 5: In fine Drui Frater ad Abs 3, and
a6. Schindler Tentagles in Hose Masue. And I have been
Liturgies written in the Hebrew Tongue, but it is easy to
perceive that they are late Compositions. They think
so find any such compiled before the Church of the Jews
was degenerated into its present wofull estate, will find
themselves disappointed, as Bishop Andrews was, when he
studied a Jewish Liturgy to be translated out of the Hebrew
into the Latin Tongue, hoping that he should have found
something therein to contemnence the English Liturgy. Gen-

Edw.
Friend, he omitted a Jewish Common prayer Book, wherein are Prayers for the Dead, &c. 7 Superstitious Commemoration of Saints. Of so little weight is the Argument taken from the Jews Liturgyes.

Reason 4. In this Age of Light, it would in me, and in all others so Educated and instructed as I have been, appear so be a great Apology, should I in the least countenance or Comply with the Common prayer worshipping.

The Corruptions of the English Liturgy have been abundantly discovered and born witness against by many Learned and worthy men, whom God has raised up and Enabled to do that Service for his Name and Truth.

The Books of the Famous Cartwright were long since published. And since that a Treatise called a Survey of the Common prayer, and the Exceptions of the London Ministers, which called them to refuse Subscription to the Liturgy, and the Apology of the Non conformists in Lincolnshire; and the Reasons of those in Cornwall, and Devon, And the Defence of those Reasons in their parts; besides many other Tracts omitted very lately by all which the Light is Convincingly manifested before the world. Yet, and there have bin many and those too, not of wilfull Tempers, but very humble and Confidentious, nor of wade parts, but as Eminent for Learning and Judgment as any in the world, who have chosen to Suffer rather then do in Complying with the Liturgy. Amongst those I might mention Dr. John Rainold, Dr. Ames and Mr. Robert Parker (a man of vast Reading and Abilities) Mr. Dod (whom Mr. Burroughs has rightly called the Moses of his Time), Mr. Bradfow, and Mr. Nichol, not to speake of others.

Onely I would not forget those Eminent and Faithful Ministers of Christ who were driven into an American desert, the Principal one of whom is Mr. Sibley, and Sufferings, was, because they durst not comply with the Common prayer Book. And since their being in New England, some of them have by their writings testified against it. The 9 Propositions (though written by Mr. Davenport) had the Approbation of the rest of the E. of New England, and therein Reasons are given why it is unlawfull to be present at the Common Prayer worship or any part thereof.

Mr. John Cotton of Boston, (a man deservedly famous in both Englands) has done the like. And Mr. John Winthrop, of Dedham in New-England (Mr. Shirley of Cambridge Joying with him) in his defence of the 9 Propositions, has expressly declared the unlawfulness of being present at the Common prayer Worship.

As for me, your selfe knoweth what my Education has bin. My Father was an Holy and a Learned man, and one that suffered much for his Non conformity: would I once go to hear Common Prayer, I Seriously profess I know not how I should be able to look my Father in the Face in the other world; much less how I should answer Christ at the great day for my Apostasy from those Principles of Truth, which my Father has instructed me in; both by word and Example. Gal. 2. 18. Is of weight with mee.

There, Sir, are some of the Reasons why I judge it would be in mee, to own the Common prayer worship: I have omitted the mentioning of many particulars contained in the Liturgy, which as to the Delirium of them are False and Corrupt. E. g. It is there affirmed that Children Baptiz'd have all things Necessary to Salvation and are undoubtedly saved. Yes, that is Certain from God's word that if a Baptiz'd child die before actual Sin, its saved. This favours of Pelagianism. And that there are only two Sacraments necessary to Salvation, which implies a double Error, viz. that the Sacraments are necessary to Salvation, and that there are more Sacraments of the New Testament than two. And the Book saith that some sins are deadly, as the Popish distinction of sins into Mortal and Venial were a found distinction. And that Christ has Redeemed all Men.

I might here also have added, that a Limited Liturgy is Opposed to the Spirit of Prayer. The Scripture teacheth that all Christians should pray with all Prayer and Supplication in the Spirit, Ephes. 6. 18. which they cannot do if they tie themselves up to a set Form never to bee varied from. I let none that Argument, from the Mistaking of a Prescript Liturgy, It is the Instrument of a foolish Shepheard. An idol and a Dumb Ministry is thereby continued in the Church.

It is well Known, that in a Place in Kent, a Common Fidler read Service for 10 days of the week. And perhaps that was more then he deserved. But let mee seriously add this farther, that a Prescribed Book is an Image or Help to Prayer devised by men, but not ordained by God, and therefore forbidden in the Second Commandment.
Mr. Catesby speaks weightily in saying, "It is fall to bring in ordinarily any other Book into the Publick worship besides the Book of God. To bring in another Book is like bringing in of another Altar into the Temple besides the Lords Altar. If it be a sin, to set up a Pulpit by Gods Pulpit, and a threshold by his threshold. So it is a sin to set up a Book by Gods Book; and consequently it is a sin to join with, or to countenance them that do so."

But before I proceed to your next question, I must leave to speak a few words in answer to that which some have been of a sufficient justification of the Liturgy, or at least of their participating in that worship, viz. in that the first Collectors and Publishers of it were good men, and divines of them dined together. Answer. Are not good men especially in times of darkness fullible, and their examples not to be followed, wherein they have fallen short of the Rule? In some ages, good men may do that which if their successors having greater light should follow them in, they would not do? Witness the Delays of the Fathers, not to mention other Errors. But as to the matter before us, the whole Liturgy was sung or sung in Latin in the Reign of King Henry 8. Until the year 1545, and when the Laten and no other part of the Liturgy was permitted in English, and that was the first book the Reformation kept in that Kings Reign. See Fuller's Church History Book 7. P. 186. In 1645 came forth the first Edition of the Common Prayer Book in King Edward's time. There is no rule of charity that does require us to believe that all the Persons Employed there about were good men. For one of them was George Day the Bishop of Chester, who was a Dissembling Hypocrite, pretending to be a Protestant, but afterwards found himself to be a Papist. Yet many sat at a table to that affair, were truly Pious men, who acted faithfully according to the light he had received in those drawings of Reformation out of Popish Darkness in England. Bishop Ridley had an hand in the first English Liturgy, being the first Slickly for conformity in those Days, but God gave him to see his Error before his Martyrdom, as is clear from his Letter to Mr. Hooper. Published by Mr. Fox, vol. 2. p. 156. 157.
For Rome: The Liturgy came from thence; and why
Perhaps lead thither again.
The Riddle of the Snow and the Water, may be ap-
plied here.
Master me genuine make quaeque significare ex me.

Not but that those who Comply with the service
Book, are true Protestants, and would suffer with their
Non-conformable Brethren (who cannot go so far as they)
rather than embrace Popery.
Nevertheless, the Liturgy hath in it itself a tendency
that way; and will by such as are most hearty Protestants,
be improved accordingly.

I proceed now to the Second Enquiry, viz.
What Reason have you to subrogate the Lawsuits of
Lying the hand on the Bible, and Kissing the Book, in
Swearing?

I answer briefly.

1. We do not find in the Scripture that the Lord's
Servants were wont to Swear after that Manner.

There were vest of Lifting up the hand in Swearing, which is like lifting up the hands or Eyes in Prayer, a
natural sign of Worship. To lift up the hand to Heaven is
Zech. 11. 23. Rev. 10. 5. In many nations they used
his gesture. The Judges in France say to Him that is
to Swear, Lift up your Hand, Except it be an Ecclesi-
astic Person, and they bid him put his hand to his Breast.
The Romans of old, so the Italians and Spaniards, have
used to lift up the Finger when they Swear solemnly.
I cannot justify the Practice of the Germans, who in tak-
ing an Oath, Lift up three Fingers, as thereby in intimating
that they invoke the Sacred Trinity.

2. Laying the hand on the Book is a Symbolizing with
Idiots and Superstitious Jews.

This Ceremony is immediately derived from the Papists;
who are wont as they lay the hand on the Book in Swear-
ing to say, So help me God and these Holy Evangelists, which
gro, Idolatry: and it is not much better when it is
said, So help the contents of this Book. The Judici-
ous Rites, in pt. 24, p. 303, 309, whither that custom
of touching the Book, were not at all used; Here faith
the abuse of it by Idiots, makes it to be a Ceremony
Kissing in a Religious way is a gesture of Adoration. (Psalm 2:12)

When the Lord said, "Kiss the Son," the meaning is worship Him. Job also taught that when he beheld the Sun and the Moon, he kissed them. (Chap. 31:25)

And to the Heathens, they also did it. (2 Kings 13:34)

And from the Heathens we have the Papists. (Psalms 135:15)

And the most learned men of the Papists, in his dissertation, say, "The kiss of the book is the kiss of the Sun." (Wits. p. 156)

And whereas some have objected that Dr. Ames in his essay, and in his speech against Ceremonies, has pleaded for the kiss of the book, it is to be noticed that it is his own work that he uses as an approval of that practice.

And now, Sir, you have my thoughts concerning both your questions; and you see the grounds I go upon. If you judge that any of your friends will receive Light and Confirmation in the Truth thereby, you may privately Communicate what I have written to you. Only let my Name (which can add no Authority to the Truth) be concealed. So I commend you to the Grace of Christ, praying that His Holy Spirit may lead us into all Truth.

FINIS.