and against primitive Orders in the Church.

"celebrate feasts on the birthdays of the martyrs, because it was the manner of the heathen." "O!" saith Tertullian, "better is the religion of the heathen: for they use no solemnity of the Christians, neither the Lord’s day, nor the Pentecost; and if they knew them they would have nothing to do with them: for they would be afraid lest they should seem Christians; but we are not afraid to be called heathen."

The same Tertullian would not have Christians to sit after they have prayed, because the idolaters did so. Whereby it appeareth, that both of particular men and of councils, in making or abolishing of ceremonies, heed hath been taken that the Christians should not be like the idolaters, no not in those things which of themselves are most indifferent to be used or not used.

The same conformity is not less opposite unto reason; first inasmuch as "contraries must be cured by their contraries, and therefore popery being anti-christianity is not healed, but by establishment of orders thereunto opposite. The way to bring a drunken man to sobriety is to carry him as far from excess of drink as may be. To rectify a crooked

"cum etiam in natalibus beatissimorum martyrum per nonnullas civitates, et in his locis sacris, talia committere non reformident.

Quibus diebus etiam (quod punitoris est dicere) salutantes celebratisimam per vicos atque plateas exercent, ut natronalis honor et innumeralimum fesinarum pulchrorum et oryem, sortem, venientium ad sacras tissimam diem, iri cives lascivae et eminentibus appetatur: ut etiam ipsius sanctae religionis poene fugiat accessorius." Concil. ii. 1649. The exact date of this canon seems to be uncertain: but it clearly refers not to Christians having feasts of their own as the Gentiles had, but to the danger they were of being tempted to join with the Gentiles in the feast; and the same is true of the Roman Catholic Church, in the persecution altera fieri occulta. Videatur vetari talia jubeant, et de cives atque possessionibus imposita praema probi: maxime, olim a praecoxibus, et tunc sollemnia sacrificia Christianorum, et in his locis sacris, praebenta.

"etiam in natalibus beatissimorum martyrum per nonnullas civitates, et in his locis sacris, talia committere non reformident."

Quibus diebus etiam (quod punitoris est dicere) salutantes celebratisimam per vicos atque plateas exercent, ut natronalis honor et innumeralimum fesinarum pulchrorum et oryem, sortem, venientium ad sacras tissimam diem, iri cives lascivae et eminentibus appeturator: ut etiam ipsius sanctae religionis poene fugiat accessorius."
stick we bend it on the contrary side, as far as it was at the
first on that side from whence we draw it, and so it cometh 
in the end to a middle between both, which is perfect
straightness. Utter inconformity therefore with the church
of Rome in these things is the best and surest policy
which the Church can use. While we use their ceremo-
nies they take occasion to blaspheme, saying, that our
religion cannot stand by itself, unless it lean upon the staff
of their ceremonies. They hereby conceive great hope of
having the rest of their popery in the end, which hope
causeth them to be more frozen in their wickedness. Nei-
ther is it without cause that they have this hope, considering
that which Master Bucer noteth upon the eighteenth of St.
Matthew 2, that where these things have been left, popery
hath returned; but on the other part in places which have
been cleansed of these things, it hath not yet been seen that
it hath had any entrance. 3 None make such clamours
for these ceremonies, as the papists and those whom they
suborn; a manifest token how much they triumph and joy
in these things. They breed grief of mind in a number, that
are godly-minded and have anti-christianity in such detes-
tation, that their minds are martyred with the very sight of
them in the Church. 4 Such godly brethren we ought not
thus to grieve with unprofitable ceremonies, yea, ceremonies
wherein there is not only no profit, but also danger of great
hurt, that may grow to the Church by infection, which
popish ceremonies are means to breed. 5

This in effect is the sum and substance of that which they
bring by way of opposition against those orders which we
have common with the church of Rome; these are the reasons
 wherewith they would prove our ceremonies in that respect
worthy of blame.

IV. Before we answer unto these things, we are to cut off
that whereunto they from whom these objections proceed do
oftentimes fly for defence and succour, when the force and

---

1 [Abridged from T. C. I. 103.]
2 [P. 144. ed. 1553. "His certe
hodie debemus ut in multis locis,
ubi diu praedicatum Evangelium
fuit, adversa sint restituta omnia:
quum id nusquam, ubi serio et
pure praedico Christo etiam ad
ipsius verbum reformata ceremo-
niae sunt, accidisse videamus."
]
3 T. C. lib. iii. p. 178.
4 Ibid. p. 179.
5 Ibid. p. 180.

strength of their arguments is elided. For the ceremonies in
use amongst us being in no other respect retained, saving only
for that to retain them is to our seeming good and profitable,
in this beyond all, so profitable and so good, that if we had either simply
taken them clean away, or else removed them so as to place in onet
with their stead others, we had done worse: the plain and direct
way against us herein had been only to prove, that all such ceremo-
nies as they require to be abolished are retained by us
unto the hurt of the Church, or with less benefit than the abolish-
ment of them would bring. But forasmuch as they saw how they
hardenly should be able to perform this, they took a more
compendious way, traducing the ceremonies of our church
under the name of being popish. The cause why this way
seemed better unto them was, for that the name of popery is
more odious than very paganism amongst divers of the more
simple sort, so as whatsoever they hear named popish, they
presently conceive deep hatred against it, imagining there
 can be nothing contained in that name but it must be
 exceeding detestable. The ears of the people they have there-
fore filled with strong clamour: "The Church of England is
fraught with popish ceremonies: they that favour the cause
of reformation maintain nothing but the sincerity of the controv-
sparion of Christ: all such as withstand them fight
for the laws of his sworn enemy, uphold the filthy relics of
Antichrist, and are defenders of that which is popish;
their usual

These are the notes wherewith are drawn from the hearts of maner is
to prove the multitude so many signs; with these tunes their minds are
that ceremo-
nies are
exasperated against the lawful guides and governors of their
souls; these are the voices that fill them with general discon-
tentment, as though the bosom of that famous church wherein
they live were more noisome than any dungeon. But when the
churches of the authors of so scandalous incantations are examined, and
called to account how can they justify such their dealings; when
they are urgently directed to answer, whether it be lawful for
us to use any such ceremonies as the church of Rome useth,
and yet
not good as
others in
their place
would be.
unprofitable, or “when as good or better may be established.” Which answer is both idle in regard of us, and also repugnant to themselves.

[2.] It is in regard of us very vain to make this answer, because they know that what ceremonies we retain common unto the church of Rome, we therefore retain them, for that we judge them to be profitable, and to be such that others instead of them would be worse. So that when they say that we ought to abrogate such Romish ceremonies as are unprofitable, or else might have other more profitable in their stead, they trifle and they beat the air about nothing which toucheth us; unless they mean that we ought to abrogate all Romish ceremonies which in their judgment have either no use or less use than some other might have. But then must they shew some commission, whereby they are authorized to sit as judges, and we required to take their judgment for good in this case. Otherwise their sentences will not be greatly regarded, when they oppose their methinketh unto the orders of the Church of England: as in the question about surplices one of them doth; “If we look to the colour, black methinketh is more decent; if to the form, a garment down to the foot hath a “great deal more comeliness in it.” If they think that we ought to prove the ceremonies commodious which we have retained, they do in this point very greatly deceive themselves.

For in all right and equity, that which the Church hath received and held so long for good, that which public approbation hath ratified, must carry the benefit of presumption with it to be accounted meet and convenient. They which have stood up as yesterday to challenge it of defect, must prove their challenge. If we being defendants do answer, that the ceremonies in question are godly, comely, decent, profitable for the Church; their reply is childish and unorderly, to say, that we demand the thing in question, and shew the poverty of our cause, the goodness whereof we are fain to beg that our adversaries would grant. For on our part this must be the answer, which orderly proceeding doth require. The burden of proving doth rest on them. In them it is frivolous to say, we ought not to use bad ceremonies of the church of Rome, and presume all such bad as it pleaseth themselves to dislike, unless we can persuade them the contrary.

[3.] Besides, they are herein opposite also to themselves. For what one thing is so common with them, as to use the custom of the church of Rome for an argument to prove, that such and such ceremonies cannot be good and profitable for us, inasmuch as that church useth them? Which usual kind of disputing sheweth, that they do not disallow only those Romish ceremonies which are unprofitable, but count all unprofitable which are Romish; that is to say, which have been devised by the church of Rome, or which are used in that church and not prescribed in the word of God. For this is the only limitation which they can use suitable unto their other positions. And therefore the cause which they yield, why they hold it lawful to retain in doctrine and in discipline some things as good, which yet are common to the church of Rome, is for that those good things are "perpetual commandments in whose place no other can "come;" but ceremonies are changeable. 1 So that their judgment in truth is, that whatsoever by the word of God is not unchangeable in the church of Rome, that church’s using is a cause why reformed churches ought to change it, and not to think it good or profitable. And lest we seem to father any thing upon them more than is properly their own, let them read even their own words, where they complain,” that we “are thus constrained to be like unto the Papists in Any their “ceremonies”;” yea, they urge that this cause, although it were “alone, ought to move them to whom that belongeth to do “them away, forasmuch as they are their ceremonies;” and that the Bishop of Salisbury doth justly this their complaint 2.

1 T. C. iii. p. 171. “What an “open untruth is it, that this is one “of our principles, not to be lawful "to use the same ceremonies which "the papists did; when as I have "both before declared the contrary, "and even here have expressly "added, that they are not to be used "when as good or better may be "established.”

2 Eccles. Discip. fol. 100. [in Cartwright’s Transl. 134. “Si de "color agit, mihi quidem magis "decorus niger color videtur; si "autem de forma, talaris vestis ho- "nestic;”]

3 T. C. lib. iii. p. 176. “As for "your often repeating that the “ceremonies in question are godly, "comely, and decent; it is your old "wont of demanding the thing in "question, and an undoubted ar- "gument of your extreme poverty.”

4 T. C. iii. 174. “Our is just in that we are thus "constrained to be like unto the "papists in any their ceremonies, "and that this cause only ought "to move them to whom that be- "longeth, to do them away, foras- "much as they are their ceremonies;"
St. Augustine's Rule not here relevant.

BOOK IV.  
Ch. v. i.

The clause is untrue which they add concerning the Bishop of Salisbury; but the sentence doth shew that we do them no wrong in setting down the state of the question between us thus: Whether we ought to abolish out of the church of England all such orders, rites, and ceremonies as are established in the Church of Rome, and are not prescribed in the word of God. For the affirmative whereof we are now to answer such proofs of theirs as have been before alleged.

V. Let the church of Rome be what it will, let them that are of it be the people of God and our fathers in the Christian faith, or let them be otherwise; hold them for catholics or hold them for heretics; it is not a thing either one way or other in this present question greatly material. Our conformity with them in such things as have been proposed is not proved as yet unlawful by all this. St. Augustine hath said, yea and we have allowed his saying, "That the custom of the people of God and the decrees of our forefathers are not to be kept, touching those things whereof the Scripture hath neither one way nor other given us any charge." What then? Doth it here therefore follow, that they being neither the people of God nor our forefathers, are for that cause in nothing to be followed? This consequent were good if so be it were granted, that only the custom of the people of God and the decrees of our forefathers are in such case to be observed. But then should no other kind of later laws in the Church be good; which were a gross absurdity to think. St. Augustine's speech therefore doth import, that where we have no divine precept, if yet we have the custom of the people of God or a decree of our forefathers, this a law and must be kept. Notwithstanding it is not denied, but that we lawfully may observe the positive constitutions of our own churches, although the same were but yesterday made by ourselves alone. Nor is there any thing in this to prove, that the church of England might not by law receive orders, rites, or customs from the church of Rome, although they were neither the people of God nor yet our forefathers. How much less when we have received from them nothing, but that which they did themselves receive from such, as we cannot deny to have been the people of God, yea such, as either we must acknowledge for our own forefathers or else disdain the race of Christ?

VI. The rites and orders wherein we follow the church of Rome are of no other kind than such as the church of Geneva itself doth follow them in. We follow the church of Rome in moe things; yet they in some things of the same nature as about which our present controversy is: so that the difference is not in the kind, but in the number of rites only, wherein they and we do follow the church of Rome. The use of wafer-cakes, the custom of godfathers and godmothers in baptism, are things not commanded nor forbidden in Scripture, things which have been of old and are retained in the church of Rome even at this very hour. Is conformity with Rome in such things a blemish unto the church of England, and unto churches abroad an ornament? Let them, if not for the reverence they owe unto this church, in the bowels whereof they have received I trust that precious and blessed vigour, which shall quicken them to eternal life, yet at the
leastwise for the singular affection which they do bear towards others, take heed how they strike, lest they wound whom they would not. For undoubtedly it cutteth deeper than they are aware of, when they plead that even such ceremonies of the church of Rome, as contain in them nothing which is not of itself agreeable to the word of God, ought nevertheless to be abolished; and that neither the word of God, nor reason, nor the examples of the eldest churches do permit the church of Rome to be therein followed.

[2.] Heretics they are, and they are our neighbours. By us and amongst us they lead their lives. But what then? therefore no ceremony of theirs lawful for us to use? We must yield and will that none are lawful, if God himself be a precedent against the use of any. But how appeareth it that God is so? Hereby they say it doth appear, in that "God severed his people from the heathens, but especially from the Egyptians, and such nations as were nearest neighbours unto them, by forbidding them to do those things which were in themselves very lawful to be done, yea, very profitable some, and incommodious to be forbade; such things it pleased God to forbid them, only because those heathens did them, with whom conformity in the same things might have bred infection. Thus in shaving, cutting, apparel-wearing, yea in sundry kinds of meats also, swine's flesh, conies, and such like, they were forbidden to do so and so, because the Gentiles did so. And the end why God forbade them such things was to sever them for fear of infection by a great and an high wall from other nations, as St. Paul teacheth." The cause of more careful separation from the nearest nations was the greatness of danger to be especially by them infected. Now papists are to us as those nations were unto Israel. Therefore if the wisdom of God be our guide, we cannot allow conformity with them, no not in any such indifferent ceremony.

[3.] Our direct answer hereunto is, that for any thing here alleged we may still doubt, whether the Lord in such indifferent ceremonies, as those whereof we dispute, did frame his

people of set purpose unto any utter dissimilitude, either with Egyptians or with any other nation else. And if God did not forbid them all such indifferent ceremonies, then our conformity with the church of Rome in some such is not hitherto as yet disproved, although papists were unto us as those heathens were unto Israel. "After the doings of the land of Egypt, wherein you dwelt, ye shall not do, saith the Lord; and after the manner of the land of Canaan, whither I will bring you, shall ye not do, neither walk in their ordinances: do after my judgments, and keep my ordinances to walk therein: I am the Lord your God. The speech is indefinite, "ye shall not be like them:" it is not general, "ye shall not be like them in any thing, or like to them in any thing indifferent, or like unto them in any indifferent ceremony of theirs." Seeing therefore it is not set down how far the bounds of his speech concerning dissimilitude should reach, how can any man assure us, that it extendeth farther than to those things only, wherein the nations there mentioned were idolatrous, or did against that which the law of God commandeth? Nay, doth it not seem a thing very probable, that God doth purposely add, "Do after my judgments," as giving thereby to understand that his meaning in the former sentence was but to bar similitude in such things, as were repugnant unto the ordinances, laws, and statutes which he had given? Egyptians and Canaanites are for example's sake named unto them, because the customs of the one they had been, and of the other they should be best acquainted with. But that wherein they might not be like unto either of them, was such peradventure as had been no whit less unlawful, although those nations had never been. So that there is no necessity to think, that God for fear of infection by reason of nearness forbade them to be like unto the Canaanites or the Egyptians, in those things which otherwise had been lawful enough.

For I would know what one thing was in those nations, and is here forbidden, being indifferent in itself, yet forbidden only because they used it. In the laws of Israel we find it written, "Ye shall not cut round the corners of your heads, "neither shalt thou tear the tufts of thy beard." These

---

1 T. C. lib. i. p. 89, 131. [See also p. 67.]
2 Lev. xviii. 3. 3 Lev. xix. 27.
4 Deut. xiv. 7; Lev. xiv.
5 Ephes. ii. 14.
6 Lev. xix. 27.
7 Deut. xxii. 11.