

A REFORMED CATHOLIC

WILLIAM PERKINS



A REFORMED CATHOLIC

A REFORMED CATHOLIC

William Perkins



A free edition from

CHRISTIAN READER

A reading & audiobook app for classic Christian literature

ABOUT THIS BOOK



A landmark work of **Reformed apologetics**, systematically comparing Protestant and Roman Catholic doctrine across twenty-two contested points — from **free will and justification** to the Mass, purgatory, and papal supremacy. Perkins argues that Reformed Christians are the true Catholics, having retained the core of the ancient faith while rejecting Roman corruptions. Each doctrine is examined through areas of agreement, sharp disagreement, biblical reasoning, and rebuttal of Papist objections, making this an essential resource for understanding the theological fault lines of the Reformation era.



ABOUT CHRISTIAN READER



Christian Reader is a free reading and audiobook app for classic Christian literature, with high-quality narration available as a premium upgrade.

Available on iOS and Android.

<https://apps.apple.com/us/app/christian-reader/id6755921023>

https://play.google.com/store/apps/details?id=com.samfrisch.christian_reader

CONTENTS



Title Page	6
To Sir William Bowes: Epistle Dedicatory	7
To the Christian Reader	9
Doctrine 1	11
Point 2: Of Original Sin	27
Point 3: Of Certainty of Salvation	33
Point 4: Of the Justification of a Sinner	47
Point 5: Of Merits	72
Point 6: Of Satisfaction	81
Point 7: Of Traditions	91
Point 8: Of Vows	101
Point 9: Of Images	112
Point 10: Of the Real Presence	120
Point 11: Of the Sacrifice of the Mass	131
Point 12: Of Fasting	141
Point 13: Of the State of Perfection and Worship of Sai... ..	148
Point 15: Of the Intercession of Saints	162
Point 16: Of Implicit Faith	167
Point 17: Of Purgatory	174
Point 18: Of Ecclesiastical Supremacy	177
Point 19: Of the Efficacy of the Sacraments	184

Point 20: Of Saving Faith	190
Point 21: Of Repentance	197
Advertisement: Roman Religion Against the Grounds	218

TITLE PAGE



A Reformed Catholic: Or, A Declaration Showing How Near We May Come to the Present Church of Rome in Sundry Points of Religion: and wherein we must forever depart from them: with an Advertisement to all favorers of the Roman religion, showing that the said religion is against the Catholic principles and grounds of the Catechism.

Printed by John Legat, Printer to the University of Cambridge.
1598.

TO SIR WILLIAM BOWES: EPISTLE DEDICATORY



Right Worshipful, it is a notable policy of the devil, which he has put into the heads of sundry men in this age, to think that our religion and the religion of the present Church of Rome are all one for substance; and that they may be reunited as (in their opinion) they were before. Writings to this effect, are spread abroad in the French tongue, and respected of English Protestants more than is proper, or ought to be. For, let men in show of moderation, pretend the peace and good estate of the Catholic Church as long as they will; this union of the two religions can never be made, more than the union of light and darkness. And this shall appear, if we do but a little consider, how they of the Roman church have razed the foundation. For, though in words they honor Christ, yet in deed they turn him into a Pseudo-Christ and an Idol of their own brain. They call him our Lord, but with this condition that the Servant of Servants of this Lord may change and add to his commandments: having so great a power, that he may open and shut heaven to whom he will; and bind the very conscience with his own laws, and consequently be partaker of the spiritual kingdom of Christ. Again they call him a Savior, but yet in us: in that he gives this grace to us, that by our merits we may be

our own Saviors: and in the want of our own merits, we may partake in the merits of the Saints. And they acknowledge that he died and suffered for us, but with this caveat, that the fault being pardoned, we must satisfy for the temporal punishment either in this world or in Purgatory. In a word, they make him our Mediator of Intercession to God; but withal, his Mother must be the Queen of heaven, and by the right of a mother command him there. Thus, in word they cry Hosanna, but in deed they crucify Christ. Therefore we have good cause to bless the name of God, that has freed us from the yoke of this Roman bondage, and has brought us to the true light and liberty of the gospel. And it should be a great height of unthankfulness in us, not to stand out against the present church of Rome, but to yield ourselves to plots of reconciliation. To this effect and purpose I have penned this little Treatise, which I present to your Worship, desiring it might be some token of a thankful mind, for undeserved love. And I crave withal, not only your Worshipful (which is more common) but also your Learned protection; being well assured, that by skill and art you are able to justify whatever I have truly taught. Thus wishing to you and yours the continuance and the increase of faith and good conscience, I take my leave. Cambridge, June 28, 1597.

Your Worship's in the Lord, William Perkins.

TO THE CHRISTIAN READER



By a Reformed Catholic, I understand any one that holds the same necessary heads of religion with the Roman Church: yet so, as he pares off and rejects all errors in doctrine whereby the said religion is corrupted. How this may be done, I have begun to make some little declaration in this small Treatise: the intent whereof is to show how near we may come to the present Church of Rome in sundry points of religion: and wherein we must forever dissent.

My purpose in penning this small discourse is threefold. The first is, to confute all such politicians as hold and maintain, that our religion and that of the Roman Church differ not in substance, and consequently that they may be reconciled: yet my meaning is not here to condemn any Pacification that tends to persuade the Roman church to our religion. The second is, that the papists which think so basely of our religion, may be won to a better liking of it: when they shall see how near we come to them in sundry points. The third, that the common protestant might in some part see and conceive the point of difference between us and the Church of Rome: and know in what manner and how far forth, we condemn the opinions of the said Church.

I crave pardon for the order which I use, in handling the several points. For I have set them down one by one, as they came to mind, not respecting the laws of method. If any Papist shall say, that I have not alleged their opinions aright, I answer that their books be at hand, and I can justify what I have said.

Thus craving your acceptance of this my pains, and wishing to you the increase of knowledge and love of pure and sound religion, I take my leave and make an end.

DOCTRINE 1



Revelation 18:4._ And I heard another voice from heaven say, Go out of her my people, that you be not partakers of — her sins, and receive not of her plagues.

In the former chapter Saint John sets down a description of the whore of Babylon, and that at large as he saw her in a vision described to him. In the sixteenth verse of the same chapter, he foretells her destruction: and in the three first verses of this 18th chapter, he goes on to propound the said destruction yet more directly and plainly; withal alleging arguments to prove the same, in all the verses following. Now in this fourth verse is set down a warning serving to forewarn all the people of God, that they may escape the judgment which shall befall the whore: and the words contain two parts: a commandment, and a reason. The commandment, Come out of her my people, that is, from Babylon. The reason, taken from the event lest you be partakers, etc. Touching the commandment, first I will search the right meaning of it, and then set down the use thereof and doctrine flowing thence. In history therefore are three Babylons mentioned: one is, Babylon of Assyria standing on the river Euphrates, where was the confusion of languages, and where the Jews were in captivity: which Babylon is in Scripture reproached for idolatry and other iniquities. The second Babylon is

in Egypt standing on the river Nile, and it is now called Cairo; of that mention is made (1 Peter 5:13) (as some think) though indeed it is as likely and more commonly thought, that there is meant Babylon of Assyria. The third Babylon is mystical, whereof Babylon of Assyria was a type and figure; and that is Rome, which is without question here to be understood. And the whore of Babylon, as by all circumstances may be gathered, is the state or regiment of a people that are the inhabitants of Rome and appertain thereto. This may be proved by the interpretation of the Holy Ghost: for in the last verse of the 17th chapter the woman that is the whore of Babylon is said to be a city which reigns over the kings of the earth: now in the days when Saint John penned this book of Revelation, there was no city in the world that ruled over the kings of the earth but Rome; it then being the seat where the Emperor put in execution his Imperial authority. Again in the seventh verse she is said to sit on a beast having seven heads and ten horns which seven heads be seven hills (verse 9), whereon the woman sits, and also they be seven kings. Therefore by the whore of Babylon is meant a city standing on seven hills. Now it is well known, not only to learned men in the Church of God, but even to the heathen themselves, that Rome alone is the city built on seven distinct hills, called Caelius, Aventinus, Esquilinus, Tarpeius or Capitolinus, Viminalis, Palatinus, Quirinalis. Papists to help themselves, do allege that old Rome stood on seven hills, but now is removed further to the plain of Campus Martius. I answer, that however the greatest part of the city in regard of habitation be not now on seven hills, yet in regard of government and practice of religion it is: for even to this day upon these hills are seated certain churches and monasteries and other like places where the Papal

authority is put in execution: and thus Rome being put for a state and government; even at this day, it stands upon seven hills. And though it has come to pass that the harlot in regard of her later days even changed her seat, yet in respect of her younger times in which she was bred and born, she sat upon the seven hills. Others, because they fear the wounding of their own heads, labor to frame these words to another meaning, and say, that by the whore, is meant the company of all wicked men in the world wherever, the devil being the head thereof. But this exposition is flat against the text: for in the second verse of the 18th chapter, she is opposed to the kings of the earth with whom she is said to commit fornication, and in the last verse she is called a city standing on seven hills and reigning over the kings of the earth (as I have said), and therefore must needs be a state of men in some particular place. And the Papists themselves perceiving that this shift will not serve their turn, make two Romes, heathenish Rome, and that whereof the Pope is head: now (say they) the whore spoken of, is heathenish Rome, which was ruled by cruel tyrants, as Nero, Domitian, and the rest: and that Rome whereof now the Pope is head, is not here meant. Behold a vain and foolish distinction: for Ecclesiastical Rome in respect of state, princely dominion, and cruelty in persecuting the Saints of God, is all one with the heathenish Empire: the See of the Bishop being turned into the Emperor's court, as all histories do manifest. But let the distinction be as they suppose, yet by their leaves, here by the whore must be understood not only heathenish Rome, but even the Papal or Ecclesiastical Rome: for verse 3 of this chapter the Holy Ghost says plainly, that she has made all nations drunk with the wine of the wrath of her fornication: indeed it is added, that she has committed fornication with

the kings of the earth, whereby is signified that she has endeavored to entangle all the nations of the earth in her spiritual idolatry, and to bring the kings of the earth to her religion. Which thing cannot be understood of the heathenish Rome, for that left all the kings of the earth to their own religion and idolatry: neither did they labor to bring foreign kings to worship their gods. Again (Revelation 18:16) it is said, that the ten horns, which be ten kings, shall hate the whore, and make her desolate and naked, which must not be understood of heathenish Rome, but of popish Rome: for whereas in former times all the kings of the earth did submit themselves to the whore, now they have begun to withdraw themselves, and make her desolate; as the king of Bohemia, Denmark, Germany, England, Scotland, and other parts: therefore this distinction is also frivolous. They further allege that the whore of Babylon is drunk with the blood of the Saints and Martyrs (Revelation 17:6), shed not in Rome, but in Jerusalem: where the Lord was crucified: and the two prophets being slain lie there in the streets (Revelation 11:8). But this place, is not meant of Jerusalem, as Jerome has fully taught, but it may well be understood of Rome: Christ was crucified there, either because the authority, whereby he was crucified was from the Roman Empire, or else because Christ in his members was and is there daily crucified, though locally in his own person he was crucified at Jerusalem. And thus, notwithstanding all which has been said, we must here by the whore understand the State and Empire of Rome, not so much under the heathen Emperors as under the head thereof the Pope: which exposition, besides the authority of the text, has the favor and defense of ancient and learned men. Bernard says, They are the ministers of Christ, but they serve Antichrist. Again, The beast spoken of in the

Apocalypse, to which a mouth is given to speak blasphemies, and to make war with the Saints of God, is now gotten into Peter's chair, as a lion prepared to his prey. It will be said, that Bernard speaks these latter words of one that came to the Popedom by intrusion or usurpation. It is true indeed: but why was he a usurper? he renders a reason thereof in the same place: because the Antipope called Innocentius was chosen by the kings of Germany, France, England, Scotland, Spain, Jerusalem, with consent of the whole clergy and people in these nations, and the other was not. And thus Bernard has given his verdict, that not only this usurper, but all the Popes for these many years are the beast in the Apocalypse; because now they are only chosen by the college of Cardinals. To this agrees the decree of Pope Nicolas the second, in the year 1059, that the Pope shall afterward be created by the votes of the Cardinal bishops of Rome, with the consent of the rest of the clergy and people, and the Emperor himself: and all Popes are excommunicate and accursed as Antichrists, that enter otherwise, as all now do. Joachim Abbas says, Antichrist was long since born in Rome, and shall be yet advanced higher in the Apostolic See. Petrarch says, Once Rome, now Babylon. And Irenaeus book 5, last chapter, said before all these, that Antichrist should be Latinus, a Roman.

Again, this commandment must not so much be understood of a bodily departure in respect of cohabitation and presence, as of a spiritual separation in respect of faith and religion. And the meaning of the Holy Ghost is, that men must depart from the Romish Church in regard of judgment and doctrine, in regard of their faith and the worship of God.

Thus then we see that the words contain a commandment from God, enjoining his Church and people to make a separation from Babylon. From which I observe, that all those who will be saved, must depart and separate themselves from the faith and religion of this present Church of Rome. And whereas they are charged with schism that separate on this manner; the truth is, they are not schismatics that do so, because they have the commandment of God for their warrant: and that party is the schismatic in whom the cause of this separation lies: and that is in the church of Rome, namely the cup of abomination in the whore's hand, which is, their heretical and schismatical religion.

Now touching this duty of separation I mean to speak at large, not standing so much to prove the same, because it is evident by the text, as to show the manner and measure of making this separation: and therein I will handle two things. First how far forth we may join with them in the matter of religion: secondly how far forth and wherein we must dissent and depart from them. And for this cause I mean to make choice of certain points of religion, and to speak of them in as good order as I can, showing in each of them our consent and difference: and the rather, because some harp much upon this string, that a union may be made of our two religions, and that we differ not in substance but in points of circumstance.

The first point wherewith I mean to begin shall be the point of free will: though it be not the principal.

****1. OUR CONSENT.****

Free will both by them and us, is taken for a mixed power in the mind and will of man; whereby discerning what is good and what is evil, he does accordingly choose or refuse the same.

Conclusion 1. Man must be considered in a fourfold estate, as he was created, as he was corrupted, as he is renewed, as he shall be glorified. In the first estate, we ascribe to man's will liberty of nature in which he could will or refuse either good or evil: in the third, liberty of grace: in the last, liberty of glory. All the doubt is of the second estate: and yet therein also we agree, as the conclusions following will declare.

Conclusion 2. The matters about which free will is occupied are principally the actions of men, which be of three sorts, natural, human, spiritual. Natural actions are such as are common to men with beasts, as to eat, drink, sleep, hear, see, smell, taste, and to move from place to place: in all which we join with the Papists, and hold that man has free will, and even since the fall of Adam by a natural power of the mind does freely perform any of these actions or the like.

Conclusion 3. Human actions are such as are common to all men good and bad, as to speak and use reason, the practice of all mechanical and liberal arts, and the outward performance of civil and ecclesiastical duties, as to come to the Church, to speak, and preach the word, to reach out the hand to receive the sacrament, and to lend the ear to listen outwardly to that which is taught. And here we may also refer the outward actions of civil virtues; as namely, justice, temperance, gentleness, generosity. And in these also we join with the church of Rome, and say (as experience teaches) that men have a natural freedom of will, to put them or not to put them in execution. Paul says (Romans 2:14), The

Gentiles that have not the law do the things of the law by nature, that is, by natural strength: and he says of himself, that before his conversion touching the righteousness of the law, he was blameless (Philippians 3:6). And for this external obedience, natural men receive reward in temporal things (Matthew 6:5; Ezekiel 29:19). And yet here some caveats must be remembered: 1, that in human actions, man's will is weak and feeble, and his understanding dim and dark; and thereupon he often fails in them. And in all such actions with Augustine I understand the will of man to be only wounded or half dead. 2, That the will of man is under the will of God, and therefore to be ordered by it; as Jeremiah says (Jeremiah 10:23), O Lord I know that the way of man is not in himself: neither is it in man to walk or direct his steps.

Conclusion 4. The third kind of actions are spiritual, more nearly concerning the heart and conscience, and these be twofold: they either concern the kingdom of darkness, or else the kingdom of God. Those that concern the kingdom of darkness are sins properly: and in these we likewise join with the Papists and teach, that in sins or evil actions man has freedom of will. Some perhaps will say, that we sin necessarily, because he that sins cannot but sin: and that free will and necessity cannot stand together. Indeed the necessity of compulsion or coercion, and free will cannot agree: but there is another kind of necessity which may stand with freedom of will: for some things may be done necessarily and also freely. A man that is in close prison, must needs there abide and cannot possibly get forth and walk where he will; yet can he move himself freely and walk within the prison: so likewise, though

man's will be chained naturally by the bonds of sin, and therefore cannot but sin: and thereupon sins necessarily, yet does it also sin freely.

Conclusion 5. The second kind of spiritual actions or things concern the kingdom of God — as repentance, faith, the conversion of a sinner, new obedience, and such like. In which we likewise in part join with the Church of Rome and say that in the first conversion of a sinner, man's free will concurs with God's grace as a fellow or co-worker in some sort. For in the conversion of a sinner three things are required: the word, God's Spirit, and man's will. For man's will is not passive in all and every respect, but has an action in the first conversion and change of the soul. When any man is converted, this work of God is not done by compulsion, but he is converted willingly, and at the very time when he is converted, by God's grace he wills his conversion. To this end said Augustine: He who made you without you will not save you without you. Again, it is certain that our will is required in this, that we may do any good thing well — but we have it not from our own power, but God works to will in us. For at whatever time God gives grace, at the same time he gives a will to desire and receive the same grace. As for example: when God works faith, at the same time he works also upon the will, causing it to desire faith and willingly to receive the gift of believing. God makes of the unwilling will a willing will, because no man can receive grace utterly against his will — for a will constrained is no will. But here we must remember that however in respect of time the working of grace by God's Spirit and the willing of it in man go together, yet in regard of order grace is first wrought, and man's will must first of all be acted and moved by

grace, and then it also acts, wills, and moves itself. And this is the last point of consent between us and the Roman Church touching free will: neither may we proceed further with them.

2. THE DISSENT OR DIFFERENCE.

The point of difference stands in the cause of the freedom of man's will in spiritual matters which concern the kingdom of God. The Papists say man's will concurs and works with God's grace in the first conversion of a sinner by itself and by its own natural power, and is only helped by the Holy Spirit. We say that man's will works with grace in the first conversion, yet not of itself but by grace. Or thus: they say the will has a natural cooperation; we deny it and say it has cooperation only by grace, being in itself not active but passive — willing well only as it is moved by grace, whereby it must first be acted and moved before it can act or will. And that we may the better conceive the difference, I will use this comparison. The Church of Rome sets forth the estate of a sinner by the condition of a prisoner, and so do we — mark then the difference. It supposes the said prisoner to lie bound hand and foot with chains and fetters, and withal to be sick and weak, yet not wholly dead but living in part. It supposes also that being in this case he stirs not himself for any help, and yet has ability and power to stir. Hereupon if the keeper comes and takes away his bolts and fetters, and holds him by the hand and helps him up, he can and will of himself stand and walk and go out of prison. Even so, say they, is a sinner bound hand and foot with the chain of his sins, and yet he is not dead but sick — like the wounded man in the way between Jericho and Jerusalem. And therefore he does not will and affect what is good; but if the Holy Spirit comes and does but untie his bonds and

reach him his hand of grace, then can he stand of himself and will his own salvation or anything else that is good. We in like manner grant that a prisoner fitly resembles a natural man, but yet such a prisoner must he be as is not only sick and weak but even stark dead — who cannot stir though the keeper unties his bolts and chains, nor hear though he sounds a trumpet in his ear. And if the said keeper would have him to move and stir, he must give him not only his hand to help him but even soul and life also. And such is every man by nature: not only chained and fettered in his sins but stark dead in them — like one who lies rotting in the grave, having no ability or power to move or stir. And therefore he cannot so much as desire or do anything that is truly good of himself, but God must first come and put a new soul into him — even the Spirit of grace to quicken and revive him. And then being thus revived, the will begins to will good things at the very same time when God by his Spirit first infuses grace. And this is the true difference between us and the Church of Rome in this point of free will.

3. OUR REASONS.

Now for the confirmation of the doctrine we hold, namely, that a man wills not his own conversion of himself by nature either in whole or in part, but by grace wholly and alone; these reasons may be used. The first is taken from the nature and measure of man's corruption, which may be distinguished into two parts. The first is the want of that original righteousness, which was in man by creation: the second is, a proneness and inclination to that which is evil, and to nothing that is truly good. This appears (Genesis 8:21): The frame of man's heart (says the Lord) is evil even from his childhood: that is, the disposition of the understanding, will, affec-

tions, with all that the heart of man devises, forms, or imagines, is wholly evil. And Paul says (Romans 8:5): The wisdom of the flesh is enmity against God. Which words are very significant: for the word [reconstructed: *phronema*] translated wisdom, signifies that the best thoughts, the best desires, affections, and endeavors that be in any natural man, even those that come most near to true holiness, are not only contrary to God, but even enmity itself. And hence I gather, that the very heart itself, that is, the will and mind, from whence these desires and thoughts do come, are also enmity to God. For such as the action is, such is the faculty from which it proceeds; such as the fruit is, such is the tree; such as the branches are such are the roots. By both these places it is evident, that in man there is not only a want, absence, or deprivation of original righteousness, but a proneness also by nature to that which is evil, which proneness includes in it an inclination not to some few, but to all and every sin; the very sin against the Holy Ghost not excepted. Hence therefore I reason thus.

- If every man by nature does both want original justice, and be also prone to all evil, then he lacks natural free will to will that which is truly good. - But every man by nature wants original justice, and is also prone to all evil. - Therefore: Every man naturally lacks free will, to will that which is good.

Reason 2. (1 Corinthians 2:14) The natural man does not perceive the things of the spirit of God: for they are foolishness to him, neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned. In these words Saint Paul sets down these points: 1, that a natural man does not so much as think of the things revealed in the Gospel. 2, that a man hearing, and in mind conceiving them; cannot give consent to them and by natural judgment approve of

them, but contrariwise thinks them to be foolishness. 3, that no man can give assent to the things of God, unless he be enlightened by the spirit of God. And hence I reason thus.

- If a man by nature does not know and perceive the things of God: and when he shall know them, cannot by nature give assent to them: then he has no power to will them. - But the first is evidently true. Therefore. - For first the mind must approve and give assent, before the will can choose or will: and when the mind has not power to conceive nor give assent, there the will has no power to will.

Reason 3. Thirdly the Holy Ghost affirms (Ephesians 2; Colossians 2:13) that all men by nature are dead in sins and trespasses: not as the Papists say, weak, sick, or half dead. Hence I gather, that man lacks natural power not to will simply, but freely and frankly to will that which is truly good. A dead man in his grave cannot stir the least finger, because he lacks the very power of life, sense, and motion: no more can he that is dead in sin, will the least good — indeed if he could either will or do any good, he could not be dead in sin. And as a dead man in the grave cannot rise but by the power of God; no more can he that is dead in sin rise, but by the power of God's grace alone, without any power of his own.

Reason 4. Fourthly, in the conversion and salvation of a sinner, the scripture ascribes all to God, and nothing to man's free will. (John 3:3) Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God. (Ephesians 2:10) We are his workmanship created in Christ Jesus to good works. And (Ephesians 4:24) the new man is created to the image of God. Now to be born again, is a work of no less importance than our first creation; and therefore wholly to be

ascribed to God as our creation is. Indeed Paul (Philippians 2:12-13) bids the Philippians work out their salvation with fear and trembling: not meaning to ascribe to them a power of doing good by themselves. And therefore in the next verse he adds, It is God that works both the will and the deed: directly excluding all natural free will in things spiritual: and yet withal he acknowledges, that man's will has a work in doing that which is good, not by nature but by grace. Because when God gives man power to will good things, then he can will them: and when he gives him a power to do good, then he can do good, and he does it. For though there be not in man's conversion a natural cooperation of his will with God's spirit, yet is there a supernatural cooperation by grace, enabling man when he is to be converted, to will his conversion: according to which Saint Paul says (1 Corinthians 15:10), I have labored in the faith: but lest any man should imagine, that this was done by any natural power: therefore he adds, yet not I, that is, not I by anything in me, but God's grace in me, enabling my will to do the good I do.

Reason 5. The judgment of the ancient Church. Augustine: The will of the regenerate is kindled only by the Holy Ghost: that they may therefore be able because they will thus: and they will thus, because God works in them to will. And, We have lost our free will to love God by the greatness of our sin. Sermon 2 on the words of the Apostle: Man when he was created, received a great strength in his free will: but by sinning he lost it. Fulgentius: God gives grace freely to the unworthy, whereby the wicked man being justified is enlightened, with the gift of good will, and with a faculty of doing good: that by mercy going before him, he may begin to will well, and by mercy coming after he may do the good he wills. Bernard

says, It is wholly the grace of God that we are created, healed, saved. Council of Orange 2, chapter 6: To believe and to will is given from above by infusion, and inspiration of the Holy Ghost. More testimonies and reasons might be alleged to prove this conclusion, but these shall suffice: now let us see what reasons are alleged to the contrary.

3. OBJECTIONS OF PAPISTS.

Objection 1. First they allege that man by nature may do that which is good, and therefore will that which is good: for none can do that which he neither wills nor thinks to do, but first he must will and then do. Now (say they) men can do good by nature, as give alms, speak the truth, do justice, and practice other duties of civil virtue: and therefore will that which is good. I answer, that a natural man may do good works for the substance of the outward work: but not in regard of the goodness of the manner: these are two diverse things. A man without supernatural grace may give alms, do justice, speak the truth, etc., which be good things considered in themselves as God has commanded them; but he cannot do them well. To think good things and to do good things are natural works: but to think good things in a good manner, and to do them well, so as God may accept the action done, are works of grace. And therefore the good thing done by a natural man is a sin, in respect of the doer: because it fails both for his right beginning, which is a pure heart, good conscience, and faith unfeigned; as also for his end which is the glory of God.

Objection 2. God has commanded all men to believe and repent: therefore they have natural free will, by virtue whereof (being helped by the spirit of God) they can believe and repent.

Answer: This reason is not good: for by such commandments God shows not what men are able to do; but what they should do, and what they cannot do. Again, the reason is not well framed, it ought rather to be thus: Because God gives men commandment to repent and believe, therefore they have power to repent and believe, either by nature or by grace: and then we hold with them. For when God in the Gospel commands men to repent and to believe, at the same time by his grace he enables them both to will or desire to believe and repent, as also actually to repent and believe.

Objection 3. If man has no free will to sin or not to sin, then no man is to be punished for his sins: because he sins by a necessity not to be avoided. Answer: The reason is not good: for though man cannot but sin, yet is the fault in himself, and therefore he is to be punished: as a bankrupt is not therefore freed from his debts, because he is not able to pay them: but the bills against him stand in force, because the debt comes through his own default.

POINT 2: OF ORIGINAL SIN



The next point to be handled, is concerning original sin after baptism: that is, how far it remains after baptism. A point to be well considered, because hereupon depend many points of popery.

1. OUR CONSENT.

Conclusion 1. They say, natural corruption after baptism is abolished, and so say we: but let us see how far it is abolished. In original sin are three things: 1, the punishment, which is the first and second death. 2, Guiltiness, which is the binding up of the creature to punishment. 3, the fault or the offending of God, under which I comprehend our guiltiness in Adam's first offense, as also the corruption of the heart: which is, a natural inclination and proneness to anything that is evil or against the law of God. For the first we say, that after baptism in the regenerate, the punishment of original sin is taken away: There is no condemnation (says the Apostle) to them that be in Christ Jesus (Romans 8:1). For the second, that is the guiltiness, we further agree and say; that is also taken away in them that are born anew: for considering there is no condemnation to them, there is nothing to bind them to punishment. Yet this

caveat must be remembered, namely that the guiltiness is removed from the person regenerate, not from the sin in the person; but of this more afterward. Thirdly, the guilt in Adam's first offense is pardoned. And touching the corruption of the heart, I affirm two things: 1, that very power or strength whereby it reigns in man, is taken away in the regenerate. 2, that this corruption is abolished (as also the fault of every actual sin past) so far forth as it is the fault and sin of the man in whom it is. Indeed it remains till death, and it is sin considered in itself, so long as it remains, but it is not imputed to the person: and in that respect is as though it were not; it being pardoned.

****2. THE DISSENT OR DIFFERENCE.****

Thus far we consent with the Church of Rome: now the difference between us stands not in the abolishment, but in the manner, and the measure of the abolishment of this sin.

Papists teach, that original sin is so far taken away after baptism, that it ceases to be a sin properly: and is nothing else but a want, defect, and weakness, making the heart fit and ready to conceive sin: much like tinder, which though it be no fire of itself, yet is it very apt and fit to conceive fire. And they of the church of Rome deny it to be sin properly, that they might uphold some gross opinions of theirs, namely, that a man in this life may fulfill the law of God; and do good works void of sin: that he may stand righteous at the bar of God's judgment by them.

But we teach otherwise, that though original sin be taken away in the regenerate, and that in sundry respects: yet does it remain in them after baptism, not only as a want and weakness but as a sin,

and that properly: as may by these reasons be proved.

Reason 1. (Romans 7:17) Paul says directly: It is no more I that do it, but sin that dwells in me: that is, original sin. The Papists answer again, that it is so called improperly: because it comes of sin and also is an occasion of sin to be done. But by the circumstances of the text, it is sin properly: for in the words following, Saint Paul says, that this sin dwelling in him, made him to do the evil which he hated. And verse 24 he cries out, O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from this body of death? From which I reason thus.

That which once was sin properly, and still remaining in man makes him to sin, and entangles him in the punishment of sin, and makes him miserable: that is sin properly.

But original sin does all these. Therefore.

Reason 2. Infants baptized and regenerate, die the bodily death before they come to the years of discretion: therefore original sin in them is sin properly; or else they should not die, having no cause of death in them: for death is the wages of sin, as the Apostle says (Romans 6:23), and (Romans 5:12) death entered into the world by sin. As for actual sin they have none, if they die immediately after they are born before they come to any use either of reason, or affection.

Reason 3. That which lusts against the spirit, and by lusting tempts, and in tempting entices and draws the heart to sin, is by nature sin itself: but concupiscence in the regenerate lusts against the spirit (Galatians 5:17) and tempts as I have said (James 1:14): God tempts no man, but every man is tempted when he is drawn away by his own concupiscence, and is enticed: then when lust

conceives, it brings forth sin. And therefore it is sin properly: such as the fruit is, such is the tree. Augustine: Concupiscence against which the spirit lusts is sin, because in it there is disobedience against the rule of the mind: and it is the punishment of sin because it befalls man for the merits of his disobedience: and it is the cause of sin.

Reason 5. The judgment of the ancient Church. Augustine (Epistle 29): Charity in some is more, in some less, in some none: the highest degree of all which cannot be increased, is in none, as long as man lives upon earth. And as long as it may be increased, that which is less than it should be, is in fault: by which fault it is, that there is no just man upon earth that does good and sins not: by which fault none living shall be justified in the sight of God: for which fault, if we say we have no sin, there is no truth in us: for which also, though we profit never so much, it is necessary for us to say, forgive us our debts, though all our words, deeds, and thoughts be already forgiven in baptism. Indeed Augustine in sundry places seems to deny concupiscence to be sin after baptism: but his meaning is, that concupiscence in the regenerate is not the sin of the person in whom it is. For thus he expounds himself, This is not to have sin, not to be guilty of sin. And, The law of sin in baptism is remitted and not ended. And, Let not sin reign: he says not, let not sin be, but let it not reign. For as long as you live, of necessity sin will be in your members: at the least, see that it reign not in you.

****OBJECTIONS OF PAPISTS.****

The arguments which the Church of Rome alleges to the contrary, are these. **Objection 1.** In baptism men receive perfect and absolute pardon of sin; and sin being pardoned is taken quite away: and therefore original sin after baptism ceases to be sin. **Answer:** Sin is abolished two ways: first in regard of imputation to the person: secondly in regard of existing and being. For this cause, God grants to man two blessings in baptism: Remission of sin, and Mortification of the same. Remission or pardon abolishes sin wholly in respect of any imputation thereof to man, but not simply in regard of the being thereof. Mortification therefore goes further, and abolishes in all the powers of body and soul, the very concupiscence or corruption itself, in respect of the being thereof. And because mortification is not accomplished till death, therefore original corruption remains till death, though not imputed.

Objection 2. Every sin is voluntary; but original sin in no man after baptism is voluntary: and therefore no sin. **Answer:** The proposition is a political rule pertaining to the courts of men, and must be understood of such actions as are done of one man to another: and it does not belong to the court of conscience, which God holds and keeps in men's hearts, in which every want of conformity to the law is made a sin. Secondly I answer, that original sin was voluntary in our first parent Adam: for he sinned, and brought this misery upon us willingly: though in us it be otherwise upon just cause. Actual sin was first in him, and then original corruption: but in us original corruption is first, and then actual sin.

Objection 3. Where the form of anything is taken away, there the thing itself ceases also: but after baptism in the regenerate, the form of original sin, that is, the guilt is quite removed: and therefore sin ceases to be sin. **Answer:** The guilt, or obligation to pun-

ishment, is not the form of original corruption, but (as we say in schools) an accident or necessary companion thereof. The true form of original sin, is a defect and deprivation of that which the law requires at our hands in our mind, will, affections, and in all the powers both of soul and body. But they urge this reason further, saying; where the guilt and punishment is taken away, there is no fault remaining: but after baptism the guilt and punishment is removed: and therefore, though original corruption remain, it is not as a fault to make us guilty before God, but only as a weakness. Answer: Guilt is removed, and not removed. It is removed from the person regenerate, which stands not guilty for any sin original or actual: but guilt is not removed from the sin itself; or, as some answer, there be two kinds of guilt, actual, and potential. The actual guilt is, whereby sin makes man stand guilty before God: and that is removed in the regenerate. But the potential guilt, which is an aptness in sin, to make a man stand guilty if he sin, that is not removed: and therefore still sin remains sin. To this or like effect says Augustine, We say that the guilt of concupiscence, not whereby it is guilty (for that is not a person) but that whereby it made man guilty from the beginning, is pardoned, and that the thing itself is evil so as the regenerate desire to be healed of this plague.

Objection 4. Lastly, for our disgrace they allege that we in our doctrine teach, that original sin after baptism is only clipped or pared, like the hair of a man's head, whose roots still remain in the flesh, growing and increasing after they are cut, as before. Answer: Our doctrine is abused: for in the paring of anything, as in cutting of the hair or in lopping a tree, the root remains untouched, and thereupon multiplies as before. But in the mortification of original

sin after baptism, we hold no such paring: but teach, that in the very first instant of the conversion of a sinner, sin receives its deadly wound in the root, never afterward to be recovered.

POINT 3: OF CERTAINTY OF SALVATION



1. OUR CONSENT.

Conclusion 1. We hold and believe that a man in this life, may be certain of salvation: and the same thing does the Church of Rome teach and hold.

Conclusion 2. We hold and believe that a man is to put a certain confidence in God's mercy in Christ for the salvation of his soul: and the same thing by common consent holds the aforesaid Church: this point makes not the difference between us.

Conclusion 3. We hold that with assurance of salvation in our hearts is joined doubting: and there is no man so assured of his salvation, but he at some time doubts thereof, especially in the time of temptation: and in this the Papists agree with us, and we with them.

Conclusion 4. They go further and say, that a man may be certain of the salvation of men, or of the Church by Catholic faith: and so say we.

Conclusion 5. Indeed they hold that a man by faith may be assured of his own salvation through extraordinary revelation, as Abraham and others were, and so do we.

6. They teach that we are to be certain of our salvation by special faith in regard of God that promises: though in regard of ourselves and our indisposition we cannot: and in the former point they consent with us.

****2. THE DISSENT OR DIFFERENCE.****

The very main point of difference lies in the manner of assurance.

Conclusion 1. We hold that a man may be certain of his salvation in his own conscience even in this life, and that by an ordinary and special faith. They hold that a man is certain of his salvation only by hope: both of us hold a certainty, we by faith, they by hope.

Conclusion 2. Further, we hold and affirm that our certainty by true faith is infallible: they say, their certainty is only probable.

Conclusion 3. And further though both of us say, that we have confidence in God's mercy in Christ for our salvation: yet we do it with some difference. For our confidence comes from certain and ordinary faith: theirs from hope, ministering (as they say) but a conjectural certainty.

Thus much of the difference: now let us see the reasons two and fro.

****3. OBJECTIONS OF PAPISTS.****

Objection 1. Where there is no word there is no faith: for these two are relatives: but there is no word of God saying, Cornelius believe, Peter believe: or you shall be saved. And therefore there is no such ordinary faith to believe a man's own particular salvation. Answer: The proposition is false, unless it be supplied with a clause on this manner: Where there is no word of promise, nor anything that does counterbalance a particular promise, there is no faith. But (say they) there is no such particular word. It is true, God does not speak to men particularly, Believe and you shall be saved. But yet does he that which is answerable to this, in that he gives a general promise, with a commandment to apply the same: and has ordained the holy ministry of the word to apply the same to the persons of the hearers in his own name: and that is as much as if the Lord himself should speak to men particularly. To speak more plainly, in the Scripture the promises of salvation be indefinitely propounded; it says not anywhere, if John will believe he shall be saved, or if Peter will believe he shall be saved: but whoever believes shall be saved. Now then comes the minister of the word, who standing in the place of God, and in the stead of Christ himself, takes the indefinite promises of the Gospel, and lays them to the hearts of every particular man: and this in effect is as much as if Christ himself should say, Cornelius believe, and you shall be saved: Peter believe, and you shall be saved. It is answered, that this applying of the Gospel is upon condition of men's faith and repentance, and that men are deceived touching their own faith and repentance: and therefore fail in applying the word to themselves. Answer: Indeed this manner of applying is false in all hypocrites, heretics, and unrepentant persons: for they apply upon carnal presumption, and not by faith. Nevertheless it is true in all the elect

having the spirit of grace, and prayer: for when God in the ministry of the word being his own ordinance, says, Seek my face: the heart of God's children truly answers, O Lord, I will seek your face (Psalm 27:8). And when God shall say, You are my people, they shall say again: The Lord is my God (Zechariah 13:6). And it is a truth of God, that he who believes knows that he believes: and he that truly repents knows that he repents; unless it be in the beginning of our conversion, and in the time of distress and temptation. Otherwise what thankfulness can there be for grace received.

Objection 2. It is no article of the Creed, that a man must believe his own salvation: and therefore no man is bound to it. Answer: By this argument it appears plainly, that the very pillars of the Church of Rome do not understand the Creed: for in that which is commonly called the Apostles' Creed, every article implies in it this particular faith. And in the first article, I believe in God, are three things contained: the first, to believe that there is a God, the second to believe the same God is my God, the third to put my confidence in him for my salvation: and so much contain the other articles, which are concerning God. When Thomas said (John 20:28-29) My God, Christ answered, You have believed Thomas. Where we see that to believe in God, is to believe God to be our God. And (Psalm 78:22) to believe in God and to put trust in him are all one: They believed not in God, and trusted not in his help. And the articles concerning Remission of sins and Life everlasting, do include, and we in them acknowledge our special faith concerning our own salvation. For to believe this or that, is to believe there is such a thing, and that the same thing belongs to me: as when David said, I should have fainted except I had believed to see the goodness of the Lord in the land of the living (Psalm 27:13). It is

answered, that in those articles we only profess ourselves to believe remission of sins, and life everlasting, to be granted to the people and Church of God. Answer: This indeed is the exposition of many, but it stands not with common reason. For if that be all the faith that is there confessed, the devil has as good a faith as we. He knows and believes that there is a God: and that this God imparts remission of sins and life everlasting to his Church. And to the end that we being God's children, may in faith go beyond all the devils in hell, we must further believe, that remission of sins and life everlasting belongs to us: and unless we do particularly apply the said articles to ourselves, we shall little or nothing differ from the devil, in making confession of faith.

Objection 3. We are taught to pray for the pardon of our sins day by day (Matthew 6:12), and all this were needless, if we could be assured of pardon in this life. Answer: The fourth petition must be understood not so much of our old debts or sins, as of our present and new sins: for as we go on from day to day, so we add sin to sin; and for the pardon of them must we humble ourselves and pray. I answer again, that we pray for the pardon of our sins: not because we have no assurance thereof, but because our assurance is weak and small; we grow on from grace to grace in Christ, as children do to man's estate by little and little. The heart of every believer is like a vessel with a narrow neck, which being cast into the sea is not filled at the first; but by reason of the strait passage, receives water drop by drop. God gives to us in Christ even a sea of mercy, but the same on our parts is apprehended and received only by little and little, as faith grows from age to age: and this is the cause why men having assurance pray for more.

OUR REASONS TO THE CONTRARY.

Reason 1. The first reason may be taken from the nature of faith on this manner. True faith is both an infallible assurance and a particular assurance of the remission of sins and of life everlasting. And therefore by this faith, a man may be certainly and particularly assured of the remission of sins and life everlasting. That this reason may be of force, two things must be proved: first that true faith is a certain assurance of God's mercy to that party in whom it is. Secondly that faith is a particular assurance thereof. For the first, that faith is a certain assurance, Christ says to Peter (Matthew 14:31): O you of little faith, why did you doubt? Where he makes an opposition between faith and doubting: thereby giving us directly to understand, that to be certain, and to give assurance is of the nature of faith. (Romans 4:20-22) Paul says of Abraham, that he did not doubt of the promise of God through unbelief: but was strengthened in faith, and gave glory to God, being fully assured, that he who had promised was able to do it: where I observe first, that doubting is made a fruit of unbelief; and therefore infallible certainty and assurance, being contrary to doubting must needs proceed from true faith; considering that contrary effects come of contrary causes: and contrary causes produce contrary effects. Secondly I note that the strength of Abraham's faith, did stand in fullness of assurance: for the text says, he was strengthened in the faith, being fully assured: and again (Hebrews 11:1) true saving faith is said to be the ground and substance of things hoped for: and the evidence or demonstration of things that are not seen: but faith can be no ground or evidence of things, unless it be for nature certainty itself: and thus the first point is manifest. The second, that saving faith is a particular assurance, is proved by this, that

the property of faith is to apprehend and apply the promise, and the thing promised, Christ with his benefits. (John 1:12) As many, says Saint John, as received him, to them he gave power to be the sons of God, namely to them that believe in his name. In these words to believe in Christ, and to receive Christ, are put for one and the same thing. Now to receive Christ, is to apprehend and apply him with all his benefits to ourselves, as he is offered in the promises of the Gospel. For in the sixth chapter following, first of all he sets forth himself not only as a Redeemer generally, but also as the bread of life and the water of life: secondly he sets forth his best hearers as eaters of his body and drinkers of his blood: and thirdly he intends to prove this conclusion, that to eat his body and to drink his blood, and to believe in him, are all one. Now then if Christ be as food, and if to eat and drink the body and blood of Christ, be to believe in him, then must there be a proportion between eating and believing. Look then as there can be no eating without taking or receiving of food, so no believing in Christ without a spiritual receiving and apprehending of him. And as the body has its hand, mouth, and stomach, whereby it takes, receives, and digests food for the nourishment of every part: so likewise in the soul there is a faith, which is both hand, mouth, and stomach to apprehend, receive, and apply Christ and all his merits for the nourishment of the soul. And Paul says yet more plainly, that through faith we receive the promise of the spirit (Galatians 3:14).

Now as the property of apprehending and applying of Christ belongs to faith, so it agrees not to hope, love, confidence, or any other gift or grace of God. But first by faith we must apprehend Christ, and apply him to ourselves, before we can have any hope or confidence in him. And this applying seems not to be done by any

affection of the will, but by a supernatural act of the mind, which is to acknowledge, set down, and believe that remission of sins, and life everlasting by the merit of Christ, belong to us particularly. To this which I have said agrees Augustine (Tract 25 on John): why do you prepare teeth and belly? Believe and you have eaten. And (Tract 50): How shall I reach my hand into heaven, that I may hold him sitting there? Send up your faith, and you lay hold on him. And Bernard says (Homily on Canticles 76): Where he is you cannot come now; yet go to follow him and seek him; believe and you have found him: for to believe is to find. Chrysostom on Mark, Homily 10: Let us believe and we see Jesus present before us. Ambrose on Luke book 6, chapter 8: By faith Christ is touched, by faith Christ is seen. Tertullian on the resurrection of the flesh: he must be chewed by understanding, and be digested by faith.

Reason 2. Whatever the Holy Ghost testifies to us, that we may, indeed that we must certainly by faith believe: but the Holy Ghost does particularly testify to us our adoption, the remission of our sins, and the salvation of our souls: and therefore we may and must particularly and certainly by faith believe the same. The first part of this reason is true, and cannot be denied of any. The second part is proved thus: Saint Paul says (Romans 8:15): We have not received the spirit of bondage to fear: but the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry Abba, Father: adding further, that the same spirit bears witness with our spirits, that we are the children of God. Where the Apostle makes two witnesses of our adoption: the spirit of God, and our spirits, that is, the conscience sanctified by the Holy Ghost. The Papists to elude this reason, allege that the spirit of God does indeed witness of our adoption, by some comfortable feelings of God's love and favor, being such as are weak and often-

times deceitful. But by their leave, the testimony of the Spirit is more than a bare sense or feeling of God's grace: for it is called the pledge and earnest of God's spirit in our hearts (2 Corinthians 1:21), and therefore it is fit to take away all occasion of doubting of our salvation: as in a bargain the earnest is given between the parties, to put all out of question. Bernard says, that the testimony of the spirit is a most sure testimony (Epistle 107).

Reason 3. That which we must pray for by God's commandment, that we must believe: but every man is to pray for the pardon of his own sins, and for life everlasting; of this there is no question: therefore he is bound to believe the same. The proposition is most of all doubtful: but it is proved thus. In every petition there must be two things: a desire of the things we ask, and a particular faith whereby we believe, that the thing we ask shall be given to us. So Christ says (Mark 11:24): Whatever you desire when you pray, believe that you shall have it, and it shall be given to you. And Saint John further notes out this particular faith, calling it our assurance that God will give to us whatever we ask according to his will (1 John 5:14). And hence it is, that in every petition there must be two grounds: a commandment to warrant us in making a petition, and a promise to assure us of the accomplishment thereof. And upon both these, follows necessarily an application of the things we ask to ourselves.

Reason 4. Whatever God commands in the Gospel, that a man must and can perform: but God in the Gospel commands us to believe the pardon of our own sins: and life everlasting: and therefore we must believe thus much, and may be assured thereof. This proposition is plain by the distinction of the commandments, of the law, and of the Gospel. The commandments of the law show us

what we must do, but minister no power to perform the thing to be done: but the doctrine and commandments of the Gospel do otherwise; and therefore they are called spirit and life; God with the commandment giving grace that the thing prescribed may be done. Now this is a commandment of the gospel, to believe remission of sins: for it was the substance of Christ's ministry, repent and believe the Gospel. And that is not generally to believe that Christ is a Savior, and that the promises made in him are true (for so the devils believe with trembling): but it is particularly to believe that Christ is my Savior, and that the promises of salvation in Christ belong in special to me, as Saint John says: This is his commandment, that we believe in the name of Jesus Christ: now to believe in Christ is to put confidence in him; which none can do, unless he be first assured of his love and favor. And therefore inasmuch, as we are enjoined to put our confidence in Christ, we are also enjoined to believe our reconciliation with him, which stands in the remission of our sins, and our acceptance to life everlasting.

Reason 5. Whereas the Papists teach, that a man may be assured of his salvation by hope: even hence it follows, that he may be infallibly assured thereof. For the property of true and lively hope is never to make a man ashamed (Romans 5:5). And true hope follows faith and ever presupposes certainty of faith: neither can any man truly hope for his salvation unless by faith he be certainly assured thereof in some measure.

The popish doctors take exception to these reasons on this manner. First they say, it cannot be proved that a man is as certain of his salvation by faith, as he is of the articles of the creed. I answer: First they prove thus much that we ought to be as certain of the one as of the other. For look, what commandment we have to

believe the articles of our faith; the like we have enjoining us to believe the pardon of our own sins, as I have proved. Secondly these arguments prove it to be the nature of essential property of faith, as certainly to assure man of his salvation, as it does assure him of the articles which he believes. And however commonly men do not believe their salvation as infallibly, as they do their articles of faith: yet some special men do; having God's word applied by the spirit as a sure ground of their faith, whereby they believe their own salvation, as they have it for a ground of the articles of their faith. Thus certainly was Abraham assured of his own salvation: as also the Prophets and Apostles, and the martyrs of God in all ages; whereupon without doubting they have been content to lay down their lives for the name of Christ; in whom they were assured to receive eternal happiness. And there is no question, but there be many now, that by long and often experience of God's mercy, and by the inward certificate of the Holy Ghost, have attained to a full assurance of their salvation.

Exception 2. However a man may be assured of his present estate, yet no man is certain of his perseverance to the end. Answer: It is otherwise: for in the sixth petition, lead us not into temptation, we pray that God would not suffer us to be wholly overcome of the devil in any temptation: and to this petition we have a promise answerable (1 Corinthians 10), that God with the temptation will give a way of escape: and therefore however the devil may buffet, molest, and wound the servants of God, yet shall he never be able to overcome them. Again he that is once a member of Christ, can never be wholly cut off. And if any by sin were wholly severed from Christ for a time, in his recovery he is to be baptized the second time: for baptism is the sacrament of initiation or ingrafting

into Christ. By this reason we should as often be baptized as we fall into any sin, which is absurd. Again Saint John says (1 John 2:19): They went out from us, but they were not of us: for if they had been of us, they would have continued with us. Where he takes it for granted, that such as be once in Christ, shall never wholly be severed or fall from him. Though our communion with Christ may be lessened, yet the union and the bond of conjunction is never dissolved.

Exception 3. They say, we are indeed to believe our salvation on God's part: but we must needs doubt in regard of ourselves: because the promises of remission of sins are given upon condition of man's faith and repentance. Now we cannot (say they) be assured that we have true faith and repentance, because we may lie in secret sins; and so lack that indeed, which we suppose ourselves to have. Answer: I say again, he that does truly repent and believe, does by God's grace know that he does repent and believe: for else Paul would never have said, Prove yourselves whether you be in the faith or not: and the same Apostle says (2 Corinthians 2:12): We have not received the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is of God, that we might know the things which are given of God: which things are not only life everlasting, but justification, sanctification, and such like. And as for secret sins, they cannot make our repentance void: for he that truly repents of his known sins, repents also of such as be unknown, and receives the pardon of them all. God requires not an express or special repentance of unknown sins; but accepts it as sufficient, if we repent of them generally: as David says (Psalm 19), Who knows the errors of this life: forgive me my secret sins. And whereas they add that faith and repentance must be sufficient, I answer that the sufficiency of our faith and re-

pentance, stands in the truth and not in the measure or perfection thereof; and the truth of both where they are, is certainly discerned.

Reason 6. The judgment of the ancient Church. Augustine: Of an evil servant you are made a good child: therefore presume not on your own doing, but on the grace of Christ: it is not arrogance but faith: to acknowledge what you have received, is not pride but devotion. And, Let no man ask another man, but return to his own heart; if he find charity there, he has security for his passage from life to death. Hilary on Matthew 5: The kingdom of heaven which our Lord professed to be in himself, his will is that it must be hoped for without any doubtfulness of uncertain will. Otherwise there is no justification by faith, if faith itself be made doubtful. Bernard (Epistle 107): Who is the just man but he that being loved of God, loves him again: which comes not to pass but by the Spirit revealing by faith the eternal purpose of God of his salvation to come. Which revelation is nothing else but the infusion of spiritual grace; by which, when the deeds of the flesh are mortified the man is prepared to the kingdom of heaven. Together receiving in one spirit that whereby he may presume that he is loved and also love again.

To conclude, the Papists have no great cause to dissent from us in this point. For they teach and profess, that they do by a special faith believe their own salvation certainly and infallibly in respect of God, that promises. Now the thing which hinders them is their own indisposition and unworthiness (as they say) which keeps them from being certain otherwise than in a likely hope. But this hindrance is easily removed, if men will judge impartially. For first of all, in regard of ourselves and our disposition we cannot be cer-

tain at all, but must despair of salvation even to the very death. We cannot be sufficiently disposed so long as we live in this world, but must always say with Jacob, I am less than all your mercies (Genesis 32), and with David, Enter not into judgment with your servant, O Lord, for none living shall be justified in your sight: and with the Centurion, Lord I am not worthy, that you should come under my roof (Matthew 8). Secondly God in making promise of salvation respects not men's worthiness. For he chose us to life everlasting when we were not: he redeemed us from death being enemies: and entitles us to the promise of salvation, if we acknowledge ourselves to be sinners (Matthew 9); if we labor and travel under the burden of them (Matthew 11); if we hunger and thirst after grace (John 7:37). And these things we may certainly and sensibly perceive in ourselves: and when we find them in us, though our unworthiness be exceeding great, it should not hinder our assurance. For God makes manifest his power in our weakness (2 Corinthians 12), and he will not break the bruised reed, nor quench the smoking flax (Isaiah 42). Thirdly if a man love God for his mercies' sake, and have a true hope of salvation by Christ, he is in Christ and has fellowship with him: and he that is in Christ, has all his unworthiness and wants laid on Christ, and they are covered and pardoned in his death: and in respect of ourselves thus considered as we are in Christ, we have no cause to waver, but to be certain of our salvation, and that in regard of ourselves.

POINT 4: OF THE JUSTIFICATION OF A SINNER



That we may see how far we are to agree with them and where to differ: first I will set down the doctrine on both parts: and secondly the main differences wherein we are to stand against them, even to death.

Our doctrine touching the justification of a sinner, I propound in four rules.

Rule 1. That, justification is an action of God, whereby he absolves a sinner, and accepts him to life everlasting for the righteousness and merit of Christ.

Rule 2. That, justification stands in two things: first in the remission of sins by the merit of Christ his death: secondly in the imputation of Christ his righteousness; which is another action of God whereby he accounts and esteems that righteousness which is in Christ, as the righteousness of that sinner which believes in him. By Christ his righteousness we are to understand two things: first his sufferings specially in his death and passion, secondly his obedience in fulfilling the law; both which go together: for Christ in suffering obeyed, and obeying suffered. And the very shedding of his blood to which our salvation is ascribed, must not only be con-

sidered, as it is passive, that is, a suffering, but also as it is active, that is, an obedience, in which he showed his exceeding love both to his Father and us, and thus fulfilled the law for us. This point if some had well thought on, they would not have placed all justification in remission of sins, as they do.

Rule 3. That, justification is from God's mere mercy and grace, procured only by the merit of Christ.

Rule 4. That, man is justified by faith alone; because faith is that alone instrument created in the heart by the Holy Ghost, whereby a sinner lays hold of Christ his righteousness, and applies the same to himself. There is neither hope, nor love, nor any other grace of God within man, that can do this, but faith alone.

The doctrine of the Roman Church touching the justification of a sinner is on this manner.

1. They hold that before justification there goes a preparation thereto; which is an action wrought partly by the Holy Ghost and partly by the power of natural free will, whereby a man disposes himself to his own future justification.

In the preparation they consider the ground of justification, and things proceeding from it. The ground is faith, which they define to be a general knowledge, whereby we understand and believe that the doctrine of the word of God is true. Things proceeding from this faith are these; a sight of our sins, a fear of hell, hope of salvation, love of God, repentance, and such like: all which, when men have attained, they are then fully disposed (as they say) to their justification.

This preparation being made, then comes justification itself: which is an action of God, whereby he makes a man righteous. It has two parts: the first, and the second. The first is, when a sinner of an evil man is made a good man. And to effect this, two things are required: first the pardon of sin, which is one part of the first justification: secondly the infusion of inward righteousness, whereby the heart is purged and sanctified: and this habit of righteousness stands specially in hope and charity.

After the first justification, follows the second; which is, when a man of a good or just man, is made better and more just: and this, say they, may proceed from works of grace: because he which is righteous by the first justification, can bring forth good works: by the merit whereof, he is able to make himself more just and righteous: and yet they grant that the first justification comes only of God's mercy by the merit of Christ.

1. OUR CONSENT AND DIFFERENCE.

Now let us come to the points of difference between us and them touching justification.

The first main difference is in the matter thereof, which shall be seen by the answer both of Protestant and Papist to this one question. What is the very thing, that causes a man to stand righteous before God, and to be accepted to life everlasting? We answer, Nothing but the righteousness of Christ, which consists partly in his sufferings, and partly in his active obedience in fulfilling the rigor of the law. And here let us consider, how near the Papists come to this answer, and wherein they dissent.

Consent 1. They grant, that in justification sin is pardoned by the merits of Christ, and that none can be justified without remission of sins: and that is well.

2. They grant, that the righteousness whereby a man is made righteous before God, comes from Christ, and from Christ alone.

3. The most learned among them say, that Christ his satisfaction, and the merit of his death is imputed to every sinner that does believe, for his satisfaction before God: and hitherto we agree.

The very point of difference is this, we hold that the satisfaction made by Christ in his death, and obedience to the law; is imputed to us and becomes our righteousness. They say, it is our satisfaction and not our righteousness whereby we stand righteous before God: because it is inherent in the person of Christ as in a subject. Now the answer of the Papist to the former question is on this manner: The thing (says he) that makes us righteous before God, and causes us to be accepted to life everlasting, is remission of sins, and the habit of inward righteousness, or charity with the fruits thereof. We agree and grant that the habit of righteousness, which we call sanctification is an excellent gift of God: and has his reward of God: and is the matter of our justification before men: because it serves to declare us to be reconciled to God, and to be justified: yet we deny it to be the thing, which makes us of sinners to become righteous or just before God.

And this is the first point of our disagreement in the matter of justification: which must be marked: because if there were no more points of difference between us, this one alone were sufficient to keep us from uniting of our religions: for hereby the church of Rome does raze the very foundation.

Now let us see by what reasons we justify our doctrine: and secondly answer the contrary objections.

****OUR REASONS.****

Reason 1. That very thing which must be our righteousness before God, must satisfy the justice of the law, which says, do these things and you shall live. Now there is nothing can satisfy the justice of the law but the righteousness or obedience of Christ for us. If any allege civil justice it is nothing: for Christ says, Except your righteousness exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, you cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven. What? shall we say that works do make us just? that cannot be: for all men's works are defective in respect of the justice of the law. Shall we say our sanctification, whereby we are renewed to the image of God in righteousness and true holiness? that also is imperfect and cannot satisfy God's justice required in the law: as Isaiah has said of himself and the people, all our righteousness is as a menstruous cloth. To have a clear conscience before God is a principal part of inward righteousness; and of it Paul in his own person says thus, I am privy to nothing by myself, yet am I not justified thereby (2 Corinthians 4:4). Therefore nothing can procure to us an absolution and acceptance to life everlasting, but Christ's imputed righteousness. And this will appear, if we do consider, how we must come one day before God's judgment seat, there to be judged in the rigor of justice: for when we must bring something that may counterbalance the justice of God: not having only acceptance in mercy, but also approbation in justice: God being not only merciful, but also a just judge.

Reason 2. (2 Corinthians 5:21) He who knew no sin, was made sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God which is in him. From which I reason thus: As Christ was made sin for us, so are we made the righteousness of God in him: but Christ was made sin, or, a sinner by imputation of our sins, he being in himself most holy; therefore a sinner is made righteous before God, in that Christ's righteousness is imputed and applied to him. Now if any shall say, that man is justified by righteousness infused; then by like reason, I say Christ was made sin for us by infusion of sin, which to say is blasphemy. And the exposition of this place by Saint Jerome is not to be despised: Christ (says he) being offered for our sins, took the name of sin that we might be made the righteousness of God in him, not ours nor in us. If this righteousness of God be neither ours nor in us, then it can be no inherent righteousness, but must needs be righteousness imputed. And Chrysostom on this place says, It is called God's righteousness, because it is not of works, and because it must be without all stain or want: and that cannot be inherent righteousness. Anselm says, he is made sin as we are made justice: not ours but God's, not in us but in him: as he is made sin not his own but ours: not in himself, but in us.

Reason 3. (Romans 5:19) As by one man's disobedience many were made sinners: so by the obedience of one, shall many be made righteous: mark here is a comparison between the first and second Adam. And hence I reason thus: As by the disobedience of the first Adam men were made sinners: so by the obedience of the second Adam, are we made righteous. Now we are not only made sinners by propagation of natural corruption, but by imputation. For Adam's first sin was the eating of the forbidden fruit: which

very act is no personal offense, but is imputed to all his posterity, in whom we have all sinned. The Fathers call this very sin Adam's handwriting, making us debtors to God. And therefore in like manner the obedience of Christ is made the righteousness of every believer, not by infusion but by imputation.

Reason 4. A satisfaction made for the want of that justice or obedience which the law requires at our hands, is accepted of God as the justice itself. But Christ's obedience is a satisfaction made for the want of that justice or obedience which the law requires, as the Papists themselves affirm. Therefore this satisfaction is our justice. And I think, the Papists upon this consideration have little cause to dissent from us. For if they make Christ's obedience their satisfaction, why should they not fully join hands with us, and make it their justice also.

Reason 5. The consent of the ancient Church. Bernard says (Epistle 190): The justice of another is assigned to man: who lacked his own, man was indebted and man made payment. The satisfaction of one is imputed to all. And, why may not justice be from another as well as guiltiness is from another. And (in Canticles Sermon 25): It suffices me, for all righteousness to have him alone merciful to me, against whom I have sinned. And, Not to sin is God's justice, man's justice is the mercifulness of God. And (Sermon 61): Shall I sing my own righteousness, Lord I will remember your righteousness alone: for it is mine also: in that even you are made to me righteousness of God. What, shall I fear lest that one be not sufficient for us both? it is not a short cloak that cannot cover two: it will cover both you and me largely being both

a large and eternal justice. Augustine on Psalm 22: He prays for our faults, and has made our faults his faults, that he might make his justice our justice.

****OBJECTIONS OF PAPISTS.****

Objections of the Papists proving inherent righteousness to be the matter of our justice before God, are these. Objection 1. It is absurd, that one man should be made righteous by the righteousness of another: for it is as much as if one man were made wise by the wisdom of another. Answer: It is true, that no man can be made righteous by the personal righteousness of another, because it pertains only to one man. And because the wisdom that is in one man, is his altogether wholly, it cannot be the wisdom of another; no more than the health and life of one body, can be the health of another. But it is otherwise with the righteousness of Christ: it is his indeed, because it is inherent in him as in a subject: it is not his alone, but his and ours together by the tenor of the Covenant of grace. Christ as he is a Mediator is given to every believer as really and truly, as land is given from man to man: and with him are given all things that concern salvation; they being made ours by God's free gift: among which, is Christ his righteousness. By it therefore, as being a thing of our own, we may be justified before God, and accepted to life everlasting.

Objection 2. If a sinner be justified by Christ his righteousness, then every believer shall be as righteous as Christ: and that cannot be. Answer: The proposition is false: for Christ his righteousness is not applied to us according as it is in Christ; neither according to the same measure, nor the same manner. For his obedience in fulfilling the law, is above Adam's righteousness, indeed above the

righteousness of all angels. For they were all but creatures, and their obedience the obedience of creatures: but Christ his obedience is the obedience or righteousness of God; so termed (Romans 1:17-18; 2 Corinthians 5:21) not only because God accepted of it, but because it was in that person which is very God. When Christ obeyed, God obeyed: and when he suffered, God suffered: not because the godhead suffered or performed any obedience, but because the person which according to one nature is God, performed obedience and suffered. And by this means his righteousness is of infinite value, price, merit, and efficacy. Hence also it comes to pass, that this obedience of Christ serves not only for the justifying of some one person (as Adam's did) but of all and every one of the elect: indeed it is sufficient to justify many thousand worlds. Now to come to the point, this righteousness that is in Christ, in this largeness and measure; is pertaining to us in a more narrow measure, because it is only received by faith so far forth, as it serves to justify any particular believer. But they urge the reason further, saying: If Christ his righteousness be the righteousness of every believer, then every man should be a Savior: which is absurd. Answer: I answer as before, and yet more plainly thus: Christ his righteousness is imputed to the person of this or that man, not as it is the price of redemption for all mankind, but as it is the price of redemption for one particular man: as for example, Christ his righteousness is imputed to Peter, not as it is the price of redemption for all, but as it is the price of redemption for Peter. And therefore Christ his righteousness, is not applied to any one sinner in that largeness and measure, in which it is in the person of

Christ: but only so far forth as it serves to satisfy the law for the said sinner, and to make his person accepted of God as righteous, and no further.

Objection 3. If we be made righteous by Christ his righteousness truly, then Christ is a sinner truly by our sins: but Christ is not indeed a sinner by our sins. Answer: We may with reverence to his majesty in good manner say, that Christ was a sinner, and that truly: not by any infusion of sin into his most holy person; but because our sins were laid on him: thus says the Holy Ghost, he who knew no sin was made sin for us, and he was counted with sinners (Isaiah 53:12): yet so, as even then in himself he was without blemish, indeed more holy than all men and angels. On this manner said Chrysostom (2 Corinthians 3): God permitted Christ to be condemned as a sinner. Again, He made the just one to be a sinner, that he might make sinners just.

Objection 4. If a man be made righteous by imputation, then God judges sinners to be righteous: but God judges no sinner to be righteous, for it is abomination to the Lord. Answer: When God justifies a sinner by Christ his righteousness, at the same time, he ceases in regard of guiltiness to be a sinner: and to whom God imputes righteousness them he sanctifies at the very same instant by his Holy Spirit; giving also to original corruption its deadly wound.

Objection 5. That which Adam never lost, was never given by Christ: but he never lost imputed righteousness: therefore it was never given to him. Answer: The proposition is not true: for saving faith, that was never lost by Adam, is given to us in Christ: and Adam never had this privilege, that after the first grace should follow the second; and thereupon being left to himself, he fell from God: and yet this mercy is granted to all believers, that after their

first conversion God will still confirm them with new grace: and by this means, they persevere to the end. And whereas they say, that Adam had not imputed righteousness: I answer, that he had the same for substance, though not for the manner of applying by imputation.

Objection 6. Justification is eternal: but the imputation of Christ his righteousness is not eternal, for it ceases in the end of this life: therefore it is not that which justifies a sinner. Answer: The imputation of Christ's righteousness is everlasting: for he that is esteemed righteous in this life by Christ his righteousness, is accepted as righteous forever: and the remission of sins granted in this life, is forever continued. And though sanctification be perfect in the world to come, yet shall it not justify: for we must conceive it no otherwise after this life, but as a fruit springing from the imputed righteousness of Christ, without which it could not be. And a good child will not cast away the first garment, because his father gives him a second. And what if inward righteousness be perfect in the end of this life, shall we therefore make it the matter of our justification? God forbid. For the righteousness whereby sinners are justified, must be had in the time of this life, before the pangs of death.

2. DIFFERENCE ABOUT THE MANNER OF JUSTIFICATION.

All, both Papists and Protestants agree, that a sinner is justified by faith. This agreement is only in word, and the difference between us is great indeed. And it may be reduced to these three heads. First, the Papist saying that a man is justified by faith: understands

a general or a Catholic faith, whereby a man believes the articles of religion to be true. But we hold that the faith which justifies, is a particular faith whereby we apply to ourselves the promises of righteousness and life everlasting by Christ. And that our opinion is the truth: I have proved before: but I will add a reason or two.

Reason 1. The faith whereby we live, is that faith whereby we are justified: but the faith whereby we live spiritually, is a particular faith whereby we apply Christ to ourselves, as Paul says (Galatians 2:20): I live, that is, spiritually, by the faith of the Son of God: which faith he shows to be a particular faith in Christ, in the very words following, who has loved me and given himself for me, particularly: and in this manner of believing Paul was and is an example to all that are to be saved (1 Timothy 1:16; Philippians 3:15).

Reason 2. That which we are to ask of God in prayer, we must believe it shall be given us, as we ask it: but in prayer we are to ask the pardon of our own sins, and the merit of Christ's righteousness for ourselves: therefore we must believe the same particularly. The proposition is a rule of God's word, requiring, that in every petition we bring a particular faith, whereby we believe, that the thing lawfully asked, shall be given accordingly (Mark 11:24). The minor is also evident, neither can it be denied: for we are taught by Christ himself to pray on this manner, Forgive us our debts: and to it we say, Amen, that is, that our petitions shall without all doubt be granted to us.

And here note, that the Church of Rome in the doctrine of justification by faith cuts off the principal part and property thereof. For in justifying faith two things are required: first Knowledge revealed in the word touching the means of salvation: secondly an

Applying of things known to ourselves, which some call assurance. Now the first, they acknowledge, but the second, which is the very substance and principal part thereof, they deny.

Reason 3. The judgment of the ancient Church. Augustine: I demand now, do you believe in Christ, O sinner? You say, I believe. What do you believe? that all your sins may freely be pardoned by him. You have that which you have believed. Bernard: The Apostle thinks that a man is justified freely by faith. If you believe that your sins cannot be remitted but by him alone against whom they were committed: but go further and believe this too, that by him your sins are forgiven you. This is the testimony which the Holy Ghost gives in the heart, saying: your sins are forgiven you. Cyprian: God promises you immortality, when you go out of this world, and do you doubt? This is indeed not to know God, and this is for a member of the church in the house of faith not to have faith. If we believe in Christ, let us believe his words and promises, and we shall never die, and shall come to Christ with joyful security, with him to reign forever.

The second difference touching faith in the act of justification, is this. The Papist says, we are justified by faith, because it disposes a sinner to his justification after this manner: By faith (says he) the mind of man is enlightened in the knowledge of the law and gospel: knowledge stirs up a fear of hell with a consideration of the promise of happiness, as also the love and fear of God, and hope of life eternal. Now when the heart is thus prepared, God infuses the habit of charity and other virtues, whereby a sinner is justified before God. We say otherwise, that faith justifies because

it is a supernatural instrument created by God in the heart of man at his conversion, whereby he apprehends and receives Christ's righteousness for his justification.

In this their doctrine is a twofold error: 1, that they make faith which justifies, to go before justification itself, both for order of nature as also for time: whereas by the word of God, at the very instant, when any man first believes, he is then justified and sanctified. For he that believes, eats and drinks the body and blood of Christ, and is already passed from death to life (John 6:54). The second is, that faith being nothing else with them but an illumination of the mind, stirs up the will; which being moved and helped, causes in the heart many spiritual motions: and thereby disposes man to his future justification. But this indeed is as much as if we should say, that dead men only helped, can prepare themselves to their future resurrection. For we are all by nature dead in sin, and therefore must not only be enlightened in mind, but also renewed in will, before we can so much as will or desire that which is good. Now we (as I have said) teach otherwise: that faith justifies as it is an instrument to apprehend and apply Christ with his obedience; which is the matter of our justification. This is the truth, I prove it thus. In the Covenant of grace, two things must be considered; the substance thereof, and the condition. The substance of the covenant is, that righteousness and life everlasting is given to God's Church and people by Christ. The condition is, that we for our parts, are by faith to receive the aforesaid benefits: and this condition is by grace as well as the substance. Now then, that we may attain to salvation by Christ, he must be given to us really, as he is propounded in the tenor of the aforesaid covenant. And for the giving of Christ, God has appointed special ordinances, as the

preaching of the word, and the administration of the sacraments. The word preached is the power of God to salvation to everyone that believes: and the end of the sacraments is to communicate Christ with all his benefits to them that come to be partakers thereof: as is most plainly to be seen in the supper of the Lord, in which the giving of bread and wine to the several communicants, is a pledge and sign of God's particular giving of Christ's body and blood with all his merits, to them. And this giving on God's part cannot be effectual without receiving on our parts: and therefore faith must needs be an instrument or hand to receive that which God gives, that we may find comfort by this giving.

The third difference concerning faith, is this: the Papist says, that a man is justified by faith; yet not by faith alone, but also by other virtues, as hope, love, the fear of God, etc. The reasons which are brought to maintain their opinion are of no moment.

Reason 1. (Luke 7:47) Many sins are forgiven her, because she loved much. From which they gather that the woman here spoken of, was justified and had the pardon of sins by love. Answer: In this text, love is not made an impulsive cause to move God to pardon her sins, but only a sign to show and manifest that God had already pardoned them. Like to this is the place of John, who says (1 John 3:14): We are translated from death to life, because we love the brothers: where love is no cause of the change, but a sign and consequence thereof.

Reason 2. (Galatians 5:6) Neither circumcision, nor uncircumcision avails anything, but faith that works by love. Hence they gather that faith does justify together with love. Answer: The property of true faith is, to apprehend and receive something to itself: and love, that goes always with faith, as a fruit and an inseparable

companion thereof, is of another nature. For it does not receive in, but as it were give out itself in all the duties of the first and second table towards God and man: and this thing faith by itself cannot do: and therefore Paul says that faith works by love. The hand has a property to reach out itself, to lay hold of anything: and to receive a gift: but the hand has no property to cut a piece of wood of itself without saw or knife, or some like instrument; and yet by help of them, it can either divide or cut. Even so it is the nature of faith, to go out of itself and to receive Christ into the heart: as for the duties of the first and second table, faith cannot of itself bring them forth; no more than the hand can divide or cut: yet join love to faith, and then can it practice duties commanded concerning God and man. And this I take to be the meaning of this text, which speaks not of justification by faith, but only of the practice of common duties, which faith puts in execution by the help of love.

Reason 3. Faith is never alone, therefore it does not justify alone. Answer: The reason is bad, and they might as well dispute thus: The eye is never alone from the head, and therefore it sees not alone; which is absurd. And though in regard of substance the eye be never alone, yet in regard of seeing, it is alone: and so though faith subsists not without love and hope and other graces of God, yet in regard of the act of justification it is alone without them all.

Reason 4. If faith alone does justify, then we are saved by faith alone: but we are not saved by faith alone: and therefore not justified by faith alone. Answer: The proposition is false: for more things are requisite to the main end than to the subordinate

means. And the assumption is false: for we are saved by faith alone, if we speak of faith as it is an instrument apprehending Christ for our salvation.

Reason 5. We are saved by hope: therefore not by faith alone. Answer: We are saved by hope, not because it is any cause of our salvation. Paul's meaning is only this; that we have not salvation as yet in possession, but wait patiently for it, in time to come to be possessed of us, expecting the time of our full deliverance: that is all, that can justly be gathered hence.

Now the doctrine which we teach on the contrary is, that a sinner is justified before God by faith: indeed, by faith alone. The meaning is, that nothing within man, and nothing that man can do either by nature or by grace concurs to the act of justification before God, as any cause thereof, either efficient, material, formal, or final, but faith alone. All other gifts and graces, as hope, love, the fear of God, are necessary to salvation, as signs thereof, and consequences of faith. Nothing in man concurs as any cause to this work but by faith alone. And faith itself is no principal but only an instrumental cause by which we receive, apprehend, and apply Christ and his righteousness for our justification.

Reason 1. (John 3:14-15) As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, so must the Son of man be lifted up: that whoever believes in him should not perish but have eternal life. In these words Christ makes a comparison on this manner: when any one of the Israelites were stung to death by fiery serpents: his cure was not by any medicine or surgery, but only by the casting of his eye up to the bronze serpent, which Moses had erected by God's commandment: even so in the cure of our souls, when we are stung to

death by sin, there is nothing required within us for our recovery, but only that we cast up and fix the eye of our faith on Christ and his righteousness.

Reason 2. The exclusive forms of speech used in scripture prove thus much. We are justified freely, not of the law, not by the law, without the law, without works, not of works, not according to works, not of us, not by the works of the law but by faith (Galatians 2:16). All boasting excluded: only believe (Luke 8:50). These distinctions, whereby works and the law are excluded in the work of justification, do include thus much: that faith alone does justify.

Reason 3. Very reason may teach thus much: for no gift in man is apt and fit as a spiritual hand to receive and apply Christ and his righteousness to a sinner, but faith. Indeed love, hope, the fear of God and repentance, have their several uses in men, but none serve for this end to apprehend Christ and his merits; none of them all have this receiving property: and therefore there is nothing in man, that justifies as a cause but faith alone.

Reason 4. The judgment of the ancient Church. Ambrose on Romans 4: They are blessed to whom without any labor or work done, iniquities are remitted and sin covered: no works of repentance required of them, but only that they believe. And (chapter 3): Neither working anything, nor repaying the like, are they justified by faith alone through the gift of God. And (1 Corinthians 1): This is appointed of God that whoever believes in Christ, shall be saved without any work by faith alone, freely receiving remission of sins. Augustine: There is one propitiation for all sins, to believe in Christ. Hesychius on Leviticus, book 1, chapter 2: Grace which is of mercy is apprehended by faith alone, and not of works. Bernard: Whoever is pricked for his sins and thirsts after righteousness, let

him believe in you, who justifies the sinner, and being justified by faith alone, he shall have peace with God. Chrysostom on Galatians 3: They said, he which rests on faith alone, is cursed: but Paul shows, that he is blessed which rests on faith alone. Basil on humility: Let man acknowledge himself to lack true justice, and that he is justified only by faith in Christ. Origen on Romans 3: We think that a man is justified by faith without the works of the law: and he says that justification by faith alone suffices, so as a man only believing may be justified. And, Therefore it lies upon us, to search who was justified by faith without works. And for an example, I think upon the thief who being crucified with Christ cried to him, Lord remember me when you come into your kingdom: and there is no other good work of his mentioned in the Gospel: but for this alone faith, Jesus says to him, This night you shall be with me in Paradise.

3. DIFFERENCE.

The third difference about justification is concerning this point, namely how far forth good works are required thereto.

The doctrine of the Church of Rome is, that there be two kinds of justification: the first and the second, as I have said. The first is, when one of an evil man is made a good man: and in this, works are wholly excluded, it being wholly of grace. The second is, when a man of a just man is made more just. And this they will have to proceed from works of grace: for (say they) as a man when he is once born can by eating and drinking make himself a bigger man, though he could not at the first make himself a man: even so a sinner having his first justification, may afterward by grace make himself more just. Therefore they hold these two things: 1, that

good works are meritorious causes of the second justification, which they term actual: 2, that good works are means to increase the first justification, which they call habitual.

Now let us see how far forth we must join with them in this point. Our consent therefore stands in three conclusions.

1. That good works done by them that are justified do please God, and are approved of him, and therefore have a reward.

2. Good works are necessary to salvation two ways: first, not as causes thereof, either conserving, aiding, or procreating: but only as consequences of faith: in that they are inseparable companions and fruits of that faith, which is indeed necessary to salvation. Secondly they are necessary as marks in a way, and as the way itself directing us to eternal life.

3. We hold and believe, that the righteous man, is in some sort justified by works: for so the Holy Ghost speaks plainly and truly (James 2:21), that Abraham was justified by works.

Thus far we join with them: and the very difference is this. They say, we are justified by works, as by causes thereof: we say, that we are justified by works as by signs and fruits of our justification before God, and no otherwise: and in this sense must the place of Saint James be understood, that Abraham was justified, that is, declared and made manifest to be just indeed by his obedience, and that even before God. Now that our doctrine is the truth, it will appear by reasons on both parts.

****OUR REASONS.****

1. (Romans 3:28) We conclude that a man is justified by faith without the works of the law. Some answer, that ceremonial works be excluded here: some, that moral works: some, works going before faith. But let them devise what they can for themselves: the truth is, that Paul excludes all works whatever, as by the very text will appear. For verse 24 he says, We are justified freely by his grace: that is, by the mere gift of God: giving us to understand, that a sinner in his justification is merely passive, that is, doing nothing on his part whereby God should accept him to life everlasting. And verse 27 he says, justification by faith excludes all boasting: and therefore all kind of works are thereby excluded; and specially such as are most of all the matter of boasting, that is, good works. For if a sinner, after that he is justified by the merit of Christ, were justified more by his own works, then might he have some matter of boasting in himself. And that we may not doubt of Paul's meaning, consider and read (Ephesians 2:8-9): By grace (says he) you are saved through faith: and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God: not of works lest any man should boast himself. Here Paul excludes all and every work, and directly works of grace themselves: as appears by the reason following, For we are his workmanship created in Christ Jesus to good works: which God has ordained that we should walk in them. Now let the Papists tell me, what be the works which God has prepared for men to walk in, and to which they are regenerate, unless they be the most excellent works of grace: and let them mark, how Paul excludes them wholly from the work of justification and salvation.

2. (Galatians 5:3) If you be circumcised, you are bound to the whole law, and you are abolished from Christ. Here Paul disputes against such men as would be saved partly by Christ, and partly by

the works of the law: hence I reason thus. If a man will be justified by works he is bound to fulfill the whole law, according to the rigor thereof: that is Paul's ground. I now assume: no man can fulfill the law according to the rigor thereof: for the lives and works of most righteous men are imperfect, and stained with sin: and therefore they are taught every day, to say on this manner; forgive us our debts. Again our knowledge is imperfect, and therefore our faith, repentance, and sanctification is answerable. And lastly the regenerate man is partly flesh and partly spirit: and therefore his best works are partly from the flesh, and in part only spiritual. Thus then for any man to be bound to the rigor of the whole law, is as much as if he were bound to his own damnation.

3. Election to salvation is of grace without works: therefore the justification of a sinner is of grace alone without works. For it is a certain rule, that the cause of a cause is the cause of a thing caused. Now grace without works is the cause of election, which election is the cause of our justification: and therefore grace without works is the cause of our justification.

4. A man must first be fully justified before he can do a good work: for the person must first please God before his works can please him. But the person of a sinner cannot please God till he be perfectly justified: and therefore till he be justified, he cannot do so much as one good work. And thus good works cannot be any meritorious causes of justification, after which they are both for time, and order of nature. In a word, whereas they make two distinct justifications: we acknowledge that there be degrees of sanctification, yet so as justification is only one, standing in remission of sins and God's acceptance of us to life everlasting by Christ; and this justification has no degrees but is perfect at the very first.

OBJECTIONS OF PAPISTS.

(Psalm 7:8) Judge me according to my righteousness. Hence they reason thus, if David be judged according to his righteousness then may he be justified thereby, but David desires to be judged according to his righteousness: and therefore he was justified thereby. Answer: There be two kinds of righteousness, one of the person, the other of the cause or action. The righteousness of a man's person, is whereby it is accepted into the favor of God into life eternal. The righteousness of the action or cause is, when the action or cause is judged of God to be good and just. Now David in this psalm, speaks only of the righteousness of the action, or innocency of his cause, in that he was falsely charged to have sought the kingdom. In like manner it is said of Phinehas (Psalm 106:31) that his act in killing Zimri and Cozbi, was imputed to him for righteousness: not because it was a satisfaction to the law, the rigor whereof could not be fulfilled in that one work; but because God accepted of it as a just work, and as a token of his righteousness and zeal for God's glory.

Objection 2. The Scripture says in sundry places, that men are blessed which do good works. (Psalm 119:1) Blessed is the man that is upright in heart, and walks in the law of the Lord. Answer: The man is blessed that endeavors to keep God's commandments. Yet is he not blessed simply, because he does so; but because he is in Christ, by whom he does so: and his obedience to the law of God is a sign thereof.

Objection 3. When man confesses his sins and humbles himself by prayer and fasting, God's wrath is pacified and stayed: therefore prayer and fasting are causes of justification before God. Answer:

Indeed men that truly humble themselves by prayer and fasting, do appease the wrath of God: yet not properly by these actions, but by their faith expressed and testified in them, whereby they apprehend that which appeases God's wrath, even the merits of Christ, in whom the Father is well pleased; and for whose sake alone he is well pleased with us.

Objection 4. Sundry persons in Scripture are commended for perfection: as Noah, and Abraham, Zechariah, and Elizabeth: and Christ bids us all be perfect; and where there is any perfection of works, there also works may justify. Answer: There be two kinds of perfection: perfection in parts, and perfection in degrees. Perfection in part is, when being regenerate, and having the seeds of all necessary virtues, we endeavor accordingly to obey God, not in some few, but in all and every part of the law: as Josiah turned to God according to all the law of Moses. Perfection in degrees is, when a man keeps every commandment of God, and that according to the rigor thereof, in the very highest degree. Now then whereas we are commanded to be perfected, and have examples of the same perfection in Scripture: both commandments and examples must be understood of perfection in parts, and not of perfection in degrees, which cannot be attained to in this life; though we for our parts, must daily strive to come as near to it, as possibly we can.

Objection 5. (2 Corinthians 4:17) Our momentary light afflictions work for us a greater measure of glory: now if afflictions work our salvation, then works also do the same. Answer: Afflictions work salvation, not as causes procuring it, but as means directing us thereto. And thus always must we esteem of works, in the mat-

ter of our salvation, as of a certain way, or a mark therein, directing us to glory, not causing and procuring it: as Bernard says they are, the way to the kingdom, not the cause of reigning there.

Objection 6. We are justified by the same thing whereby we are judged: but we are judged by our good works: therefore justified also. Answer: The proposition is false: for judgment is an act of God, declaring a man to be just that is already just: and justification is another distinct act of God, whereby he makes him to be just, that is by nature unjust. And therefore in equity the last judgment is to proceed by works: because they are the fittest means to make trial of every man's cause, and serve fitly to declare whom God has justified in this life.

Objection 7. Wicked men are condemned for evil works: therefore righteous men are justified by good works. Answer: The reason holds not: for there is great difference between evil and good works. An evil work is perfectly evil, and so deserves damnation: but there is no good work of any man that is perfectly good: and therefore cannot justify.

Objection 8. To believe in Christ is a work, and by it we are justified: and if one work does justify, why may we not be justified by all the works of the law. Answer: Faith must be considered two ways: first, as a work, quality, or virtue: secondly as an instrument, or a hand reaching out itself to receive Christ's merit. And we are justified by faith, not as it is a work, virtue, or quality; but as it is an instrument to receive and apply that thing whereby we are justified. And therefore it is a figurative speech to say, We are justified by faith. Faith considered by itself makes no man righteous: neither does the action of faith which is to apprehend justify; but the object of faith, which is Christ's obedience apprehended.

These are the principal reasons commonly used, which as we see, are of no moment. To conclude therefore we hold: that works concur to justification, and that we are justified thereby as by signs and effects, not as causes: for both the beginning, middle, and accomplishment of our justification is only in Christ: and hereupon John says, If any man (being already justified) sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ and he is the propitiation for our sins. And to make our good works means or causes of our justification, is to make every man a Savior to himself.

POINT 5: OF MERITS



By merit, we understand anything or any work, whereby God's favor and life everlasting is procured; and that for the dignity and excellence of the work or thing done: or, a good work done, binding him that receives it to repay the like.

OUR CONSENT.

Touching merits, we consent in two conclusions with them. The first conclusion, that merits are so far forth necessary, that without them there can be no salvation.

The second, that Christ our Mediator and Redeemer, is the root and fountain of all merit.

THE DISSENT OR DIFFERENCE.

The popish Church places merits within man, making two sorts thereof: the merit of the person, and the merit of the work. The merit of the person, is a dignity in the person, whereby it is worthy of life everlasting. And this (as they say) is to be found in infants dying after baptism, who though they lack good works, yet are they not void of this kind of merit, for which they receive the kingdom

of heaven. The merit of the work, is a dignity or excellence in the work, whereby it is made fit and enabled to deserve life everlasting for the doer. And works (as they teach) are meritorious two ways: first, by covenant, because God has made a promise of reward to them: secondly, by their own dignity, for Christ has merited, that our works might merit. And this is the substance of their doctrine. From it we dissent in these points.

1. We renounce all personal merits, that is, all merits within the person of any mere man. 2. And we renounce all merit of works, that is, all merit of any work done by any mere man whatever. And the true merit whereby we look to attain the favor of God, and life everlasting, is to be found in the person of Christ alone: who is the storehouse of all our merits: whose prerogative it is, to be the person alone in whom God is well pleased. God's favor is of infinite dignity, and no creature is able to do a work that may counterbalance the favor of God, save Christ alone; who by reason of the dignity of his person, being not a mere man but God-man, or Man-God, he can do such works as are of endless dignity every way answerable to the favor of God: and therefore sufficient to merit the same for us. And though a merit or meritorious work agrees only to the person of Christ, yet is it made ours by imputation. For as his righteousness is made ours, so are his merits depending thereon: but his righteousness is made ours by imputation, as I have showed. Hence arises another point, namely that as Christ's righteousness is made ours really by imputation to make us righteous: so we by the merit of his righteousness imputed to us, do merit and deserve life everlasting. And this is our doctrine. In a word, the Papist maintains the merits of his own works: but we re-

nounce them all, and rest only on the merit of Christ. And that our doctrine is truth, and theirs falsehood, I will make manifest by sundry reasons; and then answer their arguments to the contrary.

****OUR REASONS.****

The first shall be taken from the properties and conditions that must be in a meritorious work, and they are four. 1, A man must do it of himself, and by himself: for if it be done by another, the merit does not properly belong to the doer. 2, A man must do it of his own free will and pleasure, not of due debt; for when we do that which we are bound to do, we do no more but our duty. 3, The work must be done to the profit of another, who thereupon must be bound to repay the like. 4, The reward and the work must be in proportion equal, for if the reward be more than the work, it is not a reward of desert, but a gift of good will. Hence follows a notable conclusion: That Christ's manhood considered apart from his godhead, cannot merit at God's hand: though it be more excellent every way than all both men and angels. For being thus considered, it does nothing of itself, but by grace received from the godhead; though it also be without measure. Secondly Christ's manhood is a creature, and in that regard bound to do whatever it does. Thirdly, Christ as man cannot give anything to God, but that which he received from God: therefore cannot the manhood properly by itself merit, but only as it is personally united to the godhead of the Son. And if this be so, then much less can any mere man, or any angel merit: indeed it is a madness to think, that either our actions or persons should be capable of any merit whereby we might attain to life eternal.

Reason 2. (Exodus 20:8) And show mercy upon thousands in them that love me, and keep my commandments. Hence I reason thus: where reward is given upon mercy, there is no merit: but reward is given of mercy to them that fulfill the law: therefore no merit. What can we any way deserve, when our full recompense must be of mercy? And this appears further by Adam: if he had stood to this day, he could not by his continual and perfect obedience, have procured a further increase of favor at God's hand, but should only have continued that happy estate in which he was first created.

Reason 3. Scripture directly condemns merit of works. (Romans 6:23) The wages of sin is death: but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord. The proportion of the argument required that Saint Paul should have said: The reward of good works is eternal life, if life everlasting could be deserved, which cannot be: because it is a free gift. Again (Titus 3:5): We are saved not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us. And (Ephesians 2:8-10): By grace you are saved through faith, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God: not of works which God has prepared that we should walk in them. If any works be crowned, it is certain that the sufferings of Martyrs shall be rewarded: now of them Paul says (Romans 8:18): The sufferings of this life are not worthy of the glory to come. Where then is the value and dignity of other works? To this purpose Ambrose says, The just man though he be tormented in the brazen bull is still just, because he justifies God, and says he suffers less than his sins deserve.

Reason 4. Whoever will merit, must fulfill the whole law: but none can keep the whole law: for if we say we have no sin we deceive ourselves (1 John 1), and he that sins against one commandment is guilty of the whole law. And what can he merit, that is guilty of the breach of the whole law?

Reason 5. We are taught to pray on this manner, Give us this day our daily bread. Wherein we acknowledge every morsel of bread to be the mere gift of God without desert; and therefore must we much more acknowledge life eternal to be every way the gift of God. It must needs therefore be a Satanical insolence for any man to imagine, that he can by his works merit eternal life, who cannot merit bread.

Reason 6. Consent of the ancient Church. Bernard: Those which we call our merits, are the way to the kingdom, and not the cause of reigning. Augustine (Manual, chapter 22): All my hope is in the death of my Lord. His death is my merit: my merit is the passion of the Lord. I shall not be void of merits, so long as God's mercies are not wanting. Basil on Psalm 114: Eternal rest is reserved for them, which have striven lawfully in this life: not for the merits of their doings, but upon the grace of the most bountiful God, in which they trusted. Augustine on Psalm 120: He crowns you, because he crowns his own gifts, not your merits. And (Psalm 142): Lord you will quicken me in your justice, not in mine: not because I have deserved it, but because you have compassion.

****OBJECTIONS OF PAPISTS.****

Objection 1. In sundry places of Scripture, promise of reward is made to them that believe and do good works: therefore our works do merit; for a reward and merit be relatives. Answer: Reward is twofold: of debt, and of mercy. Life everlasting is not a reward of debt but of mercy, given of the good will of God, without anything done of man. Secondly, the kingdom of heaven is properly an inheritance given of a Father to a child, and therefore it is called a reward not properly, but by a figure or by resemblance. For as a workman having ended his labor, receives his wages; so after men have led their lives and finished their course in keeping faith and good conscience, as dutiful children; God gives them eternal life. And hereupon it is termed a reward. Thirdly, if I should grant that life everlasting is a deserved reward, it is not for our works, but for Christ's merit imputed to us, causing us thereby to merit: and thus the relation stands directly between the reward and Christ's merit applied to us.

Objection 2. Christ by his death merited that our works should merit life everlasting. Answer: That is false: all we find in Scripture is, that Christ by his merit procured pardon of sin, imputation of righteousness, and life everlasting: and it is nowhere said in the word of God, that Christ did merit, that our works should merit: it is a dotage of their own devising. He died not for our good works to make them able to satisfy God's anger: but for our sins, that they might be pardoned. Thus much says the Scripture, and no more. And in that Christ did sufficiently merit life eternal for us, by his own death: it is a sufficient proof that he never intended to give us power of meriting the same: unless we suppose that at some time he gives more than is needful. Again, Christ in the office of mediation as he is a King, Priest, and Prophet, admits no deputy or fel-

low. For he is a most perfect Mediator, doing all things by himself, without the help of any. And the ministers that dispense the word are not his deputies, but reasonable and voluntary instruments, which he uses. But if men by works can merit increase of grace and happiness for themselves, then has Christ partners in the work of redemption: men doing that by him, which he does of himself, in procuring their salvation. Indeed, if this might stand, that Christ did merit, that our works should merit, then Christ should merit that our stained righteousness being for this cause not capable of merit, should nevertheless merit. I call it stained; because we are partly flesh and partly spirit: and therefore in ourselves deserving the curse of the law, though we be regenerate. Again, for one good work we do, we have many evil, the offense whereof defaces the merit of our best deeds, and makes them too light in the balance of the law.

Objection 3. Our works merit by bargain or covenant, because God has promised to reward them. Answer: The word of God sets down two covenants: one legal, the other evangelical. In the legal covenant life everlasting is promised to works, for that is the condition of the law; do these things and you shall live. But on this manner can no man merit life everlasting, because none is able to do all that the law requires; whether we respect the manner, or the measure of obedience. In the evangelical covenant, the promises that are made are not made to any work or virtue in man, but to the worker: not for any merit of his own person or work, but for the person and merit of Christ. For example, it is a promise of the Gospel (Revelation 2:10): Be faithful to death, and I will give you the crown of life. Here the promise is not made to the virtue of fidelity, but to the faithful person; whose fidelity is but a token that

he is in Christ: for the merit of whose obedience God promises the crown of life: and therefore Christ says further: I come quickly and will give to every man according to his works, mark, he says not to the work or for the work, but to the worker according to his works. And thus the bond of all other promises of the Gospel, in which God willingly binds himself to reward our works, do not directly concern us, but have respect to the person, and obedience of Christ, for whose sake alone God binds himself as debtor to us, and gives the recompense or reward, according to the measure of our faith testified by our works. And therefore it cannot be truly gathered: that works do merit by any promise or covenant, passed on God's part to man. Some may say, if works merit not why are they mentioned in the promises? I answer, not because they merit, but because they are tokens that the doer of the work is in Christ, for whose merit the promise shall be accomplished.

Objection 6. Good works are perfect and without fault, for they are the works of the Holy Ghost, who cannot sin: therefore they merit. Answer: If works did proceed only and immediately from the Holy Ghost, there could not be any fault in them: but our works come from the Holy Ghost, in and by the will and understanding of man: and by this means they are tainted with sin: as water in the fountain is both clear and sweet, yet the streams thereof passing through the filthy channel, are defiled thereby. Again they reason thus; that which we are bound to do has no fault in it; but we are bound to do good works: therefore they are perfect. Answer: The proposition must be expounded: that which we are bound to do, in itself, according to the intention of the com-

mander, has no fault: or, that which we are bound to do according as we are bound to do it, has no fault, yet in regard of the intention of the doer, or in regard of our manner of doing, it may be faulty.

Objection 5. Christ says (Revelation 3:4) that the faithful in the Church of Sardis shall walk with him in white: for they are worthy: therefore believers merit. Answer: Every believer is worthy to walk with Christ: yet not worthy in himself, but in Christ, to whom he is united, and made bone of his bone, and flesh of his flesh. And by reason of this conjunction it is, that men are said to be worthy, because they are enriched with Christ's merits and righteousness.

Objection 7. (2 Timothy 4:8) Everlasting life is termed a crown, and a crown of righteousness to be given of a just judge: therefore man for his part by his works deserves the same. Answer: Everlasting life is called a crown only in resemblance. For as he which runs a race, must continue and run to the end, and then be crowned: even so must we continue to walk in good works to the end, and then receive eternal life. And it is called a crown of righteousness, not because it belongs to any man by due and desert; but because God has bound himself by a promise to give it, in performing whereof he is termed just: and by virtue of this promise, it is obtained and no otherwise. These are the principal objections, by which we may judge what the rest are. And thus we see what is the truth, namely that merit is necessary to salvation; yet neither merit of man's work, or person, but the merit of Christ imputed to us, whereby we being in him do procure and deserve the favor of God and life eternal.

POINT 6: OF SATISFACTION



OUR CONSENT.

Conclusion 1. First, we acknowledge and hold civil or political satisfaction: that is, a recompense for injuries, and damages offered any way to our neighbors. This Zacchaeus practiced, when at his conversion he restored fourfold, things gotten by forged cavilation. Again by civil satisfaction I understand, the imposition of fines, penalties, and punishments upon offenders, and the inflicting of death upon malefactors. For all these are satisfactions to the law, and societies of men when they are wronged. All these we maintain as necessary, for neither Church, nor commonwealth can well be without them: considering they are notable means to uphold civil peace; and sometimes they are fruits of true faith, as the satisfaction of Zacchaeus was.

Conclusion 2. We acknowledge canonical or ecclesiastical satisfaction: and that is, when any having given offense to the church of God or any part thereof, do make an open public testimony of their repentance. Miriam for murmuring against Moses, was stricken with leprosy, and afterward by his prayer she was cleansed, and yet for all that she must go seven days out of the tent and congrega-

tion, that she might make a kind of satisfaction to the people for her trespass. And in the old testament, sackcloth and ashes were signs of their satisfaction.

Conclusion 3. We hold that no man can be saved, unless, he make a perfect satisfaction to the justice of God for all his sins: because God is infinite in justice, and therefore will either exact an everlasting punishment, or satisfaction for the same.

****THE DISSENT OR DIFFERENCE.****

The points of our difference and dissent are these. The Church of Rome teaches and believes, that Christ by his death has made a satisfaction for all the sins of men, and for the eternal punishment of them all: yet so, as they themselves must satisfy the justice of God for the temporal punishment of their offenses, either on earth or in purgatory. We teach and believe, that Christ by his death and passion has made a perfect and all-sufficient satisfaction to the justice of God for all the sins of men, and for the whole punishment thereof both eternal and temporal. Thus we differ, and herein we for our parts must forever stand at difference with them so as if there were no more points of variance but this one, it should be sufficient to keep us always from uniting our religions, and cause us to obey the voice of Christ, Come out of her my people. For as in the former points, so in this also, the Papists err, not in circumstance, but in the very foundation and life of religion.

****OUR REASONS.****

Reason 1. A satisfaction that is made imperfect either directly or by consequence, is indeed no satisfaction at all. But the Papists make Christ's satisfaction imperfect, in that they do add a supply by human satisfactions: and thus much a learned schoolman, Biel in plain words confessed. Although (says he) the passion of Christ be the principal merit, for which grace is conferred, the opening of the kingdom and glory: yet it is never the alone and total meritorious cause: it is manifest, because always with the merit of Christ, there concurs some work, as the merit of congruity or condignity of him that receives grace or glory, if he be of years and have the use of reason: or of some other for him, if he lacks reason. For that which admits a supply by another, is imperfect in itself. Therefore human satisfactions cannot stand. Learned Papists make answer, that Christ's satisfaction and man's may stand well together. For (say they) Christ's satisfaction is sufficient in itself to answer the justice of God for all sin and punishment: but it is not sufficient to this or that man till it be applied: and it must be applied by our satisfaction made to God for the temporal punishment of our sins. But I say again, that man's satisfaction can be no means to apply the satisfaction of Christ: and I prove it thus. The means of applying God's blessings and graces to man are twofold: some respect God himself, and some respect man. Those which respect God, are such whereby God on his part does offer and convey his mercies in Christ to man: of this sort are the preaching of the word, baptism, and the Lord's supper, and these are as it were the hand of God whereby he reaches down and gives to us Christ with all his benefits. The other means of applying on man's part, are those whereby the said benefits are received. Of this sort there is only one, namely faith, whereby we believe that Christ with all his benefits belong to

us. And this is the hand of man whereby he receives Christ as he is offered, or exhibited by God in the word and sacraments. As for other means beside these, in Scripture we find none. Foolish therefore is the answer of the Papist, that make men's satisfactions means to apply the satisfaction of Christ to us: for by human satisfactions, Christ's is neither offered on God's part, nor yet received on man's part: let them prove it if they can. Others, not content with this their former answer, say; that our satisfactions do nothing derogate from the satisfaction of Christ: because our works have their dignity and merit from Christ's satisfaction: he meriting that our works should satisfy God's justice for temporal punishments. But this is also absurd and false, as the former was. For if Christ did satisfy that man might satisfy, then Christ does make every believer to be a Christ, a Jesus, a Redeemer, and a Priest in the same order with his own self. But to make sinful man his own redeemer, though it be but from temporal punishments, is a doctrine of devils. For the Holy Ghost teaches that the priesthood of Christ is incommunicable, and cannot pass from him to any other. Now to make satisfaction for sin or any part of the punishment thereof, is a duty, or a part of Christ his priesthood, and therefore to make satisfaction is a work that cannot pass from his person to the person of any man. Again, if Christ by his satisfaction gives power to man to satisfy, then man does satisfy by Christ, and Christ beside his own satisfaction upon the cross, must daily satisfy in man, to the end of the world: but this cannot be, for Christ upon the cross, when death was upon him, said, It is finished, that is, I have fully satisfied for all the sins of mankind, both in respect of the fault and punishment. As for Christ's burial and resurrection which followed his death, they served not to satisfy but to confirm

and ratify the same. Again Paul says (2 Corinthians 5:21): He that knew no sin was made sin for us, that is, the punishment of sin for us; but if the Church of Rome says true, that Christ does daily satisfy, then Paul spoke too short, and should have said further, that Christ was made sin for us, and in us too: and that God was not only in Christ but also in us reconciling the world to himself. But Paul never knew this learning: and therefore let them turn themselves which way they will, by putting a supplement to Christ's satisfaction, they do indeed annihilate the same.

Reason 2. In sundry places of Scripture, especially in the Epistles of Paul: we are said to be redeemed, justified, and saved freely: which word freely, does import that we are justified and saved without anything done on our part or by ourselves in the matter of our salvation: and if this be so, then can we do nothing at all that may satisfy the justice of God for the least punishment of our sins. If we satisfy in our own persons we are not saved freely: and if we be saved freely, we make no satisfaction at all.

Reason 3. We pray daily, forgive us our sins: now to plead pardon, and to satisfy for our sins be contrary: and for all things, for which we can make satisfaction, we need not crave a pardon; but we are taught in the aforesaid petition wholly and only to use the plea of pardon for our sins, and therefore we acknowledge that we cannot make any satisfaction at all.

Reason 4. The judgment of the ancient Church. Tertullian on Baptism: Guiltiness being taken away, the punishment is also taken away. Augustine: Christ, by taking upon him the punishment and not the fault, has done away both the fault and the punishment. And (Volume 10, Homily 5) he says, when we are gone out of this world, there will remain no compunction or satisfaction. Some

new editions have foisted in the word 'some' and so have turned the sense on this manner: There will remain no compunction or some satisfaction. But this is flat against Augustine's meaning who says a little before, that when the way is ended there is no compounding of our cause with any. Chrysostom (preface on Isaiah): Say not to me, I have sinned; how shall I be freed from so many sins? You cannot: but your God can. Indeed, and he will so blot out your sins that there shall remain no print of them: which thing befalls not the body, for when it is healed there remains a scar: but God as soon as he exempts you from punishment, he gives you justice. Ambrose says, I read of Peter's tears, but I read not of his satisfaction. Again, Let us adore Christ that he may say to us, fear not your sins of this world, nor the waves of bodily sufferings: I have remission of sins. Jerome says on Psalm 31: The sin that is covered is not seen, the sin that is not seen is not imputed: that which is not imputed, is not punished. Chrysostom on Matthew, Homily 44: Among all men, some endure punishment in this life and the life to come: others in this life alone: others alone in the life to come: others neither in this life nor the life to come. There alone, as Dives, who was not lord so much as of one drop of water. Here alone, as the incestuous man among the Corinthians. Neither here nor there, as the Apostles and Prophets, as also Job and the rest of this kind: for they endured no sufferings for punishment, but that they might be known to be conquerors in the fight.

OBJECTIONS OF PAPISTS.

Objection 1. (Leviticus 4) Moses according to God's commandment prescribed several sacrifices for several persons; and they were means of satisfaction for the temporal punishments of their daily

sins. Answer: Those sacrifices were only signs and types of Christ's satisfaction to be offered to his Father in his alone sacrifice upon the cross: and whoever offered any sacrifice in the old testament, did thus and no otherwise esteem of it, but as a type and figure of better things. Secondly, the said sacrifices were satisfactions to the Church, whereby men did testify their repentance for their offenses, and likewise their desire to be reconciled to God and men. And such kind of satisfactions, we acknowledge.

Objection 2. Men, whose sins are all pardoned, have afterward sundry crosses and afflictions laid upon them, to the end of their days: therefore in all likelihood they make satisfaction to God for temporal punishments. As for example, the Israelites for murmuring against the Lord in the wilderness were barred all from the land of promise: and the like befell Moses and Aaron for not glorifying God, as they should have done at the waters of strife. Answer: Man must be considered in a twofold estate, as he is under the law, and as he is under grace. In the first estate, all afflictions are curses or legal punishments, be they little or great: but to them that are in the second estate and believe in Christ, though the same afflictions remain, yet do they change their condition, and are the actions of a Father serving to be trials, corrections, preventings, admonitions. (1 Corinthians 11:32): When we are judged, we are nurtured of the Lord and (Hebrews 12:7): If we endure chastisement, God offers himself to you as children. And Chrysostom says (1 Corinthians, Homily 28): When we are corrected of the Lord, it is more for our admonition than damnation: more for a medicine than for a punishment: more for a correction than for a penalty. And whereas God denied the believing Israelites, with Moses and Aaron to enter into the land of Canaan, it cannot be proved that it was a punish-

ment or penalty of the law upon them. The scripture says no more but that it was an admonition to all men in all ages following, to take heed of like offenses, as Paul writes (1 Corinthians 10:11): All these things came to them for examples, and were written for our admonition.

Objection 3. David was punished after his repentance for his adultery, for the child died, and he was plagued in his own kind, in the incest of Absalom: and when he had numbered the people he was yet punished in the death of his people after his own repentance. Answer: I answer as before that the hand of God was upon David after his repentance: but yet the judgments which befell him were not curses to him properly, but corrections for his sins, and trials of his faith, and means to prevent further sin, and to renew both his faith and repentance: as also they served to admonish others in like case; for David was a public person and his sins were offensive, both within the Church of God and without.

Objection 4. The Prophets of God, when the people are threatened with the plague, famine, sword, captivity, etc., exhort them to repent and to humble themselves in sackcloth and ashes; and thereby they turned away the wrath of God that was then coming forth against them. Therefore by temporal humiliation, men may escape the temporal punishments of the Lord. Answer: Famine, sword, banishment, the plague, and other judgments sent on God's people, were not properly punishments of sin but only the corrections of a Father whereby he humbled them that they might repent: or thus, they were punishments tending to correction, not serving for satisfaction. And the punishments of God are turned from them, not because they satisfy the justice of God in their own

sufferings, but because by faith they lay hold on the satisfaction of the Messiah, and testify the same by their humiliation and repentance.

Objection 5. (Daniel 4:27) Daniel gives this counsel to Nebuchadnezzar, redeem your sins by justice and your iniquities by alms deeds. Behold (say they) alms deeds are made a means to satisfy for man's iniquities. Answer: The word which they translate to redeem, (as the most learned in the Chaldean tongue with one consent affirm) does properly signify to break off; as if the Prophet should say: O King, you are a mighty Monarch, and to enlarge your kingdom you have used much injustice and cruelty, therefore now repent of your iniquity, and break off these your sins, testify your repentance by doing justice, and give alms to the poor whom you have oppressed. Therefore here is nothing spoken of satisfaction for sin, but only of testification of repentance by the fruits thereof.

Objection 6. Matthew 3:2: Do penance, and bring forth fruits worthy of penance, which (say they) are works of satisfaction enjoined by the priest. Answer: This text is absurd — for the word signifies this much: change your minds from sin to God, and testify it by good works, that is, by doing the duties of the moral law. These must be done not because they are means to satisfy God's justice for man's sin, but because they are fruits of that faith and repentance which lies in the heart.

Objection 7. 2 Corinthians 7:10: Paul sets down sundry fruits of repentance, whereof the last is revenge, whereby repentant persons punish themselves, thereby to satisfy God's justice for the temporal punishment of their sins. Answer: A repentant sinner must take revenge of himself, and that is only to use all means which serve to subdue the corruption of his nature, to bridle carnal

affections, and to mortify sin. These kinds of actions are restraints properly, and not punishments, and are directed against the sin and not against the person.

Lastly, they make three works of satisfaction: prayer, fasting, and almsdeeds. For the first, it is mere foolishness to think that man by prayer can satisfy for his sins. It is all one as if they had said that a beggar by asking alms should deserve his alms, or that a debtor by requesting his creditor to pardon his debt should thereby pay his debt. Secondly, fasting is a thing indifferent, of the same nature with eating and drinking, and of itself contributes nothing to the obtaining of the kingdom of heaven, no more than eating and drinking does. Thirdly and lastly, almsdeeds cannot be works of satisfaction for sins. For when we give them as we ought, we do but our duty, whereunto we are bound. We may as well say that a man by paying one debt may discharge another, as to say that by doing his duty he may satisfy God's justice for the punishment of his sins. These we confess are fruits of faith, but yet they are no works of satisfaction. The only and all-sufficient satisfaction made to God's justice for our sins is to be found in the person of Christ, procured by the merit of his death and his obedience. Thus our doctrine touching satisfaction is cleared, and it is to be learned carefully by our common people, because the opinion of human satisfaction is natural and sticks fast in the heart of natural men. When any have sinned and feel a touch of conscience, their manner is then to perform some outward humiliation and repentance, thinking thereby to stop the mouth of conscience, and by doing some ceremonial duties to appease the wrath of God for their sins.

Many think to satisfy God's justice by repeating the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments — so foolish are they in this kind.

POINT 7: OF TRADITIONS



Traditions are doctrines delivered from hand to hand, either by word of mouth or by writing, beside the written word of God.

OUR CONSENT.

Conclusion 1. We hold that the very word of God has been delivered by tradition. God first revealed his will to Adam by word of mouth, and renewed the same to the patriarchs not by writing but by speech, by dreams, and other inspirations. Thus the word of God went from man to man for the space of two thousand four hundred years, until the time of Moses, who was the first penman of holy Scripture. For the space of this time, men worshipped God and held the articles of their faith by tradition, not from men but immediately from God himself. The history of the New Testament, as some say for eighty years and as others think for twenty years and more, went from hand to hand by tradition, till penned by the Apostles, or being penned by others was approved by them.

Conclusion 2. We hold that the prophets, our Savior Christ, and his Apostles spoke and did many things good and true which were not written in the Scriptures, but came either to us or to our

ancestors only by tradition. As 2 Timothy 3:8 says, Jannes and Jambres were the magicians that withstood Moses — yet in the books of the Old Testament we shall not find them once named, and therefore it is likely that the Apostle had their names by tradition or by some writings then extant among the Jews. So Hebrews 12:21 records of Moses that when he saw a terrible sight in Mount Sinai, he said, I tremble and am afraid — words not to be found in all the books of the Old Testament. In the Epistle of Jude, mention is made that the devil strove with Michael the Archangel about the body of Moses, which point, not being found in holy writ, it seems the Apostle had by tradition from the Jews. That the prophet Isaiah was killed with a fuller's club is received for truth, but yet not recorded in Scripture. Likewise, that the Virgin Mary lived and died a virgin. Many worthy sayings of the Apostles and other holy men are recorded in ecclesiastical writers and received by us for truth, though not set down in the books of the Old or New Testament. Many things we hold for truth not written in the word, if they are not against the word.

Conclusion 3. We hold that the Church of God has power to prescribe ordinances, rules, or traditions touching time and place of God's worship, and touching order and comeliness to be used in the same. In this regard, Paul in 1 Corinthians 11:2 commends the Church of Corinth for keeping his traditions. In Acts 15, the Council at Jerusalem decreed that the churches of the Gentiles should abstain from blood and from things strangled. This decree is termed a tradition, and it was in force among them so long as the offense of the Jews remained. This kind of traditions, whether made by general councils or particular synods, we take care to maintain and observe — with these caveats: first, that they pre-

scribe nothing childish or absurd to be done; second, that they not be imposed as any parts of God's worship; third, that they be severed from superstition or opinion of merit; and lastly, that the Church of God not be burdened with the multitude of them.

THE DIFFERENCE.

Papists teach that beside the written word, there are certain unwritten traditions which must be believed as profitable and necessary to salvation. These they say are twofold: Apostolical, namely such as were delivered by the Apostles and not written; and Ecclesiastical, which the Church decrees as occasion is offered. We hold that the Scriptures are most perfect, containing in them all doctrines needful to salvation, whether they concern faith or manners. Therefore we acknowledge no such traditions beside the written word which shall be necessary to salvation — such that whoever believes them not cannot be saved.

OUR REASONS.

Testimony 1. Deuteronomy 4:2: You shall not add to the words that I command you, nor take anything therefrom. Therefore the written word is sufficient for all doctrines pertaining to salvation. If it be said that this commandment is spoken as well of the unwritten as of the written word, I answer that Moses speaks of the written word only — for these very words are a certain preface which he set before a long commentary made of the written law, to make the people more attentive and obedient.

Testimony 2. Isaiah 8:20: To the law and to the testimony. If they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them. Here the prophet teaches what must be done in cases of difficulty. Men must not run to the wizard or soothsayer but to the law and testimony, and here he commends the written word as sufficient to resolve all doubts and scruples in conscience whatsoever.

Testimony 3. John 20:31: These things were written that you might believe that Jesus is the Christ, and in believing might have everlasting life. Here is set down the full end of the Gospel and of the whole written word, which is to bring men to faith and consequently to salvation. Therefore the whole Scripture alone is sufficient to this end without traditions. If it be said that this place must be understood of Christ's miracles only, I answer that miracles without the doctrine of Christ and knowledge of his sufferings can bring no man to life everlasting. Therefore the place must be understood of the doctrine of Christ and not of his miracles alone, as Paul teaches in Galatians 1:8: If we or an angel from heaven preach to you anything beside that which we have preached, let him be accursed. And to this effect he blames those who taught a doctrine different from what he had taught in 1 Timothy 1:3.

Testimony 4. 2 Timothy 3:16-17: The whole Scripture is given by inspiration of God and is profitable to teach, to reprove, to correct, and to instruct in righteousness, that the man of God may be complete, being made perfect for every good work. In these words are contained two arguments to prove the sufficiency of Scripture without unwritten doctrines. First: that which is profitable for these four uses — to teach all necessary truth, to confute all errors, to correct faults in manners, and to instruct in righteousness — is

sufficient to salvation. But Scripture serves all these uses, and therefore it is sufficient, and unwritten traditions are superfluous. Second: that which can make the man of God — that is, prophets and apostles and the ministers of the word — perfect in all the duties of their callings is sufficient to make all other men perfect in all good works. But God's word is able to make the man of God perfect. Therefore it is sufficient to prescribe the true and perfect way to eternal life, without the help of unwritten traditions.

Testimony 5: The judgment of the Church. Tertullian says, Take from heretics the opinions which they maintain with the heathen, that they may defend their questions by Scripture alone, and they cannot stand. Again, We need no curiosity after Christ Jesus, nor inquisition after the Gospel. When we believe it, we desire to believe nothing beside — for this we first believe: that there is nothing more which we may believe. Jerome on Matthew 23, writing of an opinion that John the Baptist was killed because he foretold the coming of Christ, says: This, because it has not authority from Scriptures, may as easily be contemned as approved. In these words there is a notable argument against all unwritten traditions. Augustine, *On Christian Doctrine*, book 2, chapter 9: In those things plainly set down in Scripture are found all those points which contain faith and manners of living well. Vincent of Lerins says: The canon of Scripture is perfect and fully sufficient to itself for all things.

Beside these testimonies, other reasons serve to prove this point. First, the practice of Christ and his Apostles, who for the confirmation of the doctrine they taught always used the testimony of Scripture. It cannot be proved that they ever confirmed any doctrine by tradition. Acts 26:22: I continue to this day, witnessing

both to small and great, saying none other things than those which the prophets and Moses said should come. By this we are given to understand that we must always have recourse to the written word as being sufficient to instruct us in matters of salvation. Second, if the believing of unwritten traditions were necessary to salvation, then we must believe the writings of the ancient fathers as well as the writings of the Apostles, because Apostolical traditions are not elsewhere to be found but in their books. Yet we may not believe their sayings as the word of God, because they often err, being subject to error. For this cause their authority, when they speak of traditions, may be suspected, and we may not always believe them upon their word.

OBJECTIONS FOR TRADITIONS.

Objection 1. 2 Thessalonians 2:15: The Apostle bids that Church keep the ordinances which he taught them either by word or by letter. Hence they gather that beside the written word, there are unwritten traditions that are indeed necessary to be kept and obeyed. Answer: It is very likely that this Epistle to the Thessalonians was the first that Paul ever wrote to any church, though in order it does not have the first place. Therefore at the time when this Epistle was penned, it might well fall out that some things needful to salvation were delivered by word of mouth, not being as yet written by any Apostle. Yet the same things were afterward set down in writing, either in the second epistle or in the epistles of Paul.

Objection 2. That Scripture is Scripture is a point to be believed, but that is an unwritten tradition — and therefore there is at least one tradition not written that we are to believe. Answer: That the books of the Old and New Testament are Scripture is to

be gathered and believed not upon bare tradition, but from the very books themselves. Let a man endued with the spirit of discerning read the several books, and let him consider the professed author thereof which is God himself, and the matter therein contained, which is a most divine and absolute truth full of piety, and the manner and form of speech which is full of majesty in the simplicity of words. The end at which they wholly aim is the honor and glory of God alone. He shall be resolved that Scripture is Scripture even by the Scripture itself, and by this means he may discern any part of Scripture from the writings of men whatsoever. Scripture proves itself to be Scripture. Yet we do not despise the universal consent or tradition of the Church in this case, which though it does not persuade the conscience, yet is a notable inducement to move us to reverence and regard the writings of the prophets and Apostles. Not in any one particular place or book of Scripture, but in every line and page of the whole Bible — to him that can read with the spirit of discerning and can discern the voice of the true pastor, as the sheep of Christ can do.

Objection 3. Some books of the canon of Scripture are lost, as the book of the Wars of God (Numbers 21:14), the book of the Just (Joshua 10:13), the books of Chronicles of the kings of Israel and Judah (1 Kings 14:19), and the books of certain prophets, Nathan, Gad, Iddo, Ahijah, and Shemaiah. Therefore the matter of these books must come to us by tradition. Answer: Though it be granted that some books of canonical Scripture are lost, yet the Scripture still remains sufficient because the matter of those books, so far as it was necessary to salvation, is contained in these books of Scripture now extant. Again, I take it to be a truth that no part of the canon is lost — for Paul says in Romans 15:4: Whatever things

were written beforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope. Where he takes it for granted that the whole canon of holy Scripture was then extant. For books that are lost serve neither for learning nor comfort. Again, to hold that any books of Scripture should be lost calls into question God's providence, and the fidelity of the Church, which has the books of God in keeping and is therefore called the pillar and ground of truth. Touching the book of the Just, and the books of Chronicles — these were but as the Chronicles of England are with us: political records of the acts and events of things in the kingdoms of Judah and Israel, from which the prophets gathered things necessary to be known and placed them in holy Scripture. As for the books of Iddo, Ahijah, Shemaiah, Gad, and Nathan, they are contained in the books of Kings and Chronicles, and in the books of Samuel. As for the books of Solomon which are lost, they did not concern religion and matters of salvation, but were concerning matters of philosophy and such like things.

Objection 4. Moses in Mount Sinai, beside the written law, received from God a more secret doctrine which he never wrote, but delivered by tradition or word of mouth to the prophets after him — and this the Jews have now set down in their Kabbalah. Answer: This indeed is the opinion of some of the Jews, whom in effect and substance sundry Papists follow, but we take it for no better than a Jewish fantasy. For if Moses had known any secret doctrine beside the written law, he would never have given this commandment of the said law: You shall not add anything thereto.

Objection 5. Hebrews 5:12: God's word is of two sorts — milk and strong meat. By milk we must understand the word of God written, wherein God speaks plainly to the capacity of the rudest; but strong meat is unwritten traditions, a doctrine not to be delivered to all but to those who grow to perfection. Answer: We must know that one and the same word of God is milk and strong meat, in regard of the manner of handling and propounding of it. For being delivered generally and plainly to the capacity of the simplest, it is milk; but being handled particularly and largely, fitted for men of more understanding, it is strong meat. For example, the doctrine of creation, of man's fall, and of redemption by Christ, when taught broadly and plainly, is milk — but when the depth of the same is thoroughly opened, it is strong meat. Therefore it is a conceit of man's brain to imagine that some unwritten word is meant by strong meat.

Objection 6. Sundry places of Scripture are doubtful, and every religion has its several exposition of them — the Papists have theirs, and the Protestants theirs. Seeing there can be but one truth, when question is of the interpretation of Scripture, recourse must be had to the tradition of the Church, that the true sense may be determined and the question ended. Answer: It is not so, for in doubtful places Scripture itself is sufficient to declare its own meaning — first, by the analogy of faith, which is the sum of religion gathered out of the clearest places of Scripture; second, by the circumstances of the place and the nature and signification of the words; third, by conference of place with place. By these and like helps contained in Scripture, we may judge which is the truest

meaning of any place. Scripture itself is the text and the best commentary. And Scripture is falsely termed the matter of strife — it being not so of itself, but by the abuse of man.

Thus much for our dissent concerning traditions, wherein we must not be wavering but steadfast, because notwithstanding our renouncing of popery, popish inclinations and dispositions are rife among us. Our common people marvelously favor human traditions — yes, man's nature is inclined more to be pleased with them than with the word of God. The feast of the nativity of our Savior Christ is only a custom and tradition of the Church, and yet men are commonly more careful to keep it than the Lord's Day, the keeping of which stands by the moral law. Positive laws are not sufficient to restrain us from buying and selling on the Sabbath, yet within the twelve days no man keeps market. Again, see the truth of this in our affection to the ministry of the word: let the preacher allege Peter and Paul, the people count it but common stuff — such as any man can bring. But let men come and allege Ambrose, Augustine, and the rest of the fathers, and he is the man alone for them. Again, let any man be in danger any way, and straight he sends to the wise man or wizard: God's word is not sufficient to comfort and direct him. All this argues that popery denied with the mouth abides still in the heart. Therefore we must learn to reverence the written word by ascribing to it all manner of perfection.

POINT 8: OF VOWS



OUR CONSENT.

Touching vows this must be known: that we do not condemn them altogether, but only labor to restore the purity of doctrine touching this point, which by the Church of Rome from time to time has been corrupted and defaced. We hold therefore that a vow is a promise made to God touching some duties to be performed unto him, and it is twofold: general or special. The general vow is that which concerns all believers, and it is made in the covenant both of the law and of the Gospel. In the covenant of the Gospel there are two actions: one of God, the other of man. God in mercy on his part promises to men the remission of sins and life everlasting, and man again for his part promises to believe in Christ and to obey God in all his commandments. All men ever made this vow to God, as the Jews in circumcision, which they also renewed so often as they received the Passover. In the New Testament, all that are baptized do the like. In baptism this vow is called the pledge of a good conscience, whereby we purpose to renounce ourselves, to believe in Christ, and to bring forth the fruits of true repentance. It ought to be renewed so often as we are partakers of the supper of the Lord. This vow is necessary and must be

kept as a part of the true worship of God, because it is a promise wherein we vow to perform all duties commanded of God either in the law or in the Gospel. Though we are already bound partly by nature and partly by the written word, yet we may renew the same bond in a vow. He that is bound may further bind himself, so it be to help his dulness for want of zeal, and to make himself more forward in duties of love to men and the worship of God. To this end David swore to keep the law of God in Psalm 119:106, though he was bound to it by nature and by the written law itself.

The special vow is that which does not reach to the person of all believers, but only concerns some special men upon some special occasions. This kind of vow is twofold. The first is the vow of a ceremonial duty in the way of service to God, and it was in practice in the Church of the Jews under the Old Testament. Examples are especially two: first, the vow of the Nazirites, whereunto no kind of men were bound by God's commandment, but they bound themselves — God only prescribing the manner and order of keeping it, with rites pertaining thereto, as abstinence from wine, the not cutting of their hair, and such like. The second example is of the Jews, when of their own accord they vowed to give God house or land, sheep or oxen, or any like things for the maintenance of the legal worship, of which God also prescribes certain rules in Leviticus 27. Now these vows were part of the Jewish ceremonial law, wherein God trained up the Jews in the Old Testament. Being observed by them, they were parts of God's worship, but now under the Gospel they are not — being all abolished with the ceremonial law, to which Christ put an end at his death upon the cross. It is true Paul made a vow and afterward kept the same in the time of the New Testament (Acts 18), yet not as a part of God's worship but as a

thing indifferent for the time, wherein he only condescended to the weakness of the Jews that by this means he might bring them the better to Christ. As for Christ being called a Nazarite in Matthew 2:23, we may not think he was of that very order, because he did not abstain from wine. Rather he was so termed because he was the reality and fulfillment of that order. By it was signified that God's church was a peculiar people severed or chosen out of the world, and that Christ in respect of holiness was also separated from all sinners. Vows concerning meats, drinks, attire, touching, tasting, times, places, and days were proper to the Jews.

The second kind of special vow is that whereby a man promises freely to perform some outward and bodily exercise for some good end. This vow, if made accordingly, is lawful and belongs both to the Church of the Old and New Testament. In the Old Testament we have the example of the Rechabites (Jeremiah 35), who by the appointment of Jonadab their father abstained from strong drink and wine, from planting vineyards and orchards. Jonadab intended only to prepare them beforehand and acquaint them with their future condition and state, that they should be strangers in a foreign land, and so prepare themselves to endure hardship in time to come. Now in the New Testament we have warrant likewise to vow — as if a man by drinking wine or strong drink finds himself prone to drunkenness, he may vow with himself to drink no more wine or strong drink for so long as he finds the drinking thereof will stir up his infirmity and minister occasion of sinning. Of this kind also are the vows in which we purpose and promise to God to keep set times of fasting, to task ourselves in prayer and reading of holy Scriptures, to give set alms for special causes known to ourselves, and to do sundry like duties. That we be not

deceived in making such vows, certain rules must be remembered. First, the vow must be agreeable to God's will and word — for if it is otherwise, the making as also the keeping of it is sin. Vows must not be the bonds of iniquity. Second, it must be so made that it may stand with Christian liberty, for we may not make such things necessary in conscience which God has made free. Christian liberty allows us the free use of all things indifferent, so it be out of the case of offense. Hence it follows that vows must be made and kept, or not kept, insofar as in conscience they may stand or not stand with our liberty purchased by Christ. Third, the vow must be made with the consent of superiors, if we are under governance. Thus among the Jews, the vow of a daughter might not stand unless the consent of parents came thereunto. Fourth, it must be within the power and ability of the maker to do or not to do — a vow made of a thing impossible is no vow. Fifth, it must be agreeable to the calling of him that makes it: both to his general calling as he is a Christian, and to that particular calling wherein he lives. If it is against either one or both, it is unlawful. Sixth, it must be made with deliberation — rash vows are not lawful, though the things vowed may be done lawfully. Seventh, the end must be good, which is to preserve and exercise the gifts of faith, prayer, repentance, obedience, and other virtues of the mind, as also to testify our thankfulness to God for blessings received. These are the principal rules which must be observed in making vows. Herewith must be remembered that vows made in this manner are by themselves no part of God's worship, but only helps and furtherances thereunto. Thus are we to esteem of all the vows of the New Testament.

THE DISSENT OR DIFFERENCE.

The points of difference between us touching vows are especially three. First, the Church of Rome teaches that in the New Testament we are as much bound to make vows as was the Church of the Jews, and that even in external exercises. We say no, considering the ceremonial law is now abolished, and we have only two ceremonies by commandment to be observed: baptism and the supper of the Lord. Again, we are not so much bound to make or keep vows as the Jews were, because they had a commandment so to do and we have none at all. But they allege to the contrary the prophet Isaiah, chapter 19:21, who speaking of the time of the Gospel says: The Egyptians shall know the Lord, and shall vow to him and keep it. I answer two ways: first, that the prophet in this place expresses and signifies the spiritual worship of the New Testament by the ceremonial worship then used, as he does also in the last chapter where he calls the ministers of the New Testament priests and Levites. Second, we grant the Church of the New Testament makes vows to God, but they are of moral and evangelical duties which must not be left undone. So often as we come to the Lord's Table, we in heart renew the vow and promise of obedience. And though vows be made of things and actions indifferent, yet they are not any parts of God's worship — which is the point to be proved.

Again they allege Psalm 76:11: Vow to God and perform it. And they say that this commandment binds all men. Answer: That commandment first binds the Jews to the making of ceremonial vows. Again, David here speaks of the vowing of praise and thanksgiving to God, and so he expounds himself in Psalm 56:12: My

vows are upon me, I will offer praises to God. This vow indeed concerns all men because it respects a moral duty, which is to set forth the praise of God.

Second point of difference. They also hold that vows made even of things not commanded — as meats, drinks, attire, and the like — are parts of God's worship, and indeed tend to a state of perfection, in that the keeping of them brings man to a higher estate than the keeping of the law can do. We flatly say no, holding that lawful vows are certain props of God's worship and not the worship itself. For Paul says plainly in 1 Timothy 4:8: Bodily exercise profits little, but godliness is profitable for much. Again, as God's kingdom is, so must his worship be. God's kingdom stands not in outward things, as in eating, drinking, and such like actions, and therefore his worship stands not in outward things.

Third point of difference. They maintain such vows as are not agreeable to the rules before named, and herein also we are to dissent from them. The first and principal is the vow of continency, whereby a man promises to God to keep chastity always in single life, that is, outside the estate of wedlock. This kind of vow is flat against the word of God, and therefore unlawful. For Paul says in 1 Corinthians 7:9: If they cannot contain, let them marry. 1 Timothy 4:1: It is a doctrine of devils to forbid to marry. Hebrews 13:4: Marriage is honorable among all, and the bed undefiled. Again, this vow is not in the power of him that vows, for continency is the gift of God, who gives it not to all but to whom he will and when he will and as long as he will. They allege that in the want of continency, fasting and prayer obtain it. Answer: It is not so. God's gifts are of two sorts: some are common to all believers, as the gift of faith, repentance, and the fear of God; others are peculiar to some

only, as the gift of continency (1 Corinthians 7:7): I would that all men were as I myself am, but every man has his proper gift of God — one this way, another that way. Now if we fast and pray for the increase of the common gifts of God, as faith, repentance, and all such as are needful to salvation, we may obtain them in some measure. But the like cannot be said of particular gifts. The child of God may pray for health or wealth and not obtain either in this world, because it is not the will of God to grant these blessings to all men. Paul prayed three times to be delivered from a temptation and yet did not obtain his request. So may we likewise pray for chastity in single estate and yet never obtain it, because it may be that it is the will of God to save us without it. This vow therefore we abhor as a thing that has heretofore and does still bring forth innumerable abominations in the world. Yet mark how we do this: though we dislike the vow, we like and commend single life. Marriage is better in two respects: first, because God has ordained it to be a remedy of incontinency for all such persons as cannot contain; second, because it is the nursery both of church and commonwealth, bringing forth a seed of God for the enlarging of his kingdom. Yet single life in those that have the gift of continency is in some respects to be preferred. First, because it brings liberty in persecution (1 Corinthians 7:26): I suppose it to be good for the present necessity for a man so to be. Second, because it frees men from the common cares, troubles, and distractions in the family (verse 28): Such shall have trouble in the flesh, but I spare you. Third, because single persons do commonly with more bodily ease and liberty worship God — it being still presupposed that they

have the gift of continency (verse 34): The unmarried woman cares for the things of the Lord, that she may be holy both in body and spirit.

Again, though we dislike the vow, yet we hold and teach that men or women, being assured that they have the gift of continency, may constantly resolve and purpose with themselves to live a single life (1 Corinthians 7:37): He that stands firm in his own heart, having no need, but has power over his own will, and has so decreed in his heart that he will keep his virgin — he does well. We embrace the saying of Theodoret on 1 Timothy chapter 4: He does not blame single life or continency, but he accuses those who by enacted law compel men to follow these. Men made themselves chaste for the kingdom of heaven (Matthew 19:12), not by vow but by a purpose of heart, which is far less than a vow and may be changed upon occasion, whereas a vow cannot unless it evidently appear to be unlawful.

Thirdly, for such persons as are able to contain, to live single for the ends before named — indeed we hold it to be no counsel of perfection, yet we do not deny it to be a counsel of expediency or outward ease. According to that which Paul says in verse 25: I give my advice — and verse 35: I speak this for your benefit, not to ensnare you.

Lastly, we think that if any having the gift of continency do make a vow to live single, and yet afterward marry (the said gift remaining), they have sinned — yet not because they are married, but because their vow is broken. And thus said Augustine of widows that married after their vow, in his book *On the Good of Widowhood*, chapter 9.

The second is the vow of poverty and monastic life, in which men bestow all they have on the poor and give themselves wholly and only to prayer and fasting. This vow is against the will of God. Acts 20:35: It is a more blessed thing to give than to receive. Proverbs 30:8: Give me neither riches nor poverty. Deuteronomy 28:22: Poverty is numbered among the curses of the law, none of which are to be vowed. And it is the rule of the Holy Spirit in 2 Thessalonians 3:10: He that will not labor in some special and warrantable calling must not eat. And verse 12: I exhort that they work with quietness and eat their own bread. Now when men live apart from others, giving themselves only to prayer and fasting, they live in no calling. And it is against the general vow made in baptism, because it frees men from sundry duties of the moral law and changes the proper end of man's life. For every man must have two callings. The first is the general calling of a Christian, by virtue of which he performs worship to God and duties of love to men. The second is a particular calling, wherein according to his gift he must do service to men in some function pertaining either to the church or commonwealth of which he is a member. The first of these two must be performed in the second, and the second in and with the first. The end of man's life is not only to serve God by the duties of the first table, but by serving man in the duties of the second table to serve God. Therefore the love of our neighbor is called the fulfilling of the whole law (Romans 13:10), because the law of God is practiced not apart but in and with the love of our neighbor. This being so, it is manifest that vowed poverty in monkish life makes many unprofitable members both of church and commonwealth.

Though we dislike this vow also, we do it holding these conclusions. First, a man may forsake all his goods upon special calling, as the Apostles did when they were sent to preach the Gospel through the whole world. Second, goods may be forsaken — yes, wife, children, parents, brothers, and all — in the case of confession: that is, when a man for the religion of Christ is persecuted and constrained to forsake all he has. For then the second table gives place to the duties of the first (Mark 10:29). Second, for the time of persecution, men may withdraw themselves (just occasion offered) and go apart to wildernesses or like places (Hebrews 11:37). Yet for the time of peace I see no cause of solitary life. If it be alleged that men go apart for contemplation and spiritual exercises, I say again that God's grace may as well be exercised in the family as in the cloister. The family is indeed as it were a school of God, in which those that have but a spark of grace may learn and exercise many virtues — the acknowledgement of God, invocation, the fear of God, love, generosity, patience, meekness, faithfulness, and so on. Nay, here are more occasions of doing or receiving good than are or can be in a cloister. Third, we do not condemn the old and ancient monks, though we do not like everything in them. For they lived not as idle persons, but in the sweat of their own brows as they ought to do, and many of them were married. In their meat, drink, apparel, rule, vow, and whole course of life they differed from the monks of this time even as heaven from earth.

The third vow is of regular obedience, whereby men give themselves to keep some devised rule or order, standing most commonly in the observance of exercises in outward things, as meats, drinks, and apparel. This vow is against Christian liberty, whereby is granted a free use of all things indifferent, so it be without the

case of offense. Galatians 5:1: Stand fast in the liberty wherein Christ has made you free. Colossians 2:16: Let no man judge you in meat or drink. To conclude: whereas the Papists magnify these their vows and yet make no such account of the vow in baptism, we for our parts must be contrary to them not only in judgment but also in practice. We ought to have special care to make good the vows we have pledged to God according to his commandment. In our creation we made a vow of obedience, and being received into the covenant of grace, we vowed to believe in Christ and to bring forth fruits of new obedience. This vow is renewed as often as we come to the Lord's Table. Our duty therefore is to perform them also to God, as David says: Vow unto God and keep it. If we keep them not, all turns to our shame and confusion. Men stand much on the keeping of that word which they have passed to men, and it is taken for a point of much honesty, as it is indeed. Now then, if there be such care to keep trust with men, much more should we have care to keep covenant with God.

POINT 9: OF IMAGES



OUR CONSENT.

Conclusion 1. We acknowledge the civil use of images as freely and truly as the Church of Rome does. By civil use I understand that use which is made of them in the common societies of men, outside the appointed places of the solemn worship of God. That this is lawful appears because the arts of painting and engraving are the ordinance of God, and to be skillful in them is the gift of God, as the example of Bezaleel and Aholiab declares in Exodus 35:30. This use of images may be in sundry things. First, in the adorning and setting forth of buildings — thus Solomon beautified his throne with the image of lions, and the Lord commanded his temple to be adorned with the images of palm trees, pomegranates, bulls, cherubs, and such like. Second, it serves for the distinction of coins, according to the practice of emperors and princes of all nations. When Christ was asked in Matthew 22 whether it was lawful to give tribute to Caesar or no, he called for a penny and said: Whose image or superscription is this? They said, Caesar's. He then said: Give to Caesar the things that are Caesar's — not condemning but approving the stamp or image upon his coin. Third, images serve to keep in memory friends deceased

whom we reverence. It is likely that hence came one occasion of the images now in use in the Roman Church — for in the days after the Apostles, men used privately to keep the pictures of their departed friends, and this practice afterward crept into the open congregation, and at last, superstition getting the upper hand, images began to be worshipped.

Conclusion 2. We hold the historical use of images to be good and lawful: that is, to represent to the eye the acts of histories, whether they be human or divine. Thus we think the histories of the Bible may be painted in private places.

Conclusion 3. In one case it is lawful to make an image to testify the presence or the effects of the majesty of God — namely when God himself gives a special commandment to do so. In this case Moses made and erected a bronze serpent, to be a type, sign, or image to represent Christ crucified (John 3:14). And the cherubs over the mercy seat served to represent the majesty of God, to whom the angels are subject. In the second commandment it is not simply said, You shall not make a carved image, but with limitation: You shall not make for yourself — that is, on your own authority and by your own will and pleasure.

Conclusion 4. The right images of the New Testament, which we hold and acknowledge, are the doctrine and preaching of the Gospel, and all things that by the word of God pertain thereto. Galatians 3:1: Who has bewitched you, that you should not obey the truth — to whom Jesus Christ was before described in your sight and among you crucified? Hence it follows that the preaching of the word is as a most excellent picture in which Christ with his benefits is lively represented to us. We do not dissent from Origen who says: We have no images framed by any base craftsmen, but

such as are brought forth and framed by the word of God, namely patterns of virtue and representations resembling Christians. He means that Christians themselves are the images of Christians.

THE DIFFERENCE.

Our dissent from them touching images stands in three points. First, the Church of Rome holds it lawful for them to make images to resemble God, though not in respect of his divine nature, yet in respect of some properties and actions. We on the contrary hold it unlawful for us to make any image in any way to represent the true God, or to make an image of anything in way of religion to worship God, much less the creature thereby. For the second commandment says plainly in Exodus 20:4: You shall not make for yourself any carved image, or the likeness of anything in heaven, and so on. The Papists say the commandment is meant of the images of false gods. But it must be understood of the images of the true God Jehovah — it forbids us to resemble God, either in his nature, properties, or works, or to use any resemblance of him for any sacred use, as to help the memory when we are about to worship God. Thus much the Holy Ghost, who is the best expositor of himself, teaches most plainly in Deuteronomy 4:15-16: You saw no image at all — either of false or true God — and therefore you shall not make any likeness of anything. Again, the prophet Isaiah in chapter 40:18 rebuking idolaters asks: To whom will you liken God, or what resemblance will you set upon him? And in verse 21: Know you nothing? Have you not heard? Has it not been told you from the beginning? — as if he should say: Have you forgotten the second commandment that God gave to your fathers? Thus he flatly reproveth all who would resemble the true God in images. But

they say further that by images in the second commandment are meant idols — that is, such things as men worship for gods. Answer: If it were so, we should confound the first and second commandments. For the first, You shall have no other gods before my face, forbids all false gods which man wickedly frames to himself. And the distinction they make — that an image is the representation of true things, and an idol of things supposed — is false. Tertullian says that every form or representation is to be termed an idol. Isidore says that the heathen used the names of image and idol indifferently in one and the same signification. Stephen in his defense in Acts 7:41 calls the golden calf an idol. Jerome says that idols are images of dead men. Ancient divines accord with all this. Lactantius says: Where images are for religion's sake, there is no religion. The Council of Elvira decreed that nothing should be painted on the walls of churches which is adored by the people. Origen: We suffer not any to worship Jesus at altars, images, and temples, because it is written: You shall have no other gods. Epiphanius says: It is against the authority of the Scriptures to see the image of Christ or of any saints hanging in the church. In the Seventh Council of Constantinople these words of Epiphanius are cited: Be mindful, beloved children, not to bring images into the church, nor set them in the places where the saints are buried, but always carry God in your hearts. Neither let them be suffered in any common house, for it is not fitting that a Christian should be occupied by the eyes but by the meditation of the mind.

ARGUMENTS OF THE PAPISTS.

Objection 1. In Solomon's temple were erected cherubim, which were images of angels, on the mercy seat where God was worshipped, and thereby was resembled the majesty of God. Therefore it is lawful to make images to resemble God. Answer: They were erected by special commandment from God, who prescribed the very form of them and the place where they must be set. Thereby Moses had a warrant to make them — otherwise he would have sinned. Let them show a like warrant for their images if they can. Secondly, the cherubim were placed in the Holy of Holies, in the most inward place of the temple, and consequently were removed from the sight of the people, who only heard of them. None but the high priest saw them, and that but once a year. And the cherubim outside the veil, though they were to be seen, yet were they not to be worshipped (Exodus 20:4). Therefore they serve nothing at all to justify the images of the Church of Rome.

Objection 2. God appeared in the form of a man to Abraham (Genesis 18) and to Daniel, who saw the Ancient of Days sitting on a throne (Daniel 7). Now as God appeared, so may he be resembled — therefore it is lawful to resemble God in the form of a man or any like image in which he showed himself to men. Answer: The proposition is false, for God may appear in whatever form it pleases his majesty, yet it does not follow that man should therefore resemble God in those forms, man having no liberty to resemble him in any form at all unless he is commanded to do so. Again, when God appeared in the form of a man, that form was a sign of God's presence only for the time when God appeared and no longer — as the bread and wine in the sacrament are signs of Christ's body and blood, not forever but for the time of administration. And when the Holy Spirit appeared in the likeness of a dove,

that likeness was a sign of his presence no longer than the Holy Spirit so appeared. Therefore he who would in these forms represent the Trinity does greatly dishonor God and does that for which he has no warrant.

Objection 3. Man is the image of God, but it is lawful to paint a man, and therefore to make the image of God. Answer: A mere quibble — for first, a man cannot be painted as he is the image of God, which stands in the spiritual gifts of righteousness and true holiness. Again, the image of a man may be painted for civil or historical use, but to paint any man for the purpose of representing God, or in way of religion that we may the better remember and worship God — that is unlawful. Other reasons which they use are of small moment, and therefore I omit them.

Second difference. They teach and maintain that images of God and of saints may be worshipped with religious worship, especially the crucifix. For Thomas Aquinas says: Seeing the cross represents Christ, who died upon a cross and is to be worshipped with divine honor, it follows that the cross is to be worshipped so too. We on the contrary hold they may not. Our principal ground is the second commandment, which contains two parts: the first forbids the making of images to resemble the true God; the second forbids the worshipping of them, or God in them, in these words: You shall not bow down to them. Now, there can be no worship done to anything less than the bending of the knee. Again, the bronze serpent was a type or image of Christ crucified (John 3:14), appointed by God himself. Yet when the people burned incense to it, Hezekiah broke it in pieces and is therefore commended (2 Kings 18:4). And when the devil bade our Savior Christ but to bow down the knee to him and he would give him the whole world, Christ rejected his of-

fer, saying: You shall worship the Lord your God, and him only shall you serve (Matthew 4:10). Again, it is lawful for one man to worship another with civil worship, but to worship man with religious honor is unlawful. For all religious worship is prescribed in the first table, and the honor due to man is only prescribed in the second table and the first commandment thereof: Honor your father — which honor is therefore civil and not religious. Now the meanest man that can be is a more excellent image of God than all the images of God or of saints devised by men. Augustine, and long after him Gregory, in plain terms denies that images are to be adored.

The Papists defend their opinion by these reasons. Psalm 99:5: Cast yourselves down before his footstool. Answer: The words are thus to be read: Bow at his footstool, that is, at the ark and mercy seat, for there he has made a promise of his presence. The words therefore say not bow to the ark, but to God at the ark.

Objection 2. Exodus 3:5: God said to Moses, Stand far off and put off your shoes, for the place is holy. Now if holy places must be revered, then much more holy images, as the cross of Christ and such like. Answer: God commanded the ceremony of putting off shoes that he might thereby strike Moses with a religious reverence, not of the place but of his own majesty, whose presence made the place holy. Let them show a like warrant for images.

Objection 3. It is lawful to kneel down to a chair of estate in the absence of the king or queen — therefore much more to the images of God and of saints in heaven glorified, being absent from us. Answer: To kneel to the chair of estate is no more than a civil testimony or sign of civil reverence, by which all good subjects when occasion is offered show their loyalty and subjection to their lawful

princes. This kneeling, being in this manner and to no other end, has sufficient warrant in the word of God. But kneeling to the image of any saint departed is religious worship, and consequently more than civil worship, as the Papists themselves confess. The argument therefore proves nothing, unless they will keep themselves to one and the same kind of worship.

Third difference. The Papists also teach that God may be lawfully worshipped in images in which he has appeared to men — as the Father in the image of an old man, the Son in the image of a man crucified, and the Holy Spirit in the likeness of a dove. But we hold it unlawful to worship God in, by, or at any image, for this is what the second commandment forbids. And the fact of the Israelites in Exodus 32, in worshipping the golden calf, is condemned as flat idolatry — albeit they worshipped not the calf but God in the calf. For in verse 5, Aaron says: Tomorrow shall be the feast of the Lord, whereby he gives us to understand that the calf was but a sign of the Lord whom they worshipped. They say it seems the Israelites worshipped the calf, for Aaron says in verse 4: These are your gods, O Israel, that brought you out of Egypt. Answer: Aaron's meaning is nothing else but that the golden calf was a sign of the presence of the true God. The name of the thing signified is given to the sign, as upon a stage he is called a king who represents the king. Augustine says that images are used to be called by the names of the things of which they are images, as the counterfeit of Samuel is called Samuel. And we must not esteem them all as madmen to think that a calf made of their earrings, being but one or two days old, should be the God that brought them out of Egypt with a mighty hand many days before.

These are the points of difference touching images, wherein we must stand at variance forever with the Church of Rome. For they err in the foundation of religion, making indeed an idol of the true God and worshipping a different Christ than we do, under new terms, maintaining the idolatry of the heathen. Therefore we have departed from them, and so must we still do because they are idolaters, as I have proved.

POINT 10: OF THE REAL PRESENCE



OUR CONSENT.

We hold and believe a presence of Christ's body and blood in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper — and that no feigned, but a true and real presence — which must be considered two ways: first in respect of the signs, and secondly in respect of the communicants. For the first, we hold and teach that Christ's body and blood are truly present with the bread and wine, being signs in the sacrament. But how? Not in respect of place or coexistence, but by sacramental relation, on this manner. When a word is uttered, the sound comes to the ear, and at the same instant the thing signified comes to the mind — and thus by relation the word and the thing spoken of are both present together. Even so at the Lord's Table, bread and wine must not be considered merely as substances and creatures, but as outward signs in relation to the body and blood of Christ. This relation, arising from the very institution of the sacrament, stands in this: that when the elements of bread and wine are present to the hand and mouth of the receiver, at the very same time the body and blood of Christ are presented to the mind. Thus and no otherwise is Christ truly present with the signs. The second presence is in respect of the

communicants, to whose believing hearts he is also really present. What kind of presence is this? Such as the communion in the sacrament is — and by the communion must we judge of the presence. Now the communion is on this manner: God the Father, according to the tenor of the evangelical covenant, gives Christ in this sacrament as really and truly as anything can be given to man — not by part and piecemeal, but whole Christ, God and man. In Christ there are two natures, the Godhead and the manhood. The Godhead is not given in regard of substance or essence, but only in regard of efficacy, merits, and operation conveyed thence to the manhood. In this sacrament, Christ's whole manhood is given — both body and soul — in this order: first of all is given the very manhood in respect of substance, and that really; secondly the merits and benefits thereof, namely the satisfaction performed by and in the manhood to the justice of God. Thus the entire manhood with the benefits thereof is given wholly and jointly together. For the two distinct signs of bread and wine signify not two distinct givings of the body apart and the blood apart, but the full and perfect nourishment of our souls. Again, the benefits of Christ's manhood are diversely given: some by imputation, which is an action of God accepting that which is done by Christ as done by us — and thus it has pleased God to give the passion of Christ and his obedience. Some again are given by a kind of propagation: as one candle is lighted by another and one torch's light is conveyed to twenty candles, even so the inherent righteousness of every believer is derived from the storehouse of righteousness which is in the manhood of Christ. For the righteousness of all the members is but the fruit thereof, even as the natural corruption in all mankind is but a fruit of that original sin which was in Adam. Thus we see

how God for his part gives Christ, and that really. To proceed: when God gives Christ, he gives withal at the same time the Spirit of Christ, which Spirit creates in the heart of the receiver the instrument of true faith, by which the heart really receives Christ as given by God, by resting upon the promise which God has made that he will give Christ and his righteousness to every true believer. Now then, when God gives Christ with his benefits, and man for his part by faith receives the same as they are given, there arises that union which is between every good receiver and Christ himself. This union is not forged but a real, true, and near conjunction — nearer than which none is or can be — because it is made by a solemn giving and receiving that passes between God and man, as also by the bond of one and the same Spirit. To come then to the point: considering there is a real union and consequently a real communion between us and Christ, there must needs be such a kind of presence wherein Christ is truly and really present to the heart of him that receives the sacrament in faith. Thus far do we consent with the Roman Church touching real presence.

THE DISSENT.

We differ not touching the presence itself, but only in the manner of presence. For though we hold a real presence of Christ's body and blood in the sacrament, yet we do not take it to be local, bodily, or substantial, but spiritual and mystical — to the signs by sacramental relation, and to the communicants by faith alone. On the contrary, the Church of Rome maintains transubstantiation, that is, a local, bodily, and substantial presence of Christ's body and blood, by a change and conversion of the bread and wine into the said body and blood.

OUR REASONS.

Reason 1. This bodily presence overturns sundry articles of faith. We believe that the body of Christ was made of the pure substance of the Virgin Mary, and that but once, namely when he was conceived by the Holy Spirit and born. But this cannot stand if the body of Christ is made of bread and his blood of wine, as they must needs be if there is no succession or annihilation but a real conversion of substances in the sacrament — unless we must believe contradictions, that his body was made of the substance of the Virgin and not of the Virgin; made once and not once but often. Again, if his body and blood are under the forms of bread and wine, then he is not yet ascended into heaven but remains still among us. Neither can he be said to come from heaven at the day of judgment, for he that must come thence to judge the quick and dead must be absent from the earth. Augustine says that Christ according to his majesty and providence and grace is present with us to the end of the world, but according to his assumed flesh he is not always with us. Cyril says he is absent in body and present in power, whereby all things are governed. Vigilus says that he is gone from us according to his humanity — he has left us in his humanity; in the form of a servant he is absent from us; when his flesh was on earth it was not in heaven; being on earth he was not in heaven; and being now in heaven he is not on earth. Fulgentius says: One and the same Christ, according to his human substance, was absent from heaven when he was on earth, and left the earth when he ascended into heaven.

Reason 2. This bodily presence overturns the nature of a true body, whose common nature or essential property is to have length, breadth, and thickness. These being taken away, a body is

no more a body. By reason of these three dimensions, a body can occupy but one place at once — as Aristotle said, the property of a body is to be situated in some place, so that a man may say where it is. They therefore that hold the body of Christ to be in many places at once make it no body at all, but rather a spirit, and that infinite. They allege that God is almighty — that is true indeed, but in this and like matters we must not dispute what God can do, but what he will do. And I say further: because God is omnipotent, therefore there are some things which he cannot do, as to deny himself, to lie, and to make the parts of a contradiction both true at the same time. To come to the point: if God should make the very body of Christ to be in many places at once, he should make it to be no body while it remains a body — to be circumscribed in some one place and not circumscribed, to be visible in heaven and invisible in the sacrament. Thus he should make contradictions to be true, which to do is against his nature and argues rather impotence than power. Augustine says to this purpose: If he could lie, deceive, be deceived, deal unjustly, he would not be omnipotent. And: Therefore he is omnipotent, because he cannot do these things. Again: He is called omnipotent by doing what he will, and not by doing what he will not — which if it should befall him, he would not be omnipotent.

Reason 3. Transubstantiation overturns the very Supper of the Lord. For in every sacrament there must be a sign, a thing signified, and a proportion or relation between them both. But popish real presence takes all away, for when the bread is really turned into Christ's body and the wine into his blood, the sign is abolished and there remains nothing but the outward forms or appearance of bread and wine. Again, it abolishes the ends of the sacrament, of

which one is to remember Christ till his coming again. He being present in the sacrament bodily needs not to be remembered, because aids of remembrance are of things absent. Another end is to nourish the soul unto eternal life, but by transubstantiation the principal feeding is of the body and not of the soul, which is only fed with spiritual food. For though the body may be bettered by the food of the soul, yet the soul cannot be fed with bodily food.

Reason 4. In the sacrament the body of Christ is received as it was crucified, and his blood as it was shed upon the cross. But now at this time Christ's body crucified remains still as a body, but not as a body crucified, because the act of crucifying has ceased. Therefore it is faith alone that makes Christ crucified to be present to us in the sacrament. Again, the blood which ran out of the feet and hands and side of Christ upon the cross was not gathered up again and put into the veins. The collection was needless because after the resurrection he lived no more a natural but a spiritual life, and none knows what has become of this blood. The Papist therefore cannot say it is present under the form of wine locally. We may better say it is received spiritually by faith, whose property is to give a being to things which are not.

Reason 5. 1 Corinthians 10:3-4: The fathers of the Old Testament did eat the same spiritual meat and drink the same spiritual drink, for they drank of the rock which was Christ. Now they could not eat his body which was crucified, or drink his blood shed bodily, but by faith, because then his body and blood were not yet in existence. The Papists answer that the fathers ate the same meat and drank the same spiritual drink with themselves, not with us. But their answer is against the text. For the Apostle's intent is to prove that the Jews were every way equal to the

Corinthians, because they ate the same spiritual meat and drank the same spiritual drink with the Corinthians. Otherwise his argument would not prove the point he has in hand, namely that the Israelites were nothing inferior to the Corinthians.

Reason 6. As it may be said that the Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath, so it may be said that the sacrament of the Lord's Supper was made for man and not man for it. Therefore man is more excellent than the sacrament. But if the signs of bread and wine are really turned into the body and blood of Christ, then the sacrament is infinitely better than man, who in his best estate is only joined to Christ and made a member of his mystical body, whereas the bread and wine are made very Christ. But the sacrament or outward elements are indeed not better than man, the end being always better than the thing ordained to the end. It remains therefore that Christ's presence is not bodily but spiritual. Again, in the Supper of the Lord, every believer receives whole Christ, God and man, though not the Godhead. Now by this carnal eating we receive not whole Christ but only a part of his manhood. Therefore in the sacrament there is no carnal eating, and consequently no bodily presence.

Reason 7: The judgment of the ancient Church. Theodoret says: The same Christ, who called his natural body food and bread, who also called himself a vine, vouchsafed the visible signs the name of his own body — not changing nature, but adding grace to nature. And: The mystical signs after sanctification do not lose their proper nature, for they remain in their first nature and keep their first figure and form — and as before may be touched and seen. Gelasius says: Bread and wine pass into the substance of the body and blood of Christ, yet so as the substance or nature of

bread and wine ceases not. And they are turned into the divine substance, yet the bread and wine remain still in the property of their nature. Peter Lombard says: If it be asked what conversion this is, whether formal or substantial or of another kind, I am not able to define. That the fathers did not hold transubstantiation I prove by sundry reasons. First, they used in former times to burn with fire whatever remained after the administration of the Lord's Supper. Second, by the sacramental union of the bread and wine with the body and blood of Christ, they used to confirm the personal union of the manhood of Christ with the Godhead against heretics — which argument they would not have used if they had believed a popish real presence. Third, it was a custom in Constantinople that if many parts of the sacrament remained after administration, young children should be sent for from school to eat them — yet these same children were barred from the Lord's Table. This argues plainly that the Church in those days took the bread after administration was ended for common bread. Again, it was once an order in the Roman Church that the wine should be consecrated by dipping into it bread that had been consecrated — but this order cannot stand with the real presence, in which the bread is turned into both the body and the blood. Nicholas Cabasilas says: After he has spoken some words to the people, he lifts their minds and raises their thoughts from earth and says, Lift up your hearts — let us think on things above and not on things that are upon the earth.

OBJECTIONS OF PAPISTS.

Objection 1. John 6:55: My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. Therefore (say they) Christ's body must be eaten with the mouth and his blood drunk accordingly. Answer: The chapter must be understood of a spiritual eating of Christ. His body is meat indeed, but spiritual meat, and his blood is spiritual drink, to be received not by the mouth but by faith. This is the very point that Christ here intends to prove, namely that to believe in him and to eat his flesh and to drink his blood are all one. Again, this chapter must not be understood of that special eating of Christ in the sacrament — for it is said generally in verse 53: Unless you eat the flesh of Christ and drink his blood, you have no life in you. If these very words, which are the substance of the chapter, must be understood of a sacramental eating, then no man before the coming of Christ was saved, for none did bodily eat or drink his body or blood, since it was not then existing in nature but only present to the believing heart by faith.

Objection 2. Another argument is taken from the words of the institution: This is my body. Therefore (say they) Christ's body must be received literally. It is objected that when any make their last wills and testaments they speak as plainly as they can — and in this Supper Christ ratifies his last will and testament, and therefore he spoke plainly, without any figure. Answer: Christ here speaks plainly and by a figure also, for it has always been the usual manner of the Lord in speaking of sacraments to give the name of the thing signified to the sign. As Genesis 17:10: Circumcision is called the covenant of God, and in the next verse in way of exposition, the sign of the covenant. And Exodus 12:11: The Passover lamb is called the passing over of the houses of the Israelites, whereas indeed it was but a sign thereof. And 1 Corinthians 10:4:

The rock was Christ. 1 Corinthians 5:7: The Passover was Christ. The like phrase is to be found in the institution of this sacrament concerning the cup, which the Papists themselves confess to be figurative — when it is said in Luke 22: This cup is the new testament in my blood, that is, a sign, seal, and pledge thereof. Again, the time when these words were spoken must be considered: it was before the passion of Christ, when yet his body was not crucified nor his blood shed. Consequently neither of them could be received in bodily manner, but by faith alone. Again, Christ was not only the author but the minister of this sacrament at the time of its institution. If the bread had been truly turned into his body, Christ with his own hands would have taken his own body and blood and given them to his disciples. Nay, which is more, he would with his own hands have taken his own flesh and drunk his own blood — he would have eaten himself. For Christ himself did eat the bread and drink the wine, that he might with his own person consecrate his Last Supper, as he had consecrated baptism before. And if these words should be properly understood, every man must be a manslayer in his eating of Christ. Lastly, by means of popish real presence, it comes to pass that our bodies should be nourished by naked qualities without any substance, which in all philosophy is false and erroneous. To help this and the like absurdities, some Papists make nine wonders in the sacrament — that Christ's body is as large a quantity as when on the cross and yet exceeds not the quantity of the bread; that there are accidents without a subject; that bread is turned into the body of Christ and yet is not the matter of the body; that the body of Christ is not increased by consecration of many hosts nor diminished by frequent receiving; and so

on. On this manner it will be easy for any man to defend the most absurd opinion that is or can be, if he may have liberty to answer arguments alleged to the contrary by wonders.

To conclude: seeing there is a real communion in the sacrament between Christ and every believing heart, our duty therefore is to bestow our hearts on Christ, endeavoring to love him, and to rejoice in him, and to long after him above all things. All our trust must be in him and with him. We being now on earth must have our conversation in heaven. And this is the true real presence which the ancient Church of God has commended to us. For in all these liturgies these words were used — and are yet extant in the Popish Mass: Lift up your hearts; we lift them up to the Lord. By which words the communicants were admonished to direct their minds and their faith to Christ sitting at the right hand of God. Thus said Augustine: If we celebrate the ascension of the Lord with devotion, let us ascend with him and lift up our hearts. Again: They who are already risen with Christ in faith and hope are invited to the great table of heaven, to the table of angels, where is the bread.

POINT 11: OF THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS



Touching this point, first I will set down what must be understood by the name Sacrifice. A sacrifice is taken properly or improperly. Properly it is a sacred or solemn action in which man offers and consecrates some outward bodily thing unto God for this end: to please and honor him thereby. Thus all the sacrifices of the Old Testament and the oblation of Christ upon the cross in the New Testament are sacrifices. Improperly — that is, only by way of resemblance — the duties of the moral law are called sacrifices. In handling this question, I understand a sacrifice both properly and improperly by way of resemblance.

OUR CONSENT.

Our consent I set down in two conclusions. Conclusion 1. The Supper of the Lord is a sacrifice and may truly be so called as it has been in former ages, and that in three respects. First, because it is a memorial of the real sacrifice of Christ upon the cross, and contains withal a thanksgiving to God for the same — which thanksgiving is the sacrifice and calves of our lips (Hebrews 13:15). Second, because every communicant there presents himself, body

and soul, a living, holy, and acceptable sacrifice unto God. For as in this sacrament God gives to us Christ with his benefits, so we answerable give up ourselves to God as servants to walk in the practice of all dutiful obedience. Third, it is called a sacrifice in respect of that which was joined with the sacrament, namely the alms given to the poor as a testimony of our thankfulness to God. In this regard also the ancient fathers called the sacrament an unbloody sacrifice, and the table an altar, and the ministers priests, and the whole action an oblation — not to God but to the congregation, and not by the priest alone but by the people. A canon of a certain council says: We decree that every Lord's Day the oblation of the altar be offered of every man and woman both for bread and wine. Augustine says that women offer a sacrifice at the altar of the Lord, that it might be offered by the priest to God. Commonly in ancient writers the communion of the whole body of the congregation is called the sacrifice or oblation.

Conclusion 2. The very body of Christ is offered in the Lord's Supper. For as we take the bread to be the body of Christ sacramentally by resemblance and no otherwise, so the breaking of bread is sacramentally the sacrificing or offering of Christ upon the cross. Thus the fathers termed the Eucharist an immolation of Christ, because it is a commemoration of his sacrifice upon the cross. Augustine writes: Neither does he lie who says Christ was offered — for if sacraments did not have the resemblance of things of which they are sacraments, they would in no wise be sacraments; but from a resemblance they often take their names. Again, Christ is sacrificed in the Last Supper in regard of the faith of the communicants, which makes a thing past and done as present. Augustine says: When we believe in Christ, he is offered for us daily. And:

Christ is then slain for every one, when he believes that he is slain for him. Ambrose says: Christ is sacrificed daily in the minds of believers, as upon an altar. Jerome says: He is always offered to the believers.

THE DIFFERENCE.

They make the Eucharist to be a real, external, or bodily sacrifice offered to God, holding and teaching that the minister is a priest properly, and that in this sacrament he offers Christ's body and blood to God the Father really and properly under the forms of bread and wine. We acknowledge no real, outward, or bodily sacrifice for the remission of sins, but only Christ's oblation on the cross once offered. Here is the main difference between us touching this point, and it is of such weight and moment that they stiffly maintaining their opinion (as they do) can be no Church of God. For this point razes the foundation to the very bottom. That it may the better appear that we hold the truth, first I will confirm our doctrine by Scripture, and secondly confute the reasons which they bring for themselves.

OUR REASONS.

Reason 1. Hebrews 9:15, 26 and 10:10: The Holy Spirit says Christ offered himself but once. Therefore not often — and thus there can be no real or bodily offering of his body and blood in the sacrament of his Supper. The text is plain. The Papists answer: The sacrifice of Christ is one for substance, yet in regard of the manner of offering it is either bloody or unbloody, and the Holy Spirit speaks only of the bloody sacrifice of Christ, which was indeed offered but

once. Answer: The author of this epistle takes it for granted that the sacrifice of Christ is only one, and that the bloody sacrifice. For he says in Hebrews 9:25: Christ did not offer himself often, as the high priests did. And verse 26: Then he must have often suffered since the foundation of the world, but now in the end he has appeared once to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. And verse 22: Without shedding of blood there is no remission of sin. By these words it is plain that Scripture never knew the twofold manner of sacrificing of Christ. And every distinction in divinity not founded in the written word is but a fabrication of man's brain. And if this distinction be good, how shall the reason of the Apostle stand? — He did not offer himself but once, because he suffered but once.

Reason 2. The Roman Church holds that the sacrifice in the Lord's Supper is all one for substance with the sacrifice which he offered on the cross. If that be so, then the sacrifice in the Eucharist must either be a continuation of that sacrifice which was begun on the cross, or else an iteration or repetition of it. Now let them choose of these two which they will. If they say it is a continuation of the sacrifice on the cross, Christ being but the beginner and the priest the finisher thereof, they make it imperfect — for to continue a thing till it is accomplished is to bring perfection to it, but Christ's sacrifice on the cross was then fully perfected, as by his own testimony appears when he said: It is finished. Again, if they say it is a repetition of Christ's sacrifice, thus also they make it imperfect — for that is the very reason which the Holy Spirit uses to prove that the sacrifices of the Old Testament were imperfect: because they were repeated.

Reason 3. A real and outward sacrifice in a sacrament is against the nature of a sacrament, and especially the Supper of the Lord, for one end thereof is to keep in memory the sacrifice of Christ. Now every remembrance must be of a thing absent, past, and done. And if Christ is daily and really sacrificed, the sacrament is no fit memorial of his sacrifice. Again, the principal end for which the sacrament was ordained is that God might give and we receive Christ with his benefits, and therefore to give and take, to eat and drink, are here the principal actions. Now in a real sacrifice, God does not give Christ and the priest receive him of God, but contrariwise the priest gives and offers Christ to God and God receives something from us. To help the matter they say that this sacrifice serves not properly to make any satisfaction to God, but rather to apply to us the satisfaction of Christ already made. But this answer still makes against the nature of a sacrament, in which God gives Christ to us, whereas in a sacrifice God receives from man and man gives something to God. A sacrifice therefore is no fit means to apply to us anything that is given of God.

Reason 4. Hebrews 7:24-25: The Holy Spirit makes a difference between Christ the high priest of the New Testament and all Levitical priests in this: that they were many, one succeeding another, but he is only one, having an eternal priesthood which cannot pass from him to any other. Now if this difference be good, then Christ alone in his own very person must be the priest of the New Testament, and no other with or under him. Otherwise in the New Testament there would be more priests in number than in the old. If they say that the whole action remains in the person of Christ and that the priest is but an instrument under him, I say

again it is false, because the whole oblation is acted and done by the priest himself, and he who does all is more than a bare instrument.

Reason 5. If the priest does offer to God Christ's real body and blood for the pardon of our sins, then man has become a mediator between God and Christ. Now the Church of Rome says that the priest in his Mass is a priest properly, and his sacrifice a real sacrifice differing only in the manner of offering from the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross. In the very Canon of the Mass they insinuate as much, when they request God to accept their gifts and offerings — namely Christ himself offered — as he did the sacrifices of Abel and Noah. Now it is absurd to think that any creature should be a mediator between Christ and God. Therefore Christ cannot possibly be offered by any creature unto God.

Reason 6: The judgment of the ancient Church. A certain council held at Toledo in Spain reproves the ministers who offered sacrifice often the same day without the holy communion. The words of the canon are these: It has been reported to us that certain priests do not so many times receive the grace of the holy communion as they offer sacrifices in one day — in one day, if they offer many sacrifices to God, in all the oblations they suspend themselves from the communion. Here mark that the sacrifices in ancient Masses were nothing else but forms of divine service, because none did communicate, not even the priest himself. And in another council the name of the Mass is put only for a form of prayer: It has pleased us that prayers, supplications, Masses, which shall be approved in the council, be used. In this sense it is taken when speech is used of the making or composing of Masses, for the propitiatory sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ admits no com-

position. Abbot Paschasius says: Because we sin daily, Christ is sacrificed for us mystically, and his passion is given in mystery. These his words are against the real sacrifice. But he expounds himself more plainly in chapter 10: The blood is drunk in mystery spiritually, and it is all spiritual which we eat. And in chapter 12: The priest distributes to every one not as much as the outward sight gives, but as much as faith receives. And chapter 13: The full resemblance is outwardly, and the immaculate flesh of the lamb is faith inwardly — that the truth be not wanting to the sacrament. And in chapter 6: One eats the flesh of Christ spiritually and drinks his blood; another seems to receive not so much as a morsel of bread from the hand of the priest — his reason being that they came unprepared. Now then, considering that in all these places he makes no receiving but spiritual, neither does he make any sacrifice but spiritual.

OBJECTIONS OF PAPISTS.

Objection 1. Genesis 14:18: When Abraham was coming from the slaughter of the kings, Melchizedek met him and brought forth bread and wine, and he was a priest of the most high God. Now this bread and wine (say they) he brought forth to offer as a sacrifice, because it is said he was a priest of the most high God. And they reason thus: Christ was a priest after the order of Melchizedek, therefore as Melchizedek offered bread and wine, so Christ under the forms of bread and wine offers himself in sacrifice to God. Answer: Melchizedek was no type of Christ in regard of the act of sacrificing, but in regard of his person and things pertaining thereto, which are all fully expounded in Hebrews 7. The sum is this: first, Melchizedek was both king and priest, as was Christ;

second, he was a prince of peace and righteousness, as was Christ; third, he had neither father nor mother recorded, because Scripture in setting down his history makes no mention of the beginning or end of his days, and so Christ had neither father nor mother — no father as he was man, no mother as he was God; fourth, Melchizedek being greater than Abraham blessed him, and Christ by virtue of his priesthood blesses, that is, justifies and sanctifies all those that be of the faith of Abraham. In these things only stands the resemblance, and not in the offering of bread and wine. Again, the end of bringing forth the bread and wine was not to make a sacrifice, but to refresh Abraham and his servants who came from the slaughter of the kings. And he is called here a priest of the most high God not in regard of any sacrifice, but in consideration of his blessing of Abraham, as the order of the words teaches: And he was the priest of the most high God, and therefore he blessed him. Thirdly, though it were granted that he brought forth bread and wine to offer in sacrifice, yet it would not follow that in the sacrament Christ himself is to be offered to God under the naked forms of bread and wine. Melchizedek's bread and wine would be absurd types of no-bread and no-wine, or of mere forms of bread and wine in the sacrament.

Objection 2. The Passover lamb was both a sacrifice and a sacrament, and the Eucharist comes in place thereof. Answer: The Passover lamb was a sacrament but no sacrifice. Indeed Christ says to his disciples: Go and prepare a place to sacrifice the Passover (Mark 14:12), but the words to offer or to sacrifice often signify no more than to kill. As when Jacob and Laban made a covenant, it is said Jacob sacrificed beasts and called his brethren to eat bread (Genesis 31:54), which words must not be understood of killing for

sacrifice but of killing for a feast. Again, when Saul sought his father's asses and asked for the seer, a maiden bids him go up quickly, for there is an offering of the people today in the high place (1 Samuel 9:12) — where the feast kept in Ramah is called a sacrifice, in all likelihood because at the beginning thereof the priest offered a sacrifice to God. So the Passover may be called a sacrifice because sacrifices were offered within the compass of the appointed feast, and yet the thing itself was no more a sacrifice than the feast in Ramah was. Again, if it were granted that the Passover was both, it would not make much against us, for the Supper of the Lord succeeds the Passover only in regard of the main end thereof, which is the increase of our communion with Christ.

Objection 3. Malachi 1:11: The prophet foretells of a clean sacrifice that shall be in the New Testament, and that (say they) is the sacrifice of the Mass. Answer: This place must be understood of a spiritual sacrifice, as we shall plainly perceive if we compare it with 1 Timothy 2:8, where the meaning of the prophet is fitly expounded. I will (says Paul) that men pray in all places, lifting up pure hands without wrath or doubting. And this is the clean sacrifice of the Gentiles. Justin Martyr says that supplications and thanksgivings are the only perfect sacrifices pleasing God, and that Christians have learned to offer them alone. Tertullian says: We sacrifice for the health of the emperor, as God has commanded, with pure prayer. Irenaeus says that this clean offering to be offered in every place is the prayers of the saints.

Objection 4. Hebrews 13:10: We have an altar, of which they may not eat who serve in the tabernacle. Now (say they) if we have an altar, then we must needs have a priest and also a real sacrifice.

Answer: Here is meant not a bodily but a spiritual altar, because the altar is opposed to the material Tabernacle. What is meant thereby is expressed in the next verse, in which he proves that we have an altar: The bodies of the beasts, whose blood was brought into the holy place by the high priest for sin, were burned outside the camp — so Christ Jesus, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered outside the gate. Now lay the proof to the thing proved, and we must needs understand Christ himself, who was both the altar, the priest, and the sacrifice.

Objection 5. Lastly, they say: where there is alteration both of law and covenant, there must needs be a new priest and a new sacrifice. But in the New Testament there is alteration both of law and covenant, and therefore there is both new priest and new sacrifice. Answer: All may be granted — in the New Testament there is both new priest and sacrifice, yet not any Popish priest, but only Christ himself both God and man. The sacrifice also is Christ as he is man, and the altar is Christ as he is God, who in the New Testament offered himself a sacrifice to his Father for the sins of the world. For though he was the Lamb of God slain from the beginning of the world in regard of the purpose of God, in regard of the value of his merit, and in regard of faith which makes things to come as present, yet was he not actually offered until the fullness of time came. And once offering himself, he remains a priest forever, and all other priests beside him are superfluous, his one offering once offered being all-sufficient.

POINT 12: OF FASTING



OUR CONSENT.

Our consent I will set down in three conclusions. Conclusion 1. We do not condemn fasting, but maintain three sorts thereof: a moral, civil, and a religious fast. The first, being moral, is a practice of sobriety or temperance, when in the use of meats and drinks the appetite is restrained that it does not exceed moderation. This must be used by all Christians in the whole course of their lives. The second, being civil, is when upon some particular and political considerations men abstain from certain meats — as in our commonwealth the law enjoins us to abstain from flesh meat at certain seasons of the year, for the special ends of preserving the breed of cattle and maintaining the calling of the fisherman. The third, namely a religious fast, is when the duties of religion — as the exercise of prayer and humiliation — are practiced in fasting. I do now specially treat of this kind.

Conclusion 2. We join with them in the allowance of the principal and right ends of a religious fast, and they are three. The first is that thereby the mind may become attentive in meditation of the duties of godliness to be performed. The second is that the rebellion of the flesh may be subdued, for the flesh pampered becomes

an instrument of licentiousness. The third, and as I take it the chief end of a religious fast, is to profess our guiltiness and to testify our humiliation before God for our sins. For this end in the feast of Nineveh, even the beasts were made to abstain.

Conclusion 3. We yield to them that fasting is a help and furtherance to the worship of God — yes, and a good work also if it be used in a good manner. For though fasting in itself, being a thing indifferent as eating and drinking are, is not to be termed a good work, yet being applied and considered in relation to the right ends before spoken of, and practiced accordingly, it is a work allowed of God and highly to be esteemed by all the servants and people of God.

THE DIFFERENCE OR DISSENT.

Our dissent from the Church of Rome in the doctrine of fasting stands in three things. First, they appoint and prescribe set times of fasting as necessary to be kept. But we hold and teach that to prescribe the time of a religious fast is in the liberty of the Church and the governors thereof, as special occasion shall be offered. When the disciples of John asked Christ why they and the Pharisees fast often but his disciples fasted not, he answered: Can the children of the marriage chamber mourn as long as the bridegroom is with them? But the days will come when the bridegroom shall be taken away from them, and then shall they fast (Matthew 9:15). Where he gives them to understand that they must fast as occasions of mourning are offered. From this I gather that a set time of fasting is no more to be enjoined than a set time of mourning. It was the opinion of Augustine that neither Christ nor his Apostles appointed any times of fasting. Tertullian says that those

of his time fasted of their own accord freely, without law or commandment, as occasions and times served. Eusebius says that Montanus was the first that made laws of fasting. It is objected that there is a set time of fasting prescribed in Leviticus 16:29. Answer: This set and prescribed fast was commanded of God as a part of the legal worship, which had its end in the death of Christ. Therefore it does not justify a set time of fasting in the New Testament, where God has left man to his own liberty without giving a like commandment. It is again alleged that in Zechariah 7:5 there were set times appointed for the celebration of religious fasts — the fifth and the seventh months. Answer: They were appointed upon occasion of the present afflictions of the Church in Babylon, and they ceased upon their deliverance. The like upon like occasion we may appoint. It is further objected that some churches of the Protestants observe set times of fasting. Answer: In some churches there are set days and times of fasting, not upon necessity or for conscience or religion's sake, but for political or civil regards — whereas in the Roman Church it is held a mortal sin to defer the set time of fasting till the next day following.

Secondly, we dissent from the Church of Rome touching the manner of keeping a fast. For the best learned among them allow the drinking of wine and water and electuaries, and that often within the compass of their appointed fast. They allow the eating of one meal on a fasting day at noon, and upon reasonable cause one hour before, the time of fasting not yet ended. But this practice is indeed absurd and contrary to the practice of the Old Testament, and it frustrates the end of fasting. For bodily abstinence is an outward means and sign whereby we acknowledge our guiltiness and unworthiness of any of the blessings of God. Again, they prescribe

a difference of meats — white meat only to be used on their fasting days, and that of necessity and for conscience sake in most cases. But we hold this distinction of meats to be both foolish and wicked. Foolish, because in such meats as they prescribe there is as much filling and delight as in any other meats — as namely in fish, fruits, wine, and the like which they permit. And it is against the end of a religious fast to use any refreshing at all, so far as necessity of health and comeliness will permit. Thus the Church in times past used to abstain not only from meat and drink but from all delights whatsoever, even from soft apparel and sweet ointments. Joel 2:15-16: Sanctify a fast — let the bridegroom go forth of his chamber, and the bride out of her bridal chamber. Daniel 10:3: I ate no pleasant bread, neither came flesh nor wine within my mouth, neither did I anoint myself at all, until three weeks of days were fulfilled. 1 Corinthians 7:5: Defraud not one another, except it be with consent for a time, that you may give yourselves to fasting and prayer.

Again, we hold this practice to be wicked because it takes away the liberty of Christians, by which unto the pure all things are pure. The Apostle in Galatians 5 bids us to stand fast in this liberty, which the Church of Rome would thus abolish. For the better understanding of this, let us consider how the Lord himself has from the beginning kept in his own hands, as a master in his own house, the disposition of his creatures for the use of man, that man might depend on him and his word for temporal blessings. In the first age, he appointed unto man for meat every herb of the earth bearing seed, and every tree wherein there is the fruit of a tree bearing seed (Genesis 1:29). After the flood the Lord renewed his grant of the use of the creatures, and gave his people liberty to eat the flesh

of living creatures — yet so as he made some things unclean and forbad the eating of them, among the rest the eating of blood. But since the coming of Christ he has enlarged his word and given liberty to all, both Jews and Gentiles, to eat of all kinds of flesh. This word of his we rest upon, holding it a doctrine of devils for men to command an abstinence from meats for conscience sake, which the Lord himself has created to be received with thanksgiving. Socrates, a Christian historian, says that the Apostles left it free to everyone to use what kind of meat they would on fasting days and other times. Spyridon in Lent dressed swine's flesh and set it before a stranger, eating himself and bidding the stranger also to eat. The stranger refusing and professing himself to be a Christian, Spyridon said: For that reason the rather must you do it, for to the pure all things are pure, as the word of God teaches us.

But they object Jeremiah 35, where Jonadab commanded the Rechabites to abstain from wine, which commandment they obeyed and are commended for doing well in obeying. Therefore (say they) some kind of meats may lawfully be forbidden. Answer: Jonadab gave this commandment not in way of religion or merit, but for other wise and political regards. For he enjoined his posterity not to drink wine, not to build houses, not to sow seed or plant vineyards, or to have any in possession, but to live in tents — to the end that they might be prepared to bear the calamities that should befall them in time to come. But the Popish abstinence from certain meats has respect to conscience and religion, and therefore is of another kind and can have no warrant thence.

Objection 2. Daniel 10:3: Daniel, being in heaviness for three weeks of days, abstained from flesh — and his example is our warrant. Answer: It was the manner of holy men in ancient times,

when they fasted many days together of their own accord freely, to abstain from sundry things. Thus Daniel abstained from flesh. But the Popish abstinence from flesh is not free but stands by commandment, and the omitting of it is mortal sin. Again, if they will follow Daniel in abstaining from flesh, why do they not also abstain from all pleasant bread and wine — yes, from ointments? And why will they eat anything in the time of their fast, whereas they cannot show that Daniel ate anything at all until evening? Molanus has noted that our ancestors abstained from wine and dainties, and that some of them ate nothing for two or three days together.

Objection 3. They allege the diet of John the Baptist, whose meat was locusts and wild honey, and of Timothy, who abstained from wine. Answer: Their kind of diet and that abstinence which they used was only for temperance's sake, not for conscience or to merit anything thereby. Let them prove the contrary if they can.

Thirdly and lastly, we dissent from them touching certain ends of fasting. For they make abstinence itself, in a person fitly prepared, to be a part of the worship of God. But we take it to be a thing indifferent in itself and therefore no part of God's worship. Yet being well used, we esteem it as a prop or furtherance of worship, in that we are made the fitter by it to worship God. Hereupon some of the more learned sort of them say: Not the work of fasting done, but the devotion of the worker, is to be reputed the service of God. Again, they say that fasting with devotion is a work of satisfaction to God's justice for the temporal punishment of our sins. Wherein we take them to blasphemously derogate from Christ our Savior, who is the whole and perfect satisfaction for sin, both in respect of fault and punishment. Here they allege the example of the

Ninevites and of Ahab's fasting, whereby they turned away the judgments of God denounced against them by his prophets. We answer that God's wrath was appeased toward the Ninevites not by their fasting but by faith laying hold on God's mercy in Christ, and thereby staying his judgment. Their fasting was only a sign of their repentance, and their repentance a fruit and sign of their faith, whereby they believed the preaching of Jonah. As for Ahab's humiliation, it is nothing to the purpose, for it was in hypocrisy. To conclude, we for our parts do not condemn this exercise of fasting, but the abuse of it. And it were to be wished that fasting were more used by all Christians in all places, considering the Lord does daily give us new and special occasions of public and private fasting.

POINT 13: OF THE STATE OF PERFECTION AND WORSHIP OF SAINTS



OUR CONSENT.

Our consent I will set down in two conclusions. Conclusion 1. All true believers have a state of true perfection in this life. Matthew 5:48: Be you perfect as your Father in heaven is perfect. Genesis 6:9: Noah was a just and perfect man in his time, and walked with God. Genesis 17:1: Walk before me and be perfect. And sundry kings of Judah are said to walk uprightly before God with a perfect heart, as David, Josiah, Hezekiah, and others. Paul accounts himself with the rest of the faithful to be perfect, saying: Let us all that are perfect be thus minded (Philippians 3:15). Now this perfection has two parts. The first is the imputation of Christ's perfect obedience, which is the ground and fountain of all our perfection whatsoever. Hebrews 10:14: By one offering — that is, by his obedience in his death and passion — has he consecrated, or made perfect, forever them that believe. The second part of Christian perfection is sincerity or uprightness, standing in two things. The first is to acknowledge our imperfection and unworthiness in respect of ourselves. Hereupon, though Paul had said he

was perfect, yet he adds further that he did account of himself not as though he had attained to perfection, but did forget the things behind and endeavored himself toward that which was before. Here it must be remembered that the perfection of which I speak may stand with sundry wants and imperfections. It is said of Asa that his heart was perfect with God all his days, and yet he pulled not down the high places, and being diseased in his feet he put his trust in the physicians and not in the Lord. Secondly, this uprightness stands in a constant purpose, endeavor, and care to keep not some few but all and every commandment of the law of God. As David says in Psalm 119:6: Then should I not be confounded, when I have respect to all your commandments. And this endeavor is a fruit of perfection, in that it proceeds from a man regenerate. For as all men through Adam's fall have in them by nature the seeds of all sin, none excepted, not even the sin against the Holy Spirit, so by grace of regeneration through Christ, all the faithful have in them likewise the seeds of all virtues needful to salvation. Hereupon they both can and do endeavor to yield perfect obedience to God according to the whole law. They may be termed perfect as a child is called a perfect man — though it lacks perfection of age and stature and reason, yet it has perfection of parts, because it has all and every part and faculty both of body and soul that is required to make a perfect man.

Conclusion 2. There are certain works of supererogation — that is, such works as are not only answerable to the law and thereupon deserve life everlasting, but go beyond the law and merit more than the law by itself can make any man to merit. But where may we find these works? Not in the person of any mere man or angel, nor in all men and angels, but only in the person of Christ, God

and man. His works are not only answerable to the perfection of the law, but go far beyond the same. For first, the obedience of his life, considered alone by itself, was answerable even to the rigor of the law. Therefore the sufferings of his death and passion were more than the law could require at his hand, since the law requires no punishment of him that is a doer of all things contained therein. Secondly, the very rigor of the law requires obedience only of those that are mere men, but the obedience of Christ was the obedience of a person that was both God and man. Thirdly, the law requires personal obedience — that every man fulfill the law for himself, and it speaks of no more. Now the obedience which Christ performed was not for himself alone but it serves also for all the elect. And considering it was the obedience of God (as Paul signified when he said: Feed the Church of God, which he purchased with his blood), it was sufficient for many thousand worlds. And by reason that the law requires no obedience of him that is God, this obedience therefore may truly be termed a work of supererogation. This one we acknowledge, and beside this we dare acknowledge none. Thus far do we agree with the Church of Rome in the doctrine of the estate of perfection, and further we dare not go.

THE DIFFERENCE.

The Papists hold (as the writings of the learned among them teach) that a man being in the state of grace may not only keep all the commandments of the law and thereby deserve his own salvation, but also go beyond the law and do works of supererogation which the law requires not — as to perform the vow of single life and the vow of regular obedience, and the like. By this means (they say) men deserve a greater degree of glory than the law can afford. Of

perfection they make two kinds: one they call necessary perfection, which is the fulfilling of the law in every commandment, whereby eternal life is deserved. The second is profitable perfection, when men do not only such things as the law requires, but over and besides make certain vows and perform certain other duties which the law enjoins not, for the doing whereof they shall be rewarded with a greater measure of glory than the law designates. They make this plain by comparison: Two soldiers fight in the field under one and the same captain. The one only keeps his standing and thereby deserves his pay. The other, in keeping his place, also wins the enemy's standard or does some other notable exploit — this man besides his pay deserves some greater reward. And thus (say they) it is with all true Catholics in the state of grace: they that keep the law shall have life eternal, but they that do more than the law, as works of supererogation, shall be crowned with greater glory. This is their doctrine. But we on the contrary teach that although we are to strive toward a perfection as much as we can, yet no man can fulfill the law of God in this life, much less do works of supererogation. For the confirmation of this, these reasons may be used. Reason 1. In the moral law two things are commanded: first, the love of God and man; and secondly, the manner of this love. Now the manner of loving God is to love him with all our heart and strength. Luke 10:27: You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your strength, and with all your thought. As Bernard said: The measure of loving God is to love him without measure — that is, to love him with the greatest perfection of love that can befall a creature. Hence it fol-

laws that in loving God, no man can possibly do more than the law requires. Therefore the performance of all vows whatsoever, and all like duties, comes short of the intention or scope of the law.

Reason 2. The compass of the law is large and comprehends in it more than the mind of man can at first conceive, for every commandment has two parts: the negative and the affirmative. In the negative is forbidden not only the capital sin named — as murder, theft, adultery — but all sins of the same kind, with all occasions and provocations thereto. And in the affirmative is commanded not only the contrary virtues, as the love of God and the love of our neighbor's honor, life, chastity, goods, and good name, but the use of all helps and means whereby the said virtues may be preserved, furthered, and practiced. Thus has our Savior Christ himself expounded the law in Matthew chapters 5 and 6. Upon this plain ground I conclude that all duties pertaining to life and manners come within the scope of some moral commandment. And that the Papists, making their works of supererogation means to further the love of God and man, must needs bring them under the compass of the law. Under which, if they be, they cannot possibly go beyond the same.

Reason 3. Luke 17:10: When you have done all those things that are commanded us, we are unprofitable servants — we have done that which was our duty to do. The Papists answer that we are unprofitable to God but not to ourselves. But this evasion is beside the very intent of the place. For a servant in doing his duty is unprofitable even to himself and does not so much as deserve thanks at his master's hand, as Christ says in verse 9: Does he thank that servant? Secondly they answer that we are unprofitable servants in doing things commanded, yet when we do things pre-

scribed in the way of counsel we may profit ourselves and merit thereby. But this answer does not stand with reason — for things commanded, in that they are commanded, are more excellent than things left to our liberty, because the will and commandment of God gives excellence and goodness to them. Again, counsels are thought to be harder than the commandments of the law. And if men cannot profit themselves by obedience of moral precepts, which are more easy, much less shall they be able to profit themselves by counsels which are of greater difficulty.

Reason 4. If it is not in the ability and power of man to keep the law, then much less is he able to do any work that is beyond and above all that the law requires. But no man is able to fulfill the law, and therefore no man is able to supererogate. Here the Papists deny the proposition, for (say they) though we keep not the law, yet we may do things of counsel above the law and thereby merit. But by their leave, they speak absurdly — for in common reason, if a man fails in the less, he cannot but fail in the greater. Now as I have said, in Popish doctrine it is easier to obey the moral law than to perform the counsels of perfection.

OBJECTIONS OF PAPISTS.

Objection 1. Isaiah 56:4-5: The Lord says to eunuchs that keep his Sabbath and choose the thing that pleases him, that he will give them a place and a name better than the sons and daughters. Now (say they) a eunuch is one that lives a single life and keeps the vow of chastity, and hereupon he is said to deserve a greater measure of glory. Answer: If the words be well considered, they prove nothing of the sort — for honor is promised to eunuchs not because they make and perform the vow of single life, but because (as the text

says) they observe the Lord's Sabbath and choose the thing that pleases God and keep his covenant, which is to believe the word of God and to obey the commandments of the moral law.

Objection 2. Matthew 19:12: Christ says, There are some who have made themselves chaste for the kingdom of heaven. Therefore (say they) the vow of single life is warrantable and is a work of special glory in heaven. Answer: The meaning of this text is that some, having received the gift of continency, do willingly content themselves with the single estate, that they may with more liberty without distraction further the good estate of the Church of God, or the kingdom of grace in themselves and others. This is all that can be gathered out of this place — hence cannot be gathered the merit of everlasting glory by single life.

Objection 3. Matthew 19:21: Christ says to the young man, If you will be perfect, go, sell what you have and give to the poor, and you shall have treasure in heaven. Therefore (say they) a man by forsaking all may merit not only heaven but also treasure there — that is, an exceeding measure of glory. Answer: This young man, being in all likelihood a most strict Pharisee, thought to merit eternal life by the works of the law, as his first question implies: Good master, what shall I do to be saved? Therefore Christ goes about to discover to him the secret corruption of his heart. Hereupon the words alleged are a commandment of trial not common to all, but special to him. The like commandment gave the Lord to Abraham, saying: Abraham, take your only son Isaac and offer him upon the mountain which I shall show you (Genesis 22:2).

Objection 4. 1 Corinthians 7:8: Paul says it is good for all to be single as he was, and in verse 38 he says it is better for virgins not to marry, and this he speaks by permission not by commandment

(verse 26). Answer: Here single life is not preferred simply, but only in respect of the present necessity, because the Church was then under persecution, and because such as live a single life are freed from the cares and distractions of the world.

Objection 5. They also allege various passages about special rewards. Answer: The saints who excelled in faith in the times of the Old and New Testament are to be honored in three ways. First, by giving thanks to God for them and the benefits that God vouchsafed by them to his Church. Thus Paul says that when the churches heard of his conversion, they glorified God for him, or in him (Galatians 1:24). The like is to be done for the saints departed. Second, they are to be honored by an imitation of their faith, humility, meekness, repentance, the fear of God, and all good virtues in which they excelled. For this cause the examples of godly men in the Old and New Testament are called a cloud of witnesses by allusion — for as the cloud guided the Israelites through the wilderness to the land of Canaan, so the faithful now are to be guided to the heavenly Canaan by the examples of good men who have believed in God before us and have walked the strait way to life everlasting.

Conclusion 2. Again, their true relics — that is, their virtues and good examples left to all posterity to be followed — we keep and respect with due reverence. And if any man can show us the bodily relic of any true saint and prove it so to be, though we will not worship it, yet will we not despise it but keep it as a monument, if it may conveniently be done without offense. Thus far we consent with the Church of Rome — further we must not go.

THE DISSENT.

Our difference stands in the manner of worshipping of saints. The Papists make two degrees of religious worship. The highest they call latria, whereby God himself is worshipped, and that alone. The second, lower than the former, is called dulia, whereby the saints and angels that are in the special favor of God and glorified with everlasting glory in heaven are worshipped. This worship they place in outward adoration, in bending of the knee and bowing of the body to them being in heaven, in invocation whereby they call upon them, in dedication of churches and houses of religion to them, in sabbaths and festival days, and lastly in pilgrimages to their relics and images. We likewise distinguish adoration or worship, for it is either religious or civil. Religious worship is that which is done to him who is Lord of all things, the searcher and trier of the heart, omnipotent, everywhere present, able to hear and help them that call upon him everywhere, the author and first cause of every good thing — and that simply for himself, because he is absolute goodness itself. This worship is due to God alone, being commanded in the first and second commandments of the first table. Civil worship is the honor done to men set above us by God himself, either in respect of their excellent gifts or in respect of their offices and authority whereby they govern others. The right end of this worship is to testify and declare that we reverence the gifts of God and that power which he has placed in those that are his instruments. This kind of worship is commanded only in the second table, in the first commandment thereof: Honor your father and mother. Upon this distinction we may judge what honor is due to everyone. Honor is to be given to God and to whom he commands. He commands that inferiors should honor their betters. Therefore unreasonable creatures and among the rest images

are not to be worshipped either with civil or religious worship, being indeed far baser than man himself. Again, unclean spirits the enemies of God must not be worshipped — yes, to honor them at all is to dishonor God. Good angels, because they excel men both in nature and gifts, when they appeared were lawfully honored, yet so that when the least signification of honor was given that was proper to God, they refused it. And because they appear not now as in former times, not so much as civil adoration in any bodily gesture is to be done to them. Lastly, governors and magistrates have civil adoration as their due and it cannot be omitted without offense. Thus Abraham worshipped the Hittites (Genesis 23) and Joseph his brothers (Genesis 50). To come to the very point: upon the former distinction we deny, against the Papists, that any civil worship in the bending of the knee or prostrating of the body is to be given to the saints, they being absent from us, much less any religious worship — as namely invocation signified by any bodily adoration. For it is the very honor of God himself, let them call it latria, or dulia, or by what name they will.

OUR REASONS.

Reason 1. All true invocation and prayer made according to the will of God must have a double foundation: a commandment and a promise. A commandment to move us to pray, and a promise to assure us that we shall be heard. For all and every prayer must be made in faith, and without a commandment or promise there is no faith. Upon this sure ground I conclude that we may not pray to saints departed, for in Scripture there is no word either commanding us to pray to them or assuring us that we shall be heard when we pray. Nay, we are commanded only to call upon God: Him only

shall you serve (Matthew 4:10). And: How shall we call upon him in whom we have not believed? (Romans 10:14). And we have no promise to be heard but for Christ's sake. Therefore prayers made to saints departed are unlawful. Answer is made that invocation of saints is warranted by miracles and revelations, which are answerable to commandments and promises. Answer: Miracles and revelations had an end before this kind of invocation took any place in the Church of God — that was about three hundred years after Christ. Again, to judge of any point of doctrine by miracles is deceitful unless three things concur: first, doctrine of faith and piety to be confirmed; second, prayer to God that something may be done for the ratifying of the said doctrine; third, the manifest edification of the Church by the two former. Where any of these three are wanting, miracles may be suspected — because sometimes false prophets have their miracles to try men whether they will cleave to God or no (Deuteronomy 13:1-3). Again, miracles are not done or to be done for them that believe, but for infidels that believe not, as Paul says in 1 Corinthians 14:22: Tongues are a sign not to them that believe but to unbelievers. And to this agree Chrysostom, Ambrose, and Isidore, who says: Behold, a sign is not necessary to believers who have already believed, but to infidels that they may be converted. Lastly, our faith is to be confirmed not by revelations and apparitions of dead men, but by the writings of the Apostles and prophets (Luke 16:29).

Reason 2. To pray to saints departed, to bow the knee to them while they are in heaven, is to ascribe to them what is proper to God himself — namely, to know the heart with the inward desires and motions thereof, and to know the speeches and behaviors of all men in all places upon earth at all times. The Papists answer

that saints in heaven see and hear all things upon earth, not by themselves (for that were to make them gods) but in God and in the glass of the Trinity, in which they see men's prayers revealed to them. I answer first that the saints are still made more than creatures, because they are said to know the thoughts and all the doings of all men at all times, which no created power can well comprehend at once. Second, I answer that this glass in which all things are said to be seen is but a fabrication of man's brain. I prove it thus: The angels themselves, who see further into God than men can do, never knew all things in God. I confirm this manner. In the temple under the law, upon the ark were placed two cherubim signifying the good angels of God, and they looked downward upon the mercy seat covering the ark, which was a figure of Christ. Their looking downward figured their desire to see into the mystery of Christ's incarnation and our redemption by him — as Peter, alluding no doubt to this type in the Old Testament, says in 1 Peter 1:12: Which things the angels desired to behold. And Paul says in Ephesians 3:10: The manifold wisdom of God is revealed by the Church to principalities and powers in heavenly places, that is, to the angels — by the Church as by an example, in which the angels saw the endless wisdom and mercy of God in the calling of the Gentiles, and by the Church as it was founded and honored by the preaching of the Apostles. For it seems that the Apostolic ministry in the New Testament revealed things touching Christ which the angels never knew before that time. Thus Chrysostom upon this text of Paul says that the angels learned some things by the preaching of John the Baptist. Again, Christ says that they do not know the hour of the last judgment (Matthew 24:36) — much less do the saints know all things in God. Hence it

is that they are said to be under the altar, where they cry: How long, Lord, holy and true, will you not avenge our blood? — being ignorant of the day of their full deliverance. And the Jews in affliction confess that Abraham was ignorant of them and their estate (Isaiah 63:16).

Reason 3. Matthew 4:10: Christ refused so much as to bow the knee to Satan upon this ground, because it was written: You shall worship the Lord your God, and him only shall you serve. Hence it was that Peter would not suffer Cornelius so much as to kneel to him, though Cornelius intended not to honor him as God. Therefore neither saint nor angel is to be honored so much as with the bowing of the knee, if it carries but the least signification of divine or religious honor.

Reason 4: The judgment of the ancient Church. Augustine: We honor the saints with charity and not by servitude, neither do we erect churches to them. And: Let it not be religion for us to worship dead men. And: They are to be honored for imitation and not to be adored for religion. Epiphanius: Neither Thecla nor any saint is to be adored, for that ancient error may not overrule us, that we should leave the living God and adore things made by him. Again: Let Mary be in honor; let the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit be adored; let none adore Mary. Again: Mary is beautiful and holy and honored, yet not to adoration. When Julian objected to the Christians that they worshipped their martyrs as God, Cyril grants the memory and honor of them but denies their adoration — and of invocation he makes no mention at all. Ambrose on Romans 1: Is any so mad that he will give to the earl the honor of the king? —

yet these men do not think themselves guilty who give the honor of God's name to a creature, and leaving the Lord adore their fellow servants, as though there were anything more reserved for God.

OBJECTIONS OF PAPISTS.

Objection 1. Genesis 48:16: Let the angel that kept me bless your children. Here (say they) is a prayer made to angels. Answer: By the angel is meant Christ, who is called the angel of the covenant (Malachi 3:1) and the angel that guided Israel in the wilderness (1 Corinthians 10:9 compared with Exodus 23:20).

Objection 2. Exodus 32:13: Moses prays that God would respect his people for Abraham's sake, and for Isaac and Israel his servants, who were not then living. Answer: Moses prays God to be merciful to the people not for the intercession of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, but for his covenant's sake which he had made with them (Psalm 105:8-11). Again, by Popish doctrine the fathers departed did not know the estate of men upon earth, neither did they pray for them, because then they were not in heaven but in *Limbus Patrum*.

Objection 3. One living man makes intercession to God for another — therefore much more do the saints in glory, who are filled with love, pray to God for us. And we pray to them no otherwise than we desire living men to pray for us. Answer: The reasoning is faulty, for we have a commandment for one living man to pray for another and to desire others to pray for us, but there is no warrant in the word of God for us to desire the prayers of men departed. Secondly, there is great difference between these two: to request our friend either by word of mouth or by letter to pray for us; and

by invocation to request those who are absent from us and departed this life to pray for us. For this is indeed a worship in which is given to them a power to hear and help all that call upon them at whatever place or time, even though they be not present in the place in which they are worshipped. Consequently it ascribes to them the seeing of the heart, presence in all places, and an infinite power to help all that pray to them — which things agree to no creature but God alone. Thirdly, when one living man requests another to pray for him, he only makes him his companion and fellow member in his prayer made in the name of one mediator, Christ. But when men invoke saints in heaven, they being then absent, they make them more than fellow members — even mediators between Christ and themselves.

POINT 15: OF THE INTERCESSION OF SAINTS



OUR CONSENT.

Conclusion 1. The saints departed pray to God by giving thanks to him for their own redemption and for the redemption of the whole Church of God upon earth. Revelation 5:8-9: The four beasts and the twenty-four elders fell down before the Lamb, and they sang a new song: You are worthy to take the book and to open the seals thereof, because you were killed and have redeemed us to God. Revelation 5:13: And all the creatures which are in heaven — praise and honor and glory and power be to him that sits upon the throne and to the Lamb forever.

Conclusion 2. The saints departed pray generally for the state of the whole Church. Revelation 6:9-10: I saw under the altar the souls of them that were killed for the word of God, and they cried: How long, Lord, holy and true, do you not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth? Whereby we see they desire a final deliverance of the Church and a destruction of the enemies thereof, that they themselves with all the people of God might be advanced to fullness of glory in body and soul. Yes, the dumb crea-

tures in Romans 8:23 are said to groan and sigh, waiting for the adoption — even the redemption of our bodies. Much more then do the saints in heaven desire the same. Thus far we consent.

THE DISSENT OR DIFFERENCE.

They hold and teach that the saints in heaven — as the Virgin Mary, Peter, Paul, and others — do make intercession to God for particular men according to their several wants, and that having received particular men's prayers they present them to God. But this doctrine we flatly renounce upon these grounds and reasons.

Reason 1. Isaiah 63:16: The church says to God: Doubtless you are our Father, though Abraham be ignorant of us, and Israel know us not. Now if Abraham knew not his posterity, neither Mary nor Peter nor any other of the saints departed know us and our estate, and consequently they cannot make any particular intercession for us. If they say that Abraham and Jacob were then in Limbo, which they will have to be a part of hell, what joy could Lazarus have in Abraham's bosom (Luke 16:25), and with what comfort could Jacob say on his death bed: O Lord, I have waited for your salvation (Genesis 49:18)?

Reason 2. 2 Kings 22:20: Huldah the prophetess tells Josiah that he must be gathered to his fathers and put in his grave in peace, that his eyes may not see all the evil which God would bring on that place. Therefore the saints departed do not see the state of the Church on earth, much less do they know the thoughts and prayers of men. This conclusion Augustine confirms at large.

Reason 3. No creature, saint, or angel can be a mediator for us to God, saving Christ alone, who is indeed the only Advocate of his church. For in a true and sufficient mediator there must be three properties. First, the word of God must reveal and set forth him to the Church, that we may in conscience be assured that praying to him and to God in his name we shall be heard. Now there is no Scripture that mentions either saints or angels as mediator in our behalf, save Christ alone. Second, a mediator must be perfectly just, so that no sin be found in him at all. 1 John 2:1: If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father — Jesus Christ the righteous. Now the saints in heaven, however fully sanctified by Christ, yet in themselves were conceived and born in sin, and therefore must needs eternally stand before God by the mediation and merit of another. Third, a mediator must be a propitiator — that is, bring something to God that may appease and satisfy the wrath and justice of God for our sins. Therefore John adds: And he is the propitiation for our sins. But neither saint nor angel can satisfy for the least of our sins. Christ only is the propitiation for them all. The Virgin Mary and the rest of the saints, being sinners, could not satisfy so much as for themselves.

Reason 4: The judgment of the Church. Augustine: All Christian men commend each other in their prayers to God. And: He who prays for all, and for whom none prays, is that one and true mediator. And: This says your Savior: You have nowhere to go but to me, you have no way to go but by me. Chrysostom: You have no need of patrons to God or of much discourse to smooth over others. But though you be alone and want a patron, and by yourself pray to God, you shall obtain your desire. And on the saying of John, If any sin, and so on: Your prayers have no effect unless they

be such as the Lord commends to your Father. And Augustine on the same place has these words: He being such a man said not, you have an advocate — but, if any sin, we have: he said not you have, neither said he, you have me.

OBJECTIONS OF PAPISTS.

Objection 1. Revelation 5:8-9: The twenty-four elders fall down before the Lamb, having every one harps and golden vials, full of odors which are the prayers of the saints. Hence the Papists gather that the saints in heaven receive the prayers of men on earth and offer them to the Father. Answer: There by prayers of the saints are meant their own prayers, in which they sing praises to God and to the Lamb, as the verses following plainly declare. And these prayers are also presented to God only from the hand of the angel, who is Christ himself.

Objection 2. Luke 16:27: Dives in hell prays for his brethren upon earth — much more do the saints in heaven pray for us. Answer: Out of a parable nothing can be gathered but that which is agreeable to the intent and scope thereof. For by the same reason it may as well be gathered that the soul of Dives being in hell had a tongue. Again, if it were true what they gather, we may gather also that the wicked in hell have compassion and love to their brethren on earth, and a zeal to God's glory — all of which are false.

Objection 3. The angels in heaven know every man's estate, they know when any sinner repents and rejoice thereat, and they pray for particular men. Therefore the saints in heaven do the like, for they are equal to the good angels (Luke 20:36). Answer: The place in Luke is to be understood of the estate of holy men at the

day of the last judgment, as appears in Matthew 22:30, where it is said that the servants of God in the resurrection are as the angels in heaven. Secondly, they are like the angels not in office and ministry, by which the angels are ministering spirits for the good of men, but they are like them in glory.

Secondly, we dissent from the Papists because they are not content to say that the saints departed pray for us in particular, but they add further that they make intercession for us by their merits in heaven. Peter Lombard says: I think (speaking of one that is of but modest goodness) that he as it were passing through the fire shall be saved by the merits and intercessions of the heavenly Church, which does always make intercession for the faithful by request and merit, until Christ shall be complete in his members. And the Roman Catechism says as much: Saints are so much the more to be worshipped and called upon, because they make prayers daily for the salvation of men, and God for their merit and favor bestows many benefits upon us. We do not deny that men upon earth have help and benefit by the faith and piety which the saints departed showed when they were in this life, for God shows mercy on them that keep his commandments to a thousand generations. Augustine says it was good for the Jews that they were loved of Moses, whom God loved. But we utterly deny that we are helped by the merits of saints either living or departed. For saints in glory have received the full reward of all their merits if they could merit, and therefore there is nothing further that they can merit.

POINT 16: OF IMPLICIT FAITH



OUR CONSENT.

We hold that there is a kind of implicit or unexpressed faith, and indeed that the faith of every man in some part of his life — as in the time of his first conversion, and in the time of some grievous temptation or distress — is implicit or enfolded. The Samaritans are said to believe (John 4:14) because they took Christ for the Messiah and thereupon were content to learn and obey the glad tidings of salvation. And in the same passage, verse 51, the ruler with his family is said to believe, who did no more than generally acknowledge that Christ was the Messiah and yielded himself to believe and obey his holy doctrine, being moved thereto by a miracle wrought upon his young son. And Rahab (Hebrews 11:13) is said to believe — yes, she is commended for faith even at the time when she received the spies. Now in the word of God we cannot find that she had any more than a confused, general, or enfolded faith, whereby she believed that the God of the Hebrews was the true God and his word was to be obeyed. This faith, as it seems, was wrought in her by the report and relation of the miracles done in Egypt, whereby she was moved to join herself to the people of God and to believe as they

did. By these examples it is manifest that in the very servants of God, there is and may be for a time an implicit faith. For the better understanding of this point, it is to be considered that faith may be enfolded two ways: first in respect of knowledge of things to be believed, and secondly in respect of the apprehension of the object of faith, namely Christ and his benefits. Now faith is enfolded in respect of knowledge when sundry things that are necessary to salvation are not as yet distinctly known. Though Christ commended the faith of his disciples — such a faith against which the gates of hell should not prevail — yet it was unexpressed or wrapped up in regard of sundry points of religion. For first of all, Peter who made confession of Christ in the name of the rest was at that time ignorant of the particular means whereby his redemption should be wrought. For after this he went about to dissuade his master from the suffering of death at Jerusalem, whereupon Christ sharply rebuked him, saying: Get behind me, Satan, you are an offense to me. Again, they were all ignorant of Christ's resurrection until certain women who first saw him after he was risen had told them, and they by experience in the person of Christ had learned the truth. Thirdly, they were ignorant of the ascension, for they dreamed of an earthly kingdom at the very time when he was about to ascend, saying: Will you at this time restore the kingdom to Israel? (Acts 1:6). And after Christ's ascension, Peter knew nothing of the breaking down of the partition wall between Jews and Gentiles, until God had better instructed him in a vision (Acts 10:14). No doubt we have ordinary examples of this implicit faith in sundry persons among us. For some there are who are dull and hard both for understanding and memory, and thereupon make no such progress in knowledge as many others do. Yet for good affec-

tion and conscience in their doings, so far as they know, they come not short of any, having withal a continual care to increase in knowledge and to walk in obedience according to what they know. Such persons, though ignorant in many things, yet have a meaning of true faith, and what is wanting in knowledge is supplied in affection. In some respects they are to be preferred before many who have the glib tongue and a brain swimming with knowledge. To this purpose Melanchthon said well: We must acknowledge the great mercy of God, who puts a difference between sins of ignorance and such as are done wittingly, and forgives manifold ignorances to them that know but the foundation and are teachable — as may be seen by the Apostles, in whom there was much want of understanding before the resurrection of Christ. But as has been said, he requires that we be teachable, and he will not have us to be hardened in our sluggishness and dullness. As it is said in Psalm 1: He meditates in his law day and night.

The second kind of implicit faith is in regard of apprehension: when a man cannot say distinctly and certainly, I believe the pardon of my sins, but he does unfeignedly desire to believe the pardon of them all, and he desires to repent. This case befalls many of God's children when they are touched in conscience for their sins. But where men are displeased with themselves for their offenses and do withal constantly from the heart desire to believe and to be reconciled to God, there is faith and many other graces of God enfolded — as in the little and tender bud is enfolded the leaf, the blossom, and the fruit. For though a desire to repent and to believe is not faith and repentance in nature, yet in God's acceptance it is, God accepting the will for the deed. Isaiah 42:3: Christ will not quench the smoking flax, which as yet by reason of weakness gives

neither light nor heat. Christ says in Matthew 5:6: Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness, for they shall be satisfied — where by persons hungering and thirsting are meant all such as feel with grief their own want of righteousness and withal desire to be justified and sanctified. Romans 8:26: God hears and regards the very groans and sighs of his servants, even though they are unspeakable by reason that they are sometimes little, weak, and confused. Yet God has respect to them because they are the work of his own Spirit. Thus when we see that in a touched heart desiring to believe there is an enfolded faith. And this is the faith which many of the true servants of God have. Our salvation stands not so much in our apprehending of Christ, as in Christ's comprehending of us. Therefore Paul says in Philippians 3:12: He follows after perfection, if that he might comprehend that for whose sake he is comprehended of Christ. Now if any shall say that without a lively faith in Christ none can be saved, I answer that God accepts the desire to believe for lively faith in the time of temptation and in the time of our first conversion. Put case: a man that never yet repented falls into some grievous sickness, and then begins to be touched in conscience for his sins and to be truly humbled. Hereupon he is exhorted to believe his own reconciliation with God in Christ and the pardon of his own sins. And as he is exhorted, so he endeavors according to the measure of grace received to believe. Yet after much striving he cannot resolve himself that he does distinctly and certainly believe the pardon of his own sins. Only this he can say: that he does heartily desire to believe, that he wishes this above all things in the world, and he esteems all things as dung for Christ — and thus he dies. I ask now, what shall we say of him? Surely we may say nothing but that he died the child of

God and is undoubtedly saved. For however it were a happy thing if men could come to that fullness of faith which was in Abraham and many servants of God, yet certain it is that God in sundry cases accepts of this desire to believe for true faith indeed. And look as it is in nature, so is it in grace: in nature some die when they are children, some in old age, some in full strength, and yet all die as men. So again, some die babes in Christ, some of more perfect faith, and yet the weakest having the seeds of grace is the child of God, and faith in its infancy is faith. All this while it must be remembered: I say not there is a true faith without all apprehension, but without a distinct apprehension for some space of time. For this very desire by faith to apprehend Christ and his merits is a kind of apprehension. And thus we see the kinds of implicit or enfolded faith.

This doctrine is to be learned for two causes. First, it serves to rectify the consciences of weak ones, that they not be deceived touching their estate. For if we think that no faith can save but a full persuasion such as the faith of Abraham was, many truly bearing the name of Christ must be put out of the roll of the children of God. We are therefore to know that there is a growth in grace as in nature, and there are differences and degrees of true faith — and the least of them all is this enfolded faith. This in effect is the doctrine of Calvin: that when we begin by faith to know somewhat and have a desire to learn more, this may be termed an unexpressed faith. Secondly, this point of doctrine serves to rectify and in part to expound sundry catechisms, in that they seem to propound faith to men at so high a reach as few can attain to it, defining it to be a certain and full persuasion of God's love and favor in Christ. Whereas, though every faith is for its nature a certain persuasion,

yet only the strong faith is the full persuasion. Therefore faith is not only in general terms to be defined, but also the degrees and measures thereof are to be expounded, that weak ones to their comfort may be truly informed of their estate. And though we teach there is a kind of implicit faith which is the beginning of true and lively faith, yet none must upon this occasion content himself therewith, but labor to increase and go on from faith to faith. And so indeed will every one do who has any beginnings of true faith, be they never so little. And he who thinks he has a desire to believe and contents himself therewith has indeed no true desire to believe.

THE DIFFERENCE.

The pillars of the Roman Church lay down this ground: that faith in its own nature is not a knowledge of things to be believed, but a reverent assent to them whether they be known or unknown. Hereupon they build that if a man knows some necessary points of religion, as the doctrine of the Godhead, of the Trinity, of Christ's incarnation, and of our redemption, it is needless to know the rest by a particular or distinct knowledge. It suffices to give his consent to the church and to believe as the pastors believe. Behold a ruinous building upon a rotten foundation — for faith contains a knowledge of things to be believed, and knowledge is of the nature of faith, and nothing is believed that is not known. Isaiah 53:11: The knowledge of my righteous servant shall justify many. John 17:3: This is eternal life, to know the eternal God and whom you have sent, Jesus Christ. In these places, by knowledge is meant faith grounded upon knowledge, whereby we know and are assured that Christ and his benefits belong to us. Secondly, this kind

of assent is the mother of ignorance. For when men shall be taught that for sundry points of religion they may believe as the Church believes, that the study of the Scriptures is not to be required of them, that to their good they may be barred the reading of them, so long as they know some principal things contained in the articles of faith, and that common believers are not bound expressly to believe all the articles of the Apostles' Creed — few or none will have care to profit in knowledge. And yet God's commandment is that we should grow in knowledge and that his word should dwell plentifully in us (Colossians 3:16). Again, the Papists say that the devotion of the ignorant is often service better accepted than that which is done upon knowledge. Such (say they) as pray in Latin pray with as great consolation of spirit, with as little tediousness, with as great devotion and affection, and oftentimes more than the other, and always more than any schismatic or heretic in his own language. To conclude, they teach that some articles of faith are believed generally by the whole Church only by a simple or implicit faith, which afterward by the authority of a general council are set forth to be believed by the Church by express faith. Roffensis against Luther gives an example of this when he confesses that purgatory was little known at the first, but was made known partly by Scripture and partly by revelation in process of time. This implicit faith touching articles of religion we reject, holding that all things concerning faith and manners necessary to salvation are plainly expressed in Scripture, and accordingly to be believed.

POINT 17: OF PURGATORY



OUR CONSENT.

We hold a Christian purgatory, according as the word of God has set down the same to us. First of all, by this purgatory we understand the afflictions of God's children here on earth. Jeremiah 3: The people afflicted say, you have sent a fire into our bones. Psalm 66:12: We have gone through water and fire. Malachi 3:3: The children of Levi must be purified in a purging fire of affliction. 1 Peter 1:7: Afflictions are called the fiery trial whereby men are cleansed from their corruptions, as gold from the dross by the fire. Secondly, the blood of Christ is a purgatory of our sins. 1 John 1:7: Christ's blood purges us from all our sins. Hebrews 9:14: It purges our consciences from dead works. And Christ baptizes with the Holy Spirit and with fire, because our inward washing is by the blood of Christ and the Holy Spirit is as fire to consume and abolish the inward corruption of nature. To this effect says Origen: Without doubt we shall feel the unquenchable fire, unless we shall now entreat the Lord to send down from heaven a purgatory fire to us, whereby worldly desires may be utterly consumed in our minds. Augustine: Suppose the mercy of God is your purgatory.

THE DIFFERENCE OR DISSENT.

We differ from the Papists touching purgatory in two things. First, for the place. They hold it to be a part of hell into which an entrance is made only after this life. We for our parts deny it, as having no warrant in the word of God, which mentions only two places for men after this life — heaven and hell — with the twofold condition thereof: joy and torment. Luke 16:25-26; John 3:36; Revelation 22:14-15; Revelation 21:7-8; Matthew 8:11. Nay, we find the contrary: Revelation 14:13 says that they that die in the Lord are said to rest from their labors, which cannot be true if any of them go to purgatory. And to cut off all evasions, it is further said that their works — that is, the reward of their works — follow them even at their heels, as an attendant does his master. Augustine says well: After this life there remains no compunction or satisfaction. And: Here is all remission of sin; here are temptations that move us to sin; lastly, here is the evil from which we desire to be delivered; but there is none of all these. And: We are not here without sin, but we shall go hence without sin. Cyril says: They who are once dead can add nothing to the things which they have done, but shall remain as they were left, and wait for the time of the last judgment. Chrysostom: After the end of this life, there are no occasions of merits.

Secondly, we differ from them touching the means of purification. They say that men are purged by suffering pains in purgatory, whereby they satisfy for their venial sins and for the temporal punishment of their mortal sins. We teach the contrary, holding that nothing can free us from the least punishment of the smallest sin but the sufferings of Christ, and purge us from the least taint of corruption, saving the blood of Christ. Indeed they say that our

sufferings in themselves considered do not purge and satisfy, but as they are made meritorious by the sufferings of Christ. But to this I oppose one text of Scripture: Hebrews 1:3, where it is said that Christ has purged our sins by himself — where the last clause cuts the throat of all human satisfactions and merits. It gives us to understand that whatsoever thing purges us from our sins is not to be found in us but in Christ alone. Otherwise it should have been said that Christ purges the sins of men by themselves as well as by himself, and that he should merit by his death that we should become our own saviors in part.

To this place I may well refer prayer for the dead, of which I will set down two affirmative conclusions and one negative. Conclusion 1. We hold that Christian charity is to extend itself to the very dead, and it must show itself in their honest burial, in the preservation of their good names, and in the help and relief of their posterity as time and occasion shall be offered (Ruth 1:8; John 19:23).

Conclusion 2. We pray further in a general manner for the faithful departed, that God would hasten their joyful resurrection and the full accomplishment of their happiness both for body and soul. And thus much we ask in saying: Your kingdom come — that is, not only the kingdom of grace but also the kingdom of glory in heaven. Thus far we come, but nearer the gates of Babylon we dare not approach.

Conclusion 3. To pray for particular men departed, and to pray for their deliverance out of purgatory, we think it unlawful, because we have neither promise nor commandment so to do.

POINT 18: OF ECCLESIASTICAL SUPREMACY



OUR CONSENT.

Touching the point of ecclesiastical supremacy, I will set down how near we may come to the Roman Church in two conclusions. Conclusion 1. For the founding of the primitive Church, the ministry of the word was distinguished by degrees not only of order but also of power, and Peter was called to the highest degree. Ephesians 4:11: Christ ascended up on high and gave gifts to men for the good of his Church — as some to be apostles, some prophets, some evangelists, some pastors and teachers. Now, however one apostle may not be above another, or one evangelist above another, or one pastor above another, yet an apostle was above an evangelist and an evangelist above all pastors and teachers. And Peter was by calling an apostle, and therefore above all evangelists and pastors, having the highest room in the ministry of the New Testament both for order and authority.

Conclusion 2. Among the twelve Apostles Peter had a threefold privilege or prerogative: of authority, of primacy, and of principality. For the first — by the privilege of authority I mean a preeminence in regard of estimation, whereby he was had in reverence

above the rest of the twelve Apostles. For Cephas with James and John are called pillars and seemed to be great (Galatians 2:6, 9). Again he had the preeminence of primacy, because he was the first named, as the foreman of the company. Matthew 10:2: The names of the twelve Apostles are these — the first is Simon called Peter. Thirdly he had the preeminence of principality among the twelve, because in regard of the measure of grace he excelled the rest. For when Christ asked his disciples whom they said he was, Peter as being of greatest ability and zeal answered for them all (Matthew 16:16). I use this clause — among the twelve — because Paul excelled Peter every way, in learning, zeal, and understanding, as far as Peter excelled the rest. And thus near we come to Popish supremacy.

THE DIFFERENCE.

The Church of Rome gives to Peter a supremacy under Christ above all causes and persons — that is, full power to govern and order the catholic Church upon the whole earth both for doctrine and governance. This supremacy stands (as they teach) in a power or judgment to determine the true sense of all places of Scripture; to determine all causes of faith; to assemble general councils; to ratify the decrees of the said councils; to excommunicate any man upon earth that lives within the Church, even princes and nations; properly to absolve and forgive sins; to decide causes brought to him by appeal from all parts of the earth; and lastly to make laws that shall bind the conscience. This fullness of power with one consent is ascribed to Peter and the bishops of Rome that follow him in a supposed succession. Now we hold on the contrary that neither Peter nor any bishop of Rome has any supremacy over the

catholic Church, but that all supremacy under Christ pertains to kings and princes within their dominions. And that our doctrine is good and theirs false and forged, I will make it manifest by sundry reasons.

Reason 1. Christ must be considered two ways. First, as he is God — and so is he an absolute king over all things in heaven and earth, with the Father and the Holy Spirit, by the right of creation. Second, he is a king as he is redeemer of mankind, and by the right of redemption he is a sovereign king over the whole Church, and that in a special manner. Now as Christ is God with the Father and the Holy Spirit, he has his deputies on earth to govern the world — namely kings and princes, who are therefore in Scripture called gods. But as Christ is Mediator, and consequently a king over his redeemed ones, he has neither fellow nor deputy. No fellow, for then he should be an imperfect mediator. No deputy, for no creature is capable of this office to do in the room and stead of Christ that which he himself does — because every work of the Mediator is a compound work arising from the effects of two natures concurring in one and the same action, namely the Godhead and the manhood. Therefore to the effecting of the said work there is required an infinite power, which far exceeds the strength of any created nature. Again, Hebrews 7:24 says Christ has a priesthood which cannot pass from his person to any other. Whence it follows that neither his kingly nor his prophetic office can pass from him to any creature, either in whole or in part, because the three offices of mediation in this regard are equal. Nay, it is a needless thing for Christ to have a deputy to put in execution any part of his mediatorship, since a deputy only serves to supply the absence of the principal — whereas Christ is always present with his Church by

his word and Spirit. For where two or three are gathered together in his name, he is in the midst among them. It may be said that the ministers in the work of the ministry are deputies of Christ. I answer that they are no deputies but active instruments. For in the preaching of the word there are two actions: the first is the uttering or propounding of it to the ear; the second is the inward operation of the Holy Spirit in the heart, which indeed is the principal and belongs to Christ alone, the action of speaking in the minister being only instrumental. Thus likewise the church of God in cutting off any member by excommunication is no more than an instrument performing a ministry in the name of Christ, and that is to testify and pronounce whom Christ himself has cut off from the kingdom of heaven. This one conclusion overthrows not only the Pope's supremacy but also many other points of popery.

Reason 2. All the Apostles in regard of power and authority were equal, for the apostolic commission both for right and execution was given equally to them all, as the very words import. Matthew 28:19: Go, teach all nations, baptizing them, and so on. And the promise, I will give to you the keys of the kingdom of heaven, is not private to Peter but is made in his person to the rest, according as his confession was in the name of the rest. Thus says Theophylact: They have the power of committing and binding that receive the gift of a bishop as Peter. And Ambrose says: What is said to Peter is said to the Apostles. Therefore Peter had no supremacy over the rest of the Apostles in respect of right to the commission, which they say belonged to him only and the execution thereof to the rest. But let all be granted that Peter was in commission above the rest for the time of his life — yet hence may not any superiority be gathered for the bishops of Rome, because

the authority of the Apostles was personal and consequently ceased with them, without being conveyed to any other. For the Lord did not vouchsafe the like honor to any after them. For first of all, it was the privilege of the Apostles to be called immediately and to see the Lord Jesus. Secondly, they had power to give the gift of the Holy Spirit by the imposition of hands. Thirdly, they had such a measure of the assistance of the Spirit that in their public sermons and in writing of the word they could not err. And these things were all denied to those that followed after them. And that their authority ceased in their persons stands with reason also, because it was given in so ample a manner for the founding of the Church of the New Testament, which being once founded, it was needful only that there should be pastors and teachers for the building of it up to the end of the world.

Reason 3. When the sons of Zebedee sued to Christ for the greatest rooms of honor in his kingdom (deeming he should be an earthly king), Christ answers them: You know that the lords of the Gentiles have dominion, and they that are great exercise authority over them, but it shall not be so with you. Bernard applies these very words to Pope Eugenius on this manner: It is plain, says he, that here dominion is forbidden the Apostles. Go to then — dare if you will to take upon you a ruling apostleship, or in your apostleship rule or dominion. If you will have both alike, you shall lose both. Otherwise you must not think yourself exempted from the number of those of whom the Lord complains: They have reigned but not of me; they have been, and I have not known them.

Reason 4. Ephesians 4 makes mention of gifts which Christ gave to his Church after his ascension, whereby some were apostles, some prophets, some evangelists, some pastors and teachers.

Now if there had been an office in which men as deputies of Christ should have governed the whole Church to the end of the world, the calling might here have been named fitly with a gift pertaining thereto. And Paul (no doubt) would not here have concealed it, where he mentions callings of lesser importance.

Reason 5. The Pope's supremacy was judged by sentences of Scripture and condemned long before it was manifest in the world, the spirit of prophecy foreseeing and foretelling the state of things to come. 2 Thessalonians 2:3-4: The man of sin (which is that Antichrist) shall exalt himself above all that is called God. Now this whole chapter with all its circumstances most fitly agrees to the see of Rome and the head thereof. And the thing which then stayed the revealing of the man of sin (verse 6) is by most expounded to be the Roman Emperor. I will allege one testimony in the room of many. Chrysostom says on this place: As long as the empire shall be had in awe, no man shall strictly submit himself to Antichrist. But after that the empire shall be dissolved, Antichrist shall invade the vacant seat of empire and shall labor to pull to himself the empire both of man and God. And this we find now in experience to be true, for the see of Rome never flourished until the empire decayed and the seat thereof was removed from the city of Rome. Again, Revelation 13 makes mention of two beasts: one coming out of the sea, whom the Papists confess to be the heathenish Roman Emperor; the second coming out of the earth, which does all that the first beast could do before him. This fitly agrees to the popes of Rome, who do and have done all things that the Emperor did or could do, and that in his very sight.

Reason 6: The judgment of the ancient Church. Cyprian says: Doubtless the rest of the Apostles were what Peter was — endued with equal fellowship both of honor and of power. But a beginning is made of unity, that the Church may appear to be one. Gregory says: If one be called universal bishop, the universal Church goes to decay. And: I say boldly that whoever calls or desires to call himself universal priest, in his pride is a forerunner of Antichrist. And: Behold, in the preface of the epistle which you directed to me, you caused to be set a proud title, calling me universal Pope. Bernard: Consider that you are not a lord of bishops, but one of them. Churches are maimed in that the Roman bishop draws all power to himself. Again, Gregory himself being Pope says to the Emperor: I who am subject to your commandment have in every way discharged what was due, in that I have performed my allegiance to the Emperor and have not concealed what I thought on God's behalf. And Pope Leo the Fourth, after Gregory by two hundred years, acknowledged the Emperor Lothair as his sovereign prince and professed obedience without gainsaying to his imperial commandments.

To conclude: whereas they say that there is a double head of the Church — one imperial which is Christ alone, the other ministerial which is the Pope governing the whole Church under Christ — I answer this distinction robs Christ of his honor. Because in setting up their ministerial head, they are forced to borrow of Christ things proper to him, as the privilege to forgive sins properly, and the power to govern the whole earth by making laws that shall as truly bind conscience as the laws of God.

POINT 19: OF THE EFFICACY OF THE SACRAMENTS



OUR CONSENT.

Conclusion 1. We hold that the sacraments are signs to represent Christ with his benefits to us.

Conclusion 2. We teach further that the sacraments are indeed instruments whereby God offers and gives the foresaid benefits to us. Thus far we consent with the Roman Church.

THE DIFFERENCE.

The difference between us stands in sundry points. First of all, the best learned among them teach that sacraments are physical instruments — that is, true and proper instrumental causes having force and efficacy in them to produce and give grace. They use to express their meaning by these comparisons: when the scrivener takes the pen into his hand and writes, the action of writing comes from the pen moved by the hand of the writer; and in cutting of wood or stone, the division comes from the saw moved by the hand of the workman. Even so the grace (say they) that is given by God is conferred by the sacrament itself. Now we for our parts hold that

sacraments are not physical but mere voluntary instruments. Voluntary, because it is the will and appointment of God to use them as certain outward means of grace. Instruments, because when we use them aright according to the institution, God then answerably confers grace from himself. In this respect only do we take them for instruments and no otherwise.

The second difference is this: they teach that the very action of the minister dispensing the sacrament, as it is a work done, gives grace immediately if the party be prepared — as the very washing or sprinkling of water in baptism and the giving of bread in the Lord's Supper. We hold the contrary — namely that no action in the dispensation of a sacrament confers grace as it is a work done, that is, by the efficacy and force of the very sacramental action itself though ordained of God. Rather grace is conferred two ways. First, by the signification thereof. For God testifies to us his will and good pleasure partly by the word of promise and partly by the sacrament — the signs representing to the eyes that which the word does to the ears, being also types and certain images of the very same things that are promised in the word and no other. The elements are not general and confused but particular signs to the several communicants, and by the virtue of the institution — for when the faithful receive the signs from God by the hands of the minister, it is as much as if God himself with his own mouth should speak to them severally and by name, promising to them remission of sins. And things said to men particularly do more affect and more take away doubting than if they were generally spoken to a whole company. Therefore signs of graces are as it were an

applying and binding of the promise of salvation to every particular believer, and by this means the oftener they are received, the more they help our infirmity and confirm our assurance of mercy.

Again, the sacrament confers grace in that the sign thereof confirms faith as a pledge, by reason it has a promise annexed to it. For when God commands us to receive the signs in faith and withal promises to the receivers to give the thing signified, he binds himself as it were in bond to stand to his own word — even as men bind themselves in obligations, putting their hands and seals, so that they cannot go back. And when the signs are thus used as pledges, and that often, they greatly increase the grace of God — as a token sent from one friend to another renews and confirms the persuasion of love.

These are the two principal ways whereby the sacraments are said to confer grace: in respect of their signification and as they are pledges of God's favor to us. The very point here to be considered is in what order and manner they confirm. And the manner is this: the signs and visible elements affect the senses outward and inward; the senses convey their object to the mind; the mind directed by the Holy Spirit reasons on this manner from the promise annexed to the sacrament: He that uses the elements aright shall receive grace thereby. But I use the elements aright in faith and repentance, says the mind of the believer, therefore shall I receive from God increase of grace. Thus faith is confirmed not by the work done, but by a kind of reasoning caused in the mind, the argument or proof whereof is borrowed from the elements being signs and pledges of God's mercy.

The third difference. The Papists teach that in the sacrament by the work done, the very grace of justification is conferred. We say no — because a man of years must first believe and be justified before he can be a meet partaker of any sacrament. And the grace that is conferred is only the increase of our faith, hope, sanctification, and the like.

OUR REASONS.

Reason 1. The word preached and the sacraments differ in the manner of giving Christ and his benefits to us — because in the word the Spirit of God teaches us by a voice conveyed to the mind by the bodily ears, but in the sacraments annexed to the word, by certain sensible and bodily signs viewed by the eye. Sacraments are nothing but visible words and promises. Otherwise for the giving itself they differ not. Christ himself says that in the very word his own flesh is eaten, which he was to give for the life of the world — and what can be said more of the Lord's Supper? Augustine says that believers are partakers of the body and blood of Christ in baptism. Jerome to Hedobia says that in baptism we eat and drink the body and blood of Christ. If thus much may be said of baptism, why may it not also be said of the word preached? Again, Jerome upon Ecclesiastes says: It is profitable to be filled with the body of Christ and to drink his blood, not only in mystery but in knowledge of holy Scripture. Now upon this it follows that seeing the work done in the word preached confers not grace, neither does the work done in the sacrament confer any grace.

Reason 2. Matthew 3:11: I baptize you with water to repentance, but he that comes after me is stronger than I — he shall baptize you with the Holy Spirit and with fire. Hence it is manifest that

grace in the sacrament proceeds not from any action in the sacrament. For John, though he does not disjoin himself and his action from Christ and the action of his Spirit, yet does he distinguish them plainly in number, persons, and effect. To this purpose Paul, who had said of the Galatians that he travailed of them and begot them by the Gospel, says of himself that he is not anything — not only as he was a man, but as he was a faithful Apostle. Thereby excluding the whole evangelical ministry, whereof the sacrament is a part, from the least part of divine operation or efficacy in conferring grace.

Reason 3. The blessed angels — nay, the very flesh of the Son of God — has not any quickening virtue from itself, but all this efficacy or virtue is in and from the Godhead of the Son, who by means of the flesh apprehended by faith derives heavenly and spiritual life from himself to the members. Now if there is no efficacy in the flesh of Christ but by reason of the hypostatic union, how shall bodily actions about bodily elements confer grace immediately?

Reason 4. Paul in Romans 4 stands much upon this, to prove that justification by faith is not conferred by the sacraments. And from the circumstance of time he gathers that Abraham was first justified and then afterward received circumcision, the sign and seal of this righteousness. Now we know that the general condition of all sacraments is one and the same, and that baptism succeeded circumcision. And what can be more plain than the example of Cornelius (Acts 10), who before Peter came to him had the commendation of the fear of God and was endued with the spirit of prayer? And afterward when Peter by preaching opened more fully the way of the Lord, he and the rest received the Holy Spirit. And

after all this they were baptized. Now if they received the Holy Spirit before baptism, then they received remission of sins and were justified before baptism.

Reason 5: The judgment of the Church. Basil: If there be any grace in the water, it is not from the nature of the water, but from the presence of the Spirit. Jerome says: Man gives water but God gives the Holy Spirit. Augustine says: Water touches the body and washes the heart. But he shows his meaning elsewhere: There is one water of the sacrament, another of the Spirit. The water of the sacrament is visible, the water of the Spirit invisible. That washes the body and signifies what is done in the soul. By this the soul is purged and sealed.

Objection. Remission of sins, regeneration, and salvation is ascribed to the sacrament of baptism in Acts 22:16, Ephesians 5, Galatians 3:27, and Titus 3:5. Answer: Salvation and remission of sins is ascribed to baptism and the Lord's Supper as to the word, which is the power of God to salvation to all that believe. And that, as they are instruments of the Holy Spirit to signify, seal, and exhibit to the believing mind the foresaid benefits. But indeed the proper instrument whereby salvation is apprehended is faith, and sacraments are but props of faith furthering salvation two ways: first because by their signification they help to nourish and preserve faith; secondly because they seal grace and salvation to us. Yea, God gives grace and salvation when we use them well, provided we believe the word of promise made to the sacrament, of which also they are seals. And thus we keep the middle way, neither giving too much nor too little to the sacraments.

POINT 20: OF SAVING FAITH



OUR CONSENT.

Conclusion 1. They teach it to be the property of faith to believe the whole word of God, and especially the redemption of mankind by Christ.

Conclusion 2. They avow that they believe and look to be saved by Christ and by Christ alone, and by the mere mercy of God in Christ.

Conclusion 3. The most learned among them hold and confess that the obedience of Christ is imputed to them for the satisfaction of the law and for their reconciliation with God.

Conclusion 4. They avow that they put their whole trust and confidence in Christ and in the mere mercy of God for their salvation.

Conclusion 5. Lastly, they hold that every man must apply the promise of life everlasting by Christ to himself, and this they grant we are bound to do. In these five points do they and we agree, at least in show of words.

By the avowing of these five conclusions, Papists may easily escape the hands of many magistrates. And unless the mystery of Popish doctrine be well known, any common man may easily be deceived, and take such for good Protestants that are but Popish priests. To this end therefore, that we may the better discern their guile, I will show wherein they fail in each of their conclusions and wherein they differ from us.

THE DIFFERENCE.

Touching the first conclusion: they believe indeed all the written word of God, and more than all — for they also believe the Apocryphal books, which antiquity for many hundred years has excluded from the canon. Yes, they believe unwritten traditions received (as they say) from councils, the writings of the fathers, and the determinations of the Church, making them also of equal credit with the written word of God given by inspiration of the Spirit. Now we for our parts do not despise the Apocrypha, as namely the books of the Maccabees, Ecclesiasticus, and the rest — but we reverence them in all convenient manner, preferring them before any other books of men, in that they have been approved by a universal consent of the Church. Yet we think them not fitting to be received into the canon of holy Scripture, and therefore not to be believed save as they are consenting with the written word. And for this our doing we have direction from Athanasius, Origen, Jerome, and the Council of Laodicea. As for unwritten traditions, they come not within the compass of our faith, neither can they, because they come to us by the hands of men that may deceive and be deceived. We hold and believe that the right canon of the books of the Old and New Testament contains in it sufficient direction for

the Church of God to life everlasting, both for faith and manners. Here then is the point of difference: they make the object of faith larger than it should be or can be, and we keep ourselves to the written word, believing nothing to salvation outside it.

In the second conclusion, touching salvation by Christ alone, there is a manifest deceit: because they craftily include and couch their own works under the name of Christ. For (say they) works done by regenerate men are not their own but Christ's in them, and as they are the works of Christ they save, and no otherwise. But we for our parts look to be saved only by such works as Christ himself did in his own person, and not by any work at all done by him in us. For all works done are in the matter of justification and salvation opposed to the grace of Christ. Romans 11:6: Election is of grace, not of works; if it be of works, it is no more of grace. Again, whereas they teach that we are saved by the works of Christ which he works in us and makes us to work, it is flat against the word. For Paul says we are not saved by such works as God has ordained that regenerate men should walk in (Ephesians 2:10). And he says further that he counted all things — even after his conversion — loss to him that he might be found in Christ, not having his own righteousness which is of the law (Philippians 3:8). Again, Hebrews 1:3: Christ washed away our sins by himself — which last words exclude the merit of all works done by Christ within man. Thus indeed the Papists overturn all that which in word they seem to hold touching their justification and salvation. We confess with them that good works in us are the works of Christ, yet they are not Christ's alone but ours also, in that they proceed from Christ by the mind and will of man — as water from the fountain by the channel. And just as the channel defiled defiles the water that is

without defilement in the fountain, even so the mind and will of man defiled by the remnants of sin defile the works which, as they come from Christ, are undefiled. Hence it is that the works of grace which we do by Christ, or Christ in us, are defective and must be severed from Christ in the act of justification or salvation.

The third conclusion concerns the imputation of Christ's obedience, which some of the most learned among them acknowledge. The difference between us stands on this manner. They hold that Christ's obedience is imputed only to make satisfaction for sin, and not to justify us before God. We hold and believe that the obedience of Christ is imputed to us even for our righteousness before God. Paul says in 1 Corinthians 1:30: Christ is made unto us of God wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption. Hence I reason thus: if Christ is both our sanctification and our righteousness, then he is not only unto us inherent righteousness, but also righteousness imputed. But he is not only our sanctification — which the Papists themselves expound of inherent or habitual righteousness — but also our righteousness, for thus by Paul are they distinguished. Therefore he is unto us both inherent and imputed righteousness. And very reason teaches thus much. For in the end of the world at the bar of God's judgment, we must bring some kind of righteousness for our justification that may stand in the rigor of the law according to which we are to be judged. But our inherent righteousness is imperfect and stained with manifold defects and shall be as long as we live in this world, as experience tells us — and consequently it is not suitable to the justice of the law. And if we go out of ourselves we shall find no righteousness serving for our turns either in men or angels that may or can procure our absolution before God and acceptance to life everlasting.

We must therefore have recourse to the person of Christ, and his obedience imputed unto us must serve not only as a satisfaction to God for all our sins, but also for our perfect justification — in that God is content to accept it for our righteousness, as if it were inherent in us or performed by us.

Touching the fourth conclusion: they hold it the safest and surest course to put their trust and confidence in the mercy of God alone for their salvation. Yet they agree that men may also put their confidence in the merit of their own works and in the merits of other men, so it be in sobriety. But this doctrine quite mars the conclusion, because by teaching that men are to put confidence in the creature, they overturn all confidence in the Creator. For in the very first commandment we are taught to make choice of the true God for our God, which thing we do when we give to God our hearts, and we give our hearts to God when we put our whole confidence in him for the salvation of our souls. Now to put confidence in men or in works is to make them our gods. The true and ancient form of making confession was on this manner: I believe in God the Father, in Jesus Christ, and in the Holy Spirit — without mention making of any confidence in works or creatures. The ancient Church never knew any such confession or confidence. Cyprian says: He believes not in God who puts not his trust concerning his salvation in God alone. And indeed the Papists themselves, when death comes, forsake the confidence of their merits and flee to the mere mercy of God in Christ. And for a confirmation of this I allege the testimony of one Vlinbergius of Cologne, who writes thus: there was a book found in the vestry of a certain parish of Cologne, written in the Dutch tongue in the year of our Lord 1475, which the priests used in visiting of the sick. And in it

these questions are found: Do you believe that you cannot be saved but by the death of Christ? The sick person answered, Yea. Then it is said unto him: Go then, while breath remains in you, put your confidence in this death alone. Have trust in nothing else. Commit yourself wholly to this death. With it alone cover yourself. Plunge yourself in every part into this death; in every part pierce yourself with it; enfold yourself in this death. And if the Lord will judge you, say: Lord, I put the death of our Lord Jesus Christ between me and your judgment, and by no other means do I contend with you. And if he shall say unto you that you are a sinner, say: Lord, the death of my Lord Jesus Christ I put between you and my sins. If he shall say unto you that you have deserved damnation, say: Lord, I oppose the death of our Lord Jesus Christ between you and my evil merits, and I offer his merit for the merit which I should have and have not. If he shall say that he is angry with you, say: Lord, I oppose the death of our Lord Jesus Christ between me and your anger. Here we see what Papists do and have done in the time of death. And that which they hold and practice when they are dying, they should hold and practice every day while they are living.

In the last conclusion they teach that we must not only believe in general but also apply unto ourselves the promises of life everlasting. But they differ from us in the very manner of applying. They teach that the promise is to be applied not by faith assuring us of our own salvation, but only by hope in likelihood conjectural. We hold that we are bound in duty to apply the promise of life by faith without making doubt thereof, and by hope to continue the certainty after the apprehension made by faith. We do not teach that every man living within the precincts of the Church, professing the name of Christ, is certain of his salvation and that by faith

— but that he ought so to be, and must endeavor to attain thereto. And here is a great point in the mystery of iniquity to be considered: for by this uncertain application of the promise of salvation and this wavering hope, they overturn half the doctrine of the gospel. For it enjoins two things: first, to believe the promises thereof to be true in themselves; second, to believe and by faith to apply them unto ourselves. And this latter part — without which the former is void of comfort — is quite overturned. The reasons which they allege against our doctrine I have answered before, and therefore I let them pass.

To conclude: though in colored terms they seem to agree with us in doctrine concerning faith, yet indeed they deny and abolish the substance thereof — namely, the particular and certain application of Christ crucified and his benefits unto ourselves. Again, they fail in that they cut off the principal duty and office of true saving faith, which is to apprehend and to apply the blessing promised.

POINT 21: OF REPENTANCE



Finis.

OUR CONSENT.

Conclusion 1. Repentance is the conversion of a sinner. There is a twofold conversion — passive and active. Passive conversion is an action of God whereby he converts man who is as yet unconverted. Active conversion is an action whereby man, being once turned by God, turns himself. And of this latter must this conclusion be understood. For the first conversion — considering it is a work of God turning us unto himself — is not the repentance whereof the Scripture speaks so often, but it is called by the name of regeneration. And repentance, whereby we being first turned by God do turn ourselves and do good works, is the fruit thereof.

Conclusion 2. Repentance stands specially for practice in contrition of heart, confession of mouth, and satisfaction in work or deed. Touching contrition, there are two kinds: legal and evangelical. Legal contrition is nothing but a remorse of conscience for sin in regard of the wrath and judgment of God, and it is no grace of God at all, nor any part or cause of repentance — but only an occasion thereof, and that by the mercy of God. For of itself it is the

sting of the law and the very entrance into the pit of hell. Evangelical contrition is when a repentant sinner is grieved for his sins not so much for fear of hell or any other punishment, as because he has offended and displeased so good and merciful a God. This contrition is caused by the ministry of the Gospel, and in the practice of repentance it is always necessary and goes before as the beginning thereof. Secondly, we hold and maintain that confession is to be made, and that in sundry respects. First to God, both publicly in the congregation and also privately in our secret and private prayers. Secondly to the Church, when any person has openly offended the congregation by any crime and is therefore excommunicate. Thirdly to our private neighbor, when we have upon any occasion offended and wronged him — Matthew 5:23: If you bring your gift to the altar and there remember that your brother has something against you, go first and be reconciled to him; now reconciliation presupposes confession. Lastly, in all true repentance we hold and acknowledge there must be satisfaction made. First to God, and that is when we entreat him in our supplications to accept the death and passion of Christ as a full, perfect, and sufficient satisfaction for all our sins. Secondly it is to be made unto the Church, after excommunication for public offenses, and it stands in duties of humiliation that fitly serve to testify the truth of our repentance. Thirdly, satisfaction is to be made to our neighbor, because if he be wronged he must have recompense and restitution made — Luke 19:8 — and repentance may justly be suspected where no satisfaction is made if it lie in our power.

Conclusion 3. In repentance we are to bring forth outward fruits worthy of amendment of life. For repentance itself is in the heart and therefore must be testified in all manner of good works,

whereof the principal is to endeavor day by day by God's grace to leave and renounce all and every sin, and in all things to do the will of God. And here let it be remembered that we are not patrons of licentiousness and enemies of good works. For though we exclude them from the act of our justification and salvation, yet we maintain a profitable and necessary use of them in the life of every Christian man. This use is threefold: in respect of God, of man, and of ourselves. Works are to be done in respect of God: that his commandments may be obeyed — 1 John 5:12; that his will may be done — 1 Thessalonians 4:3; that we may show ourselves to be obedient children to God our Father — 1 Peter 1:14; that we may show ourselves thankful for our redemption by Christ — Titus 2:14; that we might not grieve the Spirit of God — Ephesians 4:30 — but walk according to the same — Galatians 5:22; that God by our good works may be glorified — Matthew 5:16; that we may be good followers of God — Ephesians 5:1. Again, works are to be done in regard of men: that our neighbor may be helped in worldly things — Luke 6:38; that he may be won by our example to godliness — 1 Peter 3:14; that we may prevent in ourselves the giving of any offense — 1 Corinthians 10:32; that by doing good we may stop the mouths of our adversaries. Thirdly and lastly, they have use in respect of ourselves: that we may show ourselves to be new creatures — 2 Corinthians 5:17; that we may walk as the children of light — Ephesians 5:8; that we may have some assurance of our faith and of our salvation — 2 Peter 1:8, 10; that we may discern dead and counterfeit faith from true faith — James 2:17; that faith and the gifts of God may be exercised and continued unto the end — 2 Timothy 1:6; that the punishments of sin both temporal and

eternal may be prevented — Psalm 89:32; that the reward may be obtained which God freely in mercy has promised to men for their good works — Galatians 6:9.

THE DIFFERENCE.

We dissent not from the Church of Rome in the doctrine of repentance itself, but in the damnable abuses thereof, which are of two sorts: general and special. General abuses are those which concern repentance wholly considered, and they are these. The first is that they place the beginning of repentance partly in themselves and partly in the Holy Spirit — or in the power of their natural free will being helped by the Holy Spirit — whereas Paul indeed ascribes this work wholly unto God: 2 Timothy 2:25, proving if God at any time will give them repentance. And men that are not weak but dead in trespasses and sins cannot do anything that may further their conversion, though they be helped ever so much — no more than dead men in their graves can rise from thence. The second abuse is that they take penance — or rather repentance — for that public discipline and order of correction that was used against notorious offenders in the open congregation. For the Scripture sets down but one repentance, and that common to all men without exception, to be practiced in every part of our lives for the necessary mortification of sin. Whereas open ecclesiastical correction pertained not to all and every man within the compass of the Church, but to them alone that gave any open offense. The third abuse is that they make repentance to be not only a virtue but also a sacrament, whereas for the space of a thousand years after Christ and upward it was not reckoned among the sacraments. It seems that Lombard was one of the first that called it a sacrament, and the

schoolmen after him disputed of the matter and form of this sacrament, not one of them able certainly to define what should be the outward element. The fourth abuse is touching the effect and efficacy of repentance, for they make it a meritorious cause of remission of sins and of life everlasting — flat against the word of God. Paul says notably in Romans 4:24: we are justified freely by his grace through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus, whom God has sent to be a reconciliation by faith in his blood. In these words the forms of speech — redemption in Christ, reconciliation in his blood, by faith, freely by grace — must be observed and considered, for they show plainly that no part of satisfaction or redemption is wrought in us or by us, but out of us only in the person of Christ. And therefore we esteem of repentance only as a fruit of faith, and the effect or efficacy of it is to testify remission of our sins and our reconciliation before God. It will be said that remission of sins and life everlasting are promised to repentance. The answer is: it is not to the work of repentance, but to the person who repents, and that not for his own merits or work of repentance but for the merits of Christ, which he applies to himself by faith. And thus are we to understand the promises of the gospel in which works are mentioned, presupposing always in them the reconciliation of the person with God to whom the promise is made. Thus we see wherefore we dissent from the Roman Church touching the doctrine of repentance.

Special abuses concern contrition, confession, and satisfaction. The first abuse concerning contrition is that they teach it must be sufficient and perfect. They now use a distinction to help the matter — saying that the sorrow in contrition must be in the highest degree in respect of value and estimation, and not in respect of in-

tensity. Yet the opinion of Adrian was otherwise: that in true repentance a man should be grieved according to all his endeavor. And the Roman Catechism says as much: that the sorrow conceived of our sins must be so great that none can be conceived to be greater; that we must be contrite in the same manner we love God, and that is with all our heart and strength in a most vehement sorrow; and that the hatred of sin must be not only the greatest but also most vehement and perfect, so as it may exclude all sloth and slackness. Indeed afterward it follows that true contrition may be effectual though it be imperfect — but how can this stand, if they will not only commend but also prescribe and avouch that contrition must be most perfect and vehement? We therefore only teach that God requires not so much the measure as the truth of any grace, and that it is a degree of unfeigned contrition to be grieved because we cannot be grieved for our sins as we should. The second abuse is that they ascribe to their contrition the merit of congruity. But this cannot stand with the all-sufficient merit of Christ. An ancient council says: God inspires into us first of all the faith and love of himself, no merits going before, that we may faithfully receive the sacrament of baptism and after baptism do the things that please him. And we for our parts hold that God requires contrition at our hands not to merit remission of sins, but that we may acknowledge our own unworthiness and be humbled in the sight of God and distrust all our own merits. Further, that we may make the more account of the benefits of Christ whereby we are received into the favor of God. Lastly, that we might more carefully avoid all sins in time to come, whereby so many pains and terrors of conscience are procured. And we acknowledge no contrition at all to be meritorious, save that of Christ, whereby he

was broken for our iniquities. The third abuse is that they make imperfect contrition or attrition — arising from the fear of hell — to be good and profitable. And to it they apply the saying of the Prophet: the fear of God is the beginning of wisdom. But servile fear of itself is the fruit of the law, which is the ministry of death and condemnation, and consequently it is the way to eternal destruction if God leaves men to themselves. And if it turns to the good of any, it is only by accident — because God in mercy makes it to be an occasion going before of grace to be given. Otherwise, remorse of conscience for sin is no beginning of repentance or the restraint of any sin, but rather is — and that properly — the beginning of unspeakable horrors of conscience and everlasting death, unless God show mercy. And yet this fear of punishment, if it be tempered and mingled with other graces and gifts of God in holy men, is not unprofitable — in whom there is not only a sorrow for punishment but also and much more for the offense. Such a kind of fear or sorrow is commanded in Malachi 1:6: If I be a father, where is my fear? If I be a Lord, where is my fear? And Chrysostom says that the fear of hell in the heart of a just man is a strong man armed against thieves and robbers to drive them from the house. And Ambrose says that martyrs in the time of their sufferings confirmed themselves against the cruelty of persecutors by setting the fear of hell before their eyes.

Abuses touching confession are these. The first is that they use a form of confession of their sins unto God uttered in an unknown language, being therefore foolish and ridiculous — and withal requiring the aid and intercession of dead men and such as be absent, whereas there is but one Mediator between God and man, the man Jesus Christ. The second is that they in practice make confes-

sion of their sins not only to God but to the saints departed, in that they make prayer to them in which they ask their intercession for the pardon of their sins. And this is not only to match them with God in seeing and knowing the heart, but also to give a part of his divine worship unto them. The third and principal abuse is that they have corrupted canonical confession by turning it into a private auricular confession, binding all men in conscience by a law made to confess all their mortal sins with all circumstances that change the kind of the sin — as far as possibly they can remember — once every year at the least, and that to a priest, unless it be in the case of extreme necessity. But in the word of God there is no warrant for this confession, nor in the writings of orthodox antiquity for the space of many hundred years after Christ, as one of their own side avouches. And the commandment of the Holy Spirit — confess one to another and pray one for another, James 5:17 — binds as well the priest to make confession unto us as any of us to the priest. And whereas it is said in Matthew 3 that many were baptized confessing their sins, and in Acts 19:18 many that believed came and confessed and showed their works — the confession was voluntary and not constrained; it was also general and not particular of all and every sin with the necessary circumstances thereof. And in this liberty of confession the Church remained 1,200 years until the Council of Lateran, in which the law of auricular confession was first enacted — a notable invention serving to discover the secrets of men and to enrich that covetous and ambitious see with the revenues of the world. It was not known to Augustine when he said: What have I to do with men that they should hear my confessions, as though they should heal all my diseases. Nor to Chrysostom, when he says: I do not compel you to

confess your sins to others. And: If you are ashamed to confess them to any man because you have sinned, say them daily in your own mind. I do not bid you confess them to your fellow servant that he should mock you; confess them to God who cures them.

The abuse of satisfaction is that they have turned canonical satisfaction — which was made to the congregation by open offenders — into a satisfaction of the justice of God for the temporal punishment of their sins. Behold here a most horrible profanation of the whole gospel, and especially of the satisfaction of Christ, which of itself without any supply is sufficient every way for the remission both of fault and punishment. But of this point I have spoken before.

Hitherto I have handled and proved by induction of sundry particulars that we are to make a separation from the present Church of Rome in respect of the foundation and substance of true religion. Many more things might be added to this very purpose, but here I conclude this first point — adding only this one caution: that we make separation from the Roman religion without hatred of the persons that are maintainers of it. Nay, we join in affection more with them than they with us. They do not die for their religion, though they deserve it, but for the treasons which they intend and enterprise. We are ready to do the duties of love unto them enjoined us in the word; we reverence the good gifts of God in many of them; we pray for them, wishing their repentance and eternal salvation.

Now I mean to proceed and to touch briefly other points of doctrine contained in this portion of Scripture which I have now in hand. In the second place therefore, out of this commandment — Go out of her, my people — I gather that the true Church of God is

and has been in the present Roman Church as corn in the heap of chaff. Though Popery reigned and overspread the face of the earth for many hundred years, yet in the midst thereof God reserved a people unto himself that truly worshipped him. And to this effect the Holy Spirit says that the dragon, which is the devil, caused the woman — that is, the Church — to flee into the wilderness, where he sought to destroy her but could not, and she still retains a remnant of her seed which keep the commandments of God and have the testimony of Jesus Christ — Revelation 12:17. Now this which I speak of the Church of Rome cannot be said in like manner of the congregations of Turks and other infidels — that the hidden Church of God is preserved among them — because there is no means of salvation at all. Whereas the Church of Rome has the Scriptures, though in a strange language, and baptism for the outward form, which helps God in all ages preserved that his elect might be gathered out of the midst of Babylon. This serves to stop the mouths of Papists who demand of us where our church was fourscore years ago, before the days of Luther — whereby they would insinuate to the world that our church and religion is new. But they are answered out of this very text: that our Church has ever been since the days of the Apostles, and that in the very midst of the papacy. It has always been a Church and did not first begin to be in Luther's time, but only then began to show itself, having been hidden by a universal apostasy for many hundred years together. Again, we have here occasion to consider the dealing of God with his own Church and people. He will have them for external society to be mixed with their enemies, and that for special purpose — namely, to exercise the humility and patience of his few servants. When Elijah saw idolatry spread over all Israel, he went

apart into the wilderness and in grief desired to die. And David cried out: Woe is me that I am constrained to dwell in Meshech and to have my habitation in the tents of Kedar — Psalm 120:5. And just Lot must have his righteous soul vexed with seeing and hearing the abominations of Sodom.

Thirdly, by this commandment we are taught what opinion to carry of the present Church of Rome. It is often demanded whether it be a Church or no, and the answer may hence be formed on this manner. If by this Church be understood a state or regiment of the people whereof the Pope is head, and the members are all such as acknowledge him to be their head and believe the doctrine established in the Council of Trent, we take it to be no Church of God. Because Babylon — which I have proved to be the Church of Rome — is here opposed to the Church or people of God, and because we are commanded to come out of it, whereas we may not wholly forsake any people until they forsake Christ. Some will happily say the Church of Rome has the Scriptures and the sacrament of baptism. I answer first of all: they have indeed the books of holy Scripture among them, but by the rest of their doctrine they overthrow the true sense thereof in the foundation, as I have proved before. And though they have the outward form of baptism, yet they overturn the inward baptism which is the substance of all, standing in the justification and sanctification of a sinner. Again I answer that they have the word and baptism not for themselves but for the true Church of God among them — like as the lantern holds the candle, not for itself but for others. Secondly, it may be and is alleged that if the Pope be Antichrist, he then sits in the temple — that is, the Church of God — and by this means the Roman Church shall be the true Church. The answer is: he sits in the temple of God, but

mark further how — as God, that is, not as a member but as a manifest usurper, like as a thief sits in the true man's house. For the Popish Church and God's Church are mingled like chaff and corn in one heap, and the Church of Rome may be said to be in the Church of God and the Church of God in the Church of Rome — as we say the wheat is among the chaff and the chaff in the wheat. Again, he is said to sit in the temple of God because the Roman Church, though falsely, takes unto itself the title of the true Catholic Church. Some go about to qualify the matter by comparing this Church to a man lying sick full of sores, having also his throat cut, yet so as body and soul are joined together and life is remaining still. But all things well considered, it is rather like a dead carcass, and is void of all spiritual life, as the Popish errors in the foundation make manifest. Indeed a known harlot may afterward remain a wife and be so termed — yet after the bill of divorcement is given she ceases to be a wife, though she can show her marriage ring. Now the Church has received the bill of her divorcement in the written word, namely 2 Thessalonians 2 and Revelation 13:11-12.

Furthermore, in this commandment we may see a lively portraiture of the state of all mankind. Here we see two sorts of men: some are pertaining to Babylon, a people running on to their destruction; some again are a people of God severed from Babylon and reserved to life everlasting. If any ask the cause of this distinction, I answer: it is the very will of God, vouchsafing mercy to some and forsaking others by withdrawing his mercy from them, for the better declaration of his justice. Thus says the Lord in Romans 11:4: I have reserved seven thousand that never bowed the knee to Baal. And the prophet Isaiah says: Unless the Lord had reserved a

remnant, we had been as Sodom and Gomorrah. By this distinction we are taught above all things to seek to be of the number of God's people, and to labor for assurance of this in our own consciences. For if all should be saved, less care would suffice — but this mercy is not common to all, and therefore the more to be thought upon.

Lastly, here I note the special care that God has over his own children. He first gives them warning to depart before he begins to execute his judgment upon his enemies with whom they live, that they might not be partakers of their sins or punishments. Thus, before God would punish Jerusalem, an angel is sent to mark in the forehead those who mourned for the abominations of the people. And in the destruction of the firstborn of Egypt, the angel passed over the houses of the Jews that had their posts sprinkled with the blood of the paschal lamb — and this passing over betokens safety and preservation in the common destruction for those who have their hearts sprinkled with the blood of Christ. This blessing of protection should move us all to become true and hearty servants of God. Men usually become members of those societies and corporations where they may enjoy many freedoms and privileges. Well, behold: in the society of the saints of God, which is the true Church, there is freedom from danger in all common destructions and from eternal vengeance at the last day. When Esther had procured safety for the Jews and liberty to avenge themselves upon their enemies, it is said that many of the people of the land became Jews. Even so, considering Christ has procured freedom from hell, death, and damnation for all that believe in him, we should labor above all things to become new creatures, joining ourselves always to the true Church of God.

Hitherto I have spoken of the commandment; now follows the reason thereof drawn from the end: that they be not partakers of her sins and that they receive not of her plagues. Here I might stand long to show what be the sins of the Church of Rome, but I will only name the principal. The first sin is atheism, and that I prove on this manner. Atheism is twofold: open and colored. Open atheism is when men both in word and deed deny God and his word. Colored atheism is not so manifest, and it has two degrees. The first degree is when men acknowledge God the creator and governor of heaven and earth, and yet deny the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Thus the Ephesians before they received the gospel are said to be without God — whom in their natural judgment they acknowledged — because they denied Christ, and consequently worshipped an idol of their own brain in that they worshipped God out of Christ. And in this respect, though the Samaritans worshipped the God of Abraham, yet our Savior Christ says they worshipped they knew not what. And the Psalmist says of all the Gentiles that their gods are idols. In this degree of atheism are placed Turks and Jews at this day, the anti-Trinitarians and Arians, and all that conceive and worship God outside the Trinity. The second degree is when men do rightly acknowledge the unity of the Godhead in the Trinity of persons, yet so as by other necessary consequences — partly of their doctrine and partly of the service of God — they overturn what they have well maintained. And thus I say that the very religion of the Church of Rome is a kind of atheism. For whereas it makes the merit of the works of men to concur with the grace of God, it overthrows the grace of God — Romans 11. In word they acknowledge the infinite justice and mercy of God, but by consequence both are denied. How can that be infinite justice

which may any way be appeased by human satisfactions? And how shall God's mercy be infinite, when we by our own satisfactions must add a supply to the satisfaction of Christ? Again: he that has not the Son has not the Father, and he that has neither Father nor Son denies God. Now the present Roman religion has not the Son — that is, Jesus Christ, God and man, the Mediator of mankind — but has transformed him into a feigned Christ. And I show it thus. For one Jesus Christ in all things like unto us in his humanity, sin only excepted, they have framed a Christ to whom they ascribed two kinds of existing: one natural, whereby he is visible, touchable, and circumscribed in heaven; the other not only above but also against nature, by which he is substantially according to his flesh in the hands of every priest, in every host, and in the mouth of every communicant — invisible, untouchable, uncircumscribed. And thus in effect they abolish his manhood. Yes, they degrade him of his offices. For one Jesus Christ the only king, lawgiver, and head of the Church, they join unto him the Pope not only as a vicar but also as a fellow, in that they give unto him power to make laws binding conscience, to resolve and determine infallibly the sense of holy Scripture, properly to pardon sin both in respect of fault and temporal punishment, to have authority over the whole earth and a part of hell, to depose kings to whom under Christ every soul is to be subject, to absolve subjects from the oath of allegiance, and so on. For one Jesus Christ the only real priest of the New Testament, they join many secondary priests unto him who offer Christ daily in the mass for the sins of the living and the dead. For one Jesus Christ the all-sufficient Mediator of intercession, they have added many fellows unto him to make request for us — namely as many saints as be in the Pope's calendar. Lastly, for the

only merits of Christ in whom alone the Father is well pleased, they have devised a treasury of the Church containing beside the merits of Christ the surplus of the merits of saints, to be dispensed to men at the discretion of the Pope. And thus we see that Christ — and consequently God himself to be worshipped in Christ — is transformed into a fantasy or idol of man's conceit. Again, there is always a proportion between the worship of God and our persuasion of him, and men in giving unto God any worship have respect to his nature, that both may be suitable and he well pleased. Let us then see what manner of worship the Roman religion affords. It is for the greatest part mere will-worship, without any allowance or commandment from God. It is a carnal service standing of innumerable bodily rites and ceremonies borrowed partly from the Jews and partly from the heathen. It is divided between God and some of his creatures, in that they are worshipped both with one kind of worship — let them paint it as they can. Thus then, if by their manner of worshipping God we may judge how they conceive of him — as we may — they have plainly turned the true God into a fantasy of their own. For God is no otherwise to be conceived than he has revealed himself in his creatures and word, and especially in Christ, who is the engraved image of the person of the Father.

The second sin is idolatry, and that as gross as was ever among the heathen. And it is to be seen in two things. First, that they worship the saints with religious worship which without exception is proper to God. Yes, they transform some of them into detestable idols, making them in truth mediators of redemption — especially the virgin Mary, whom they call a lady, a goddess, a queen whom Christ her son obeys in heaven, a mediatrix, or life, hope, the medicine of the diseased. And they pray unto her thus: Prepare

glory for us; defend us from our enemies, and in the hour of death receive us; loose the bonds of the guilty; bring light to the blind; drive away all devils. Show yourself to be a mother; let him receive the prayers. Again, their idolatry is manifest in that they worship God in, at, and before images — having no commandment so to do, but the contrary. They allege that they use and worship images only in remembrance of God. But this is all one as if an unchaste wife should receive many lovers into her house in the absence of her husband, and being reprov'd should answer that they were the friends of her husband and that she kept them only in remembrance of him. Thirdly, their idolatry exceeds the idolatry of the heathen in that they worship a bread-god, or Christ in and under the forms of bread and wine. And if Christ according to his humanity is absent from the earth — as I have proved — the Popish host is as abominable an idol as ever was.

The third sin is the maintenance of adultery, and that is manifest in two things. First, in the toleration of houses of prostitution, flat against the commandment of God. Deuteronomy 23:17: There shall be no prostitute of the daughters of Israel, neither shall there be a male prostitute of the sons of Israel. And this toleration is an occasion of uncleanness to many young men and women who otherwise would abstain from all such kind of filthiness. And what an abomination is this, when brother and brother, father and son, nephew and uncle shall come to one and the same harlot, one before or after the other. Secondly, their law beyond the fourth degree allows the marriage of any persons, and by this means they sometimes allow incest. For in the unequal collateral line, the person next the common stock is a father or mother to the brothers' or sisters' posterity, as the following example shows.

John had two children: Nicholas and Anne. Nicholas had children Thomas and Lewes. Anne had children Roger, Anthony, and James. Here Anne and Nicholas are brother and sister, making Anne in the stead of a mother to all descended from Nicholas.

Here Anne and Nicholas are brother and sister, and Anne is distant from James six degrees, he being her great-nephew. The marriage between them is allowed by the Church of Rome, they not being within the compass of four degrees. Nevertheless this is against the law of nature, for Anne being the sister of Nicholas is in the stead of a mother to all that are begotten of Nicholas, even to James and James's posterity. Yet thus much I grant: that the daughter of Anne may lawfully marry James or Anthony, the case being altered, because they are not to one another as parents and children.

The fourth sin is magic, sorcery, or witchcraft — in the consecration of the host in which they make their bread-god; in exorcisms over holy bread, holy water, and salt; in the casting out or driving away of devils by the sign of the cross, by solemn conjurations, by holy water, by the ringing of bells, by lighting tapers, by relics, and such like. For these things have not their supposed force either by creation or by any institution of God in his holy word, and therefore if anything be done by them it is from the secret operation of the devil himself.

The fifth sin is that in their doctrine they maintain perjury. Because they teach with one consent that a Papist examined may answer doubtfully against the direct intention of the examiner, framing another meaning to himself in the ambiguity of his words. As for example, when a man is asked whether he said or heard Mass in such a place: though he did, they affirm he may say no and

swear unto it — because he was not there to reveal it to the examiner. Whereas in the very law of nature, he that takes an oath should swear according to the intention of him that has power to minister an oath, and that in truth, justice, and judgment. Let them clear their doctrine from all defense of perjury if they can.

The sixth sin is that they reverse many of God's commandments, making that no sin which God's word makes a sin. Thus they teach that if any man steal some little thing that is thought not to cause any notable hurt, it is no mortal sin. That the officious lie and the lie made in sport are venial sins. That to pray for our enemies in particular is no precept but a counsel, and that none is bound to greet his enemy in the way of friendship — flat against the rule of Christ in Matthew 5:47. That rash judgment, though consent come thereto, is regularly but a venial sin. That it is lawful sometimes to feign holiness. That the painting of the face is ordinarily but a venial sin. That it is not lawful to forbid begging, whereas the Lord forbade there should be any beggar in Israel. Again, they teach that men in their anger, when they are quarreling and swear oaths of violence, are not indeed blasphemers.

Lastly, their writers use manifest lying to justify their doctrine. They plead falsely that all antiquity is on their side, whereas it is as much against them as for them, and as much for us as for them. Again, their manner has been and is still to prove their opinions by forged and counterfeit writings of men, some of which I will name.

Among the forged writings used by Rome to prove their opinions are these: the Liturgy of Saint James; the Canons of the Apostles; the books of Dionysius the Areopagite, namely his work on ecclesiastical hierarchy; the Decretal Epistles of the Popes; the works of Pope Clement; some of the epistles of Ignatius; Origen's

book on repentance, his homilies on various saints, commentaries on Job, and his book on Lamentation; the Liturgy of Chrysostom; the Liturgy of Basil and his Ascetica; various works falsely attributed to Augustine; the Questions and Answers of Justin Martyr; the epistle of Athanasius to Pope Felix; Bernard's sermons on the Lord's Supper; Jerome's epistle to Demetrias savoring of Pelagius; Tertullian's work on monogamy; Cyprian on chrism and on the washing of feet; in the Council of Sardica the third, fourth, and fifth canons are forged; in the Council of Nicea all canons save twenty are forged; certain Roman councils under Silvester are forged, for he was at this time dead and therefore could not confirm them; to the sixth canon of the Council of Nicea are patched these words: that the Roman Church has always had the supremacy; and lastly, Pope Zosimus, Boniface, and Celestine falsified the canons of the Council of Nicea to prove appeals from all places to Rome, so that the bishops of Africa were forced to send for the true copies of the said Council from Constantinople and the churches of Greece.

I might here rehearse many other sins which with the former call for vengeance upon the Roman Church, but it shall suffice to have named a few of the principal.

Now in this reason our Savior Christ prescribes another main duty to his own people, and that is to be careful to shun all the sins of the Church of Rome, that they may withal escape her deserved plagues and punishments. And from this prescribed duty I observe two things. The first is that every good servant of God must carefully avoid contracts of marriage with professed Papists — that is, with such as hold the Pope for their head and believe the doctrine of the Council of Trent. For in such matches men hardly keep faith

and good conscience, and hardly avoid communion with the sins of the Roman Church. A further ground of this doctrine I thus propound. In God's word there is mentioned a double league between man and man, country and country. The first is the league of concord, when one kingdom binds itself to live in peace with another for the maintenance of trade without disturbance, and this kind of league may stand between God's Church and the enemies thereof. The second is the league of amity, which is when men, people, or countries bind themselves to defend each other in all causes and to make the wars of the one the wars of the other — and this league may not be made with those that be enemies of God. Jehoshaphat, otherwise a good king, made this kind of league with Ahab and is therefore reprov'd by the prophet, saying: Would you help the wicked and love them that hate the Lord? — 2 Chronicles 19:2. Now the marriages of Protestants with Papists are private leagues of amity between person and person, and therefore are not to be allowed. Again, in Malachi 2:11 the Lord says: Judah has defiled the holiness of the Lord which he loved, and has married the daughters of a strange god — where is flatly condemned marriages made with the people of a false god. Now the Papists by the consequences of their doctrine and religion turn the true Jehovah into an idol of their own brain, as I have shown, and the true Christ revealed in the written word into a feigned Christ made of bread. Yet if such a marriage be once made and finished it may not be dissolved. For such parties sin not simply in that they marry, but because they marry not in the Lord, being of different religions. The fault is not in the substance of marriage but in the manner of mak-

ing it. And for this cause the Apostle commands the believing party not to forsake or refuse the unbelieving party — being a very infidel, which no Papist is — if he or she will abide: 1 Corinthians 7:13.

The second thing is that every servant of God must take heed how he travels into such countries where Popish religion is established, lest he partake in the sins and punishments thereof. Indeed to go upon embassy to any place, or to travel for this end — that we may perform the necessary duties for our special or general callings — is not unlawful. But to travel out of the precincts of the Church only for pleasure's sake and to see strange fashions has no warrant. And hence it is that many men who go forth in good order and well-minded come home with damaged consciences. The best traveler of all is he who, living at home or abroad, can go out of himself and depart from his own sins and corruptions by true repentance.

ADVERTISEMENT: ROMAN RELIGION AGAINST THE GROUNDS OF THE CATECHISM



Great is the number of them that embrace the religion of the present Church of Rome, being deceived by the glorious titles of universality, antiquity, and succession. And no doubt, though some be willfully blinded, yet many devoted this way never saw any other truth. Now of them and the rest I desire this favor: that they will but weigh and ponder with themselves this one thing which I will now offer to their consideration. That is: the Roman religion now established by the Council of Trent is, in the principal points thereof, against the very grounds of the catechism that have been agreed upon ever since the days of the Apostles by all churches. These grounds are four: the first is the Apostles' Creed; the second is the Decalogue or ten commandments; the third is the form of prayer called the Lord's Prayer; the fourth is the institution of the two sacraments — baptism and the Lord's Supper — 1 Corinthians 11:23.

That I may in some order manifest this which I say, I will begin with the Symbol or Creed. First of all it must be considered that some of the principal doctrines believed in the Church of Rome are

these: that the Pope or Bishop of Rome is the vicar of Christ and the head of the Catholic Church; that there is a fire of purgatory after this life; that images of God and saints are to be placed in churches and worshipped; that prayer is to be made to saints departed and their intercession to be required; that there is a propitiatory sacrifice daily offered in the mass for the sins of the living and the dead. These points are of such moment that without them the Roman religion cannot stand, and in the Council of Trent the curse of anathema is pronounced upon all such as deny these or any of them. And yet mark: the Apostles' Creed — which has been thought to contain all necessary points in religion to be believed, and has therefore been called the key and rule of faith — this creed has not any of these points. Nor do the expositions made thereof by the ancient fathers, nor any other creed or confession of faith made by any council or church for the space of many hundred years. This is a plain proof to any fair-minded man that these are new articles of faith never known in the Apostolic Church, and that the fathers and councils could not find any such articles of faith in the books of the Old and New Testaments. Answer is made that all these points of doctrine are believed under the article: I believe the Catholic Church — the meaning of which they will have to be this: I believe all things which the Catholic Church holds and teaches to be believed. If this be as they say, we must needs believe in the Church — that is, put our confidence in the Church for the manifestation and certainty of all doctrines necessary to salvation. And thus the eternal truth of God the Creator shall depend on the determination of the creature, and the written word of God in this respect is made insufficient, as though it had not plainly revealed all points of doctrine pertaining to salvation. And the ancient

churches have been far overseen in that they did not propose the former points to be believed as articles of faith, but left them to these latter times.

Second: in this Creed, to believe in God and to believe the Church are distinguished. To believe in is pertaining to the Creator; to believe, to the creature — as Rufinus has noted, when he says that by this preposition in, the Creator is distinguished from the creature, and things pertaining to God from things pertaining to men. And Augustine says: it must be known that we must believe the Church and not believe in the Church, because the Church is not God but the house of God. Hence it follows that we must not believe in the saints, nor put our confidence in our works, as the learned Papists teach. Therefore Eusebius says: we ought of right to believe Peter and Paul, but to believe in Peter and Paul — that is, to give to the servants the honor of the Lord — we ought not. And Cyprian says: he does not believe in God who does not place in him alone the trust of his whole happiness.

Third: the article conceived by the Holy Spirit is overturned by the transubstantiation of bread and wine in the mass into the body and blood of Christ. For here we are taught to confess the true and perpetual incarnation of Christ, beginning in his conception and never ending afterward, and we acknowledge the truth of his manhood and that his body has the essential properties of a true body — consisting of flesh and bone, having quantity, figure, and dimensions, namely length, breadth, and thickness, having part out of part as head out of feet and feet out of head, being also circumscribed, visible, and touchable. In a word, it has all things in it which by order of creation belong to a body. It will be said that the body of Christ may remain a true body and yet be altered in re-

spect of some qualities, as namely circumscription. But I say again that local circumscription can by no means be severed from a body if it remains a body. For to be circumscribed in place is an essential property of every quantity, and quantity is the common essence of every body. And therefore a body in respect of its quantity must needs be circumscribed in one place. This was the judgment of Leo, when he said: the body of Christ is by no means outside the truth of our body. And Augustine, when he said: only God in Christ so comes that he does not depart; so returns that he does not leave us. But man according to body is in place, and goes out of the same place, and when he shall come to another place, he is not in the place from which he comes. To help the matter they distinguish thus: Christ's body in respect of its whole essence may be in many places, but not in respect of its whole quantity, whereby it is only in one place. But as I have said, they speak contradictions — for quantity by all learning is the essence of a body, without which a body cannot be.

Fourth: in the Creed we confess that Christ is ascended into heaven, and there after his ascension sits at the right hand of his Father, and that according to his manhood. Hence I conclude that Christ's body is not really and locally in the sacrament and in every host which the priest consecrates. This argument was good when Vigilius against Eutyches said: when it — the flesh — was on earth, it was not in heaven; and because it is now in heaven, it is not on earth. And he adds afterward that this is the Catholic faith and confession. And it was good when Fulgentius said: according to his human substance he was absent from earth when he was in heaven, and he left the earth when he ascended into heaven. And: the same inseparable Christ, according to his whole manhood leav-

ing the earth, locally ascended into heaven, and sits at the right hand, and according to the same whole manhood he is to come to judgment. And it was good when Cyril said: no man doubts but that when he ascended into heaven, though he is always present by the power of his Spirit, he was absent in respect of the presence of his flesh. And it was good when Augustine said: according to the flesh which the Word assumed, he ascended into heaven — he is not here; there he sits at the right hand of the Father; and he is here according to the presence of his majesty. And: he went as he was man, and he stayed as he was God; he went by that whereby he was in one place; he stayed by that whereby he was everywhere.

Fifth: again, in that we believe the Catholic Church, it follows that the Catholic Church is invisible — because things seen are not believed. And the answer commonly used — that we believe the holiness of the Church — will not serve the turn. For the words are plain, and in them we make confession that we believe not only the holiness of the Church but also the Church itself.

Sixth: lastly the articles — remission of sins, resurrection of the body, and life everlasting — contain a confession of special faith. For the meaning of them is this: I believe the remission of my own sins and the resurrection of my own body to life everlasting — and that by the judgment of learned antiquity. Augustine says: if you also believe that you shall rise again and ascend into heaven — because you are sure of so great a patron — you are certain of so great a gift. And: make not Christ less, who brings you to the kingdom of heaven for remission of sins; without this faith, if any come to baptism, he shuts the gate of mercy against himself. And: whoever faithfully believes and holds this profession of his faith — in which all his sins are forgiven him — let him prepare his will to the

will of God and not fear his passage by death. And: the whole sacrament of baptism stands in this, that we believe the resurrection of the body and remission of sins to be given us by God. And: he gave these keys to the Church, that whoever in his Church should not believe his sins to be forgiven, they should not be forgiven unto him; and whoever believed and turned from them, abiding in the bosom of the said Church, shall at length be healed by faith and amendment of life. And: that which you have heard to be fulfilled in the glorious resurrection of Christ, believe that the very same shall be fulfilled in you — in the last judgment the resurrection of your flesh shall restore you for all eternity; for unless you believe that you are to be repaired by death, you cannot come to the reward of life eternal. And in ancient time the article of the resurrection has been rehearsed on this manner: the resurrection of this flesh; and the last applied to it: to everlasting life. Hence then two main opinions of the Church of Rome are quite overthrown: one, that we cannot by special faith be certain of the remission of our sins and the salvation of our souls; the other, that a man truly justified may fall away and be damned. Now this cannot be, if the practice of the ancient Church is good, which has taught us to believe everlasting life jointly with remission of sins.

To come to the Decalogue: first of all it is a rule in expounding the several commandments that where any vice is forbidden, there the contrary virtue is commanded, and all virtues of the same kind with all their causes, occasions, and furtherances. This rule is granted by all. And hence it follows that counsels of perfection — if they have in them any furtherance of virtue — are enjoined in and by the law, and therefore prescribe no state of perfection beyond the scope of the law.

Secondly, the commandment — you shall not make to yourself any graven image, and so on — has two several parts. The first forbids the making of carved or graven images; the second forbids the adoration of them. Now the first part is notably expounded by Moses in Deuteronomy 4:16: Take good heed unto yourselves that you corrupt not yourselves and make you a graven image or representation of any figure in the likeness of male or female. Mark the reason of this prohibition in the same place: for, says he, you saw no image in the day the Lord spoke unto you in Horeb. And in verse 15: you heard the voice of the words but saw no likeness save a voice. Now the reason being understood of the image of God himself, the prohibition must needs be so understood. Again there is no question that God directs his commandment against a sin in speculation, but against some common and wicked practice of the Jews — and that was to represent God himself in likenesses and bodily forms — Isaiah 40:18. And that was also the practice of the Gentiles, who were far more gross in this kind than the Jews — Romans 1:23. This then is plain to any fair-minded man: the first part of the commandment forbids the making of graven images or likenesses of the true Jehovah, and thus the Roman Catechism understands the words. As for the second part, it must be understood according to the meaning of the first, and therefore it forbids us to bow down to any image of God. Hence it follows that to worship God or saints in or at images, and to worship images with religious worship, is abominable idolatry. And common reason might teach us thus much: for they that adore and worship the true God in images bind the presence of God, his operation, grace, and his hearing of us to certain things, places, and signs to which he has not bound himself by commandment or promise. And that is to wor-

ship God and to seek for his blessings otherwise than he has commanded himself to be worshipped or promised to hear us. Upon this ground is plainly overthrown the excuse which they make — that they worship not images but God and saints in images — for neither God nor the saints acknowledge this kind of honor but they abhor it. Whence it follows necessarily that they worship nothing beside the image or the device of their own brain, in which they feign to themselves such a God as will be worshipped and receive their prayers at images. It will be said that the Papists tie the worship and invocation of God to images no otherwise than God tied himself to the sanctuary and the temple of Solomon. And I say again: it was the will of God that he would show his presence and be worshipped at the sanctuary, and the Jews had the warrant of God's word for it. But we have no like warrant — either by promise or commandment — to tie God's presence to an image or crucifix. Again, reason may yet further discover their idolatry. They who worship they know not what, worship an idol. But the Papists worship they know not what, and I prove it thus: to the consecration of the host there is required the intention of the priest at the least virtually, as they say. And if this be true, it follows that none of them can come to the mass or pray in faith but he must always doubt of what is lifted up by the hands of the priest in the mass — whether it be bread or the body and blood of Christ. For none can have any certainty of the intention of the priest in consecrating this bread and this wine, but rather may have just occasion of doubting by reason of the common ignorance and looseness of life in such persons.

Thirdly, the commandment touching the Sabbath gives a liberty to work six days in the ordinary affairs of our callings, and this liberty cannot be repealed by any creature. The Church of Rome therefore errs in that it prescribes set and ordinary festival days not only to God but also to saints, enjoining them as strictly and with as much solemnity to be observed as the Sabbath of the Lord.

Fourthly, the third commandment — or as they say the fourth — enjoins children to obey father and mother in all things, especially in matters of moment such as their marriage and choice of their callings, and that even unto death. And yet the Church of Rome, against the intent of this commandment, allows that clandestine marriages and the vow of religion shall be in force though they be without and against the consent of wise and careful parents.

Fifthly, the last commandment of lust forbids the first motions to sin that are before consent. I prove it thus: lusting is forbidden in the former commandments as well as in the last, yes, lusting that is joined with consent — as in the commandment you shall not commit adultery, lusting after our neighbor's wife is forbidden; and in the next, lusting after our neighbor's goods, and so on. Now if the last commandment also forbade no more than lust with consent, it is confounded with the rest, and by this means there shall not be ten distinct words or commandments — which to say is absurd. It remains therefore that the lust here forbidden goes before consent. Again, the philosophers knew that lust with consent was evil even by the light of nature. But Paul — a learned Pharisee and therefore more than a philosopher — knew not lust to be sin, that is forbidden in this commandment, Romans 7. Therefore the lust forbidden here is without consent. Wicked then is the doctrine of

the Roman Church, teaching that in every mortal sin there is required an act commanded of the will — and hence they say many thoughts against faith and unclean imaginations are no sins.

Sixth and lastly: the words of the second commandment — and show mercy to thousands on them that love me and keep my commandments — overthrow all human merits. For if the reward is given of mercy to them that keep the law, it is not given for the merit of the work done.

To come to the third part of the catechism: the Lord's Prayer is a most absolute and perfect form of prayer. For which cause it was called by Tertullian the breviary of the gospel, and Celestine says: the law of praying is the law of believing and the law of working. Now in this prayer we are taught to direct our prayers to God alone — Our Father, and so on — and that only in the name and mediation of Christ. For God is our Father only by Christ. It is needless therefore to use any invocation of saints or to make them our mediators of intercession unto God, and it is sufficient if we pray only unto God in the name of Christ alone.

Second: in the fourth petition we say thus: Give us our daily bread. In which words we acknowledge that every morsel of bread is the mere gift of God. What madness then is it for us to think that we should merit the kingdom of heaven by works that cannot merit so much as bread?

Third: in the next petition — Forgive us our debts — four opinions of the Roman religion are directly overthrown. The first is concerning human satisfactions. For the child of God is here after his conversion taught to humble himself day by day and to pray for the pardon of his daily sins. Now to make satisfaction and to sue

for pardon are contrary. The second opinion here overthrown is touching merits. For we acknowledge ourselves to be debtors unto God — yes, bankrupts — and that beside the main sum of many thousand talents we daily increase the debt. Therefore we cannot possibly merit any of the blessings of God. It is mere madness to think that they who cannot pay their debts but rather increase them day by day should deserve or purchase any of the goods of the creditor or the pardon of their debts. And if any favor is shown them, it comes of mere goodwill without the least desert. In a word, this must be thought upon: if all we can do will not keep us from increasing the main sum of our debt, much less shall we be able by any merit to diminish the same. By good right therefore do all the servants of God cast down themselves and pray: Forgive us our debts. The third opinion is that punishment may be retained while the fault is wholly remitted. But this cannot stand, for here sin is called our debt because by nature we owe God obedience, and for the defect of this payment we further owe him the forfeiture of punishment. Sin then is called our debt in respect of the punishment. And therefore when we pray for the pardon of sin, we require the pardon not only of fault but of the whole punishment. And when a debt is pardoned, it is absurd to think that the least payment should remain. The fourth opinion is that a man in this life may fulfill the law — whereas in this place every servant of God is taught to ask a daily pardon for the breach of the law. Answer is made that our daily sins are venial and not against the law but beside the law. But this which they say is against the petition, for a debt that comes by forfeiture is against the bond or obligation. Now every sin is a debt causing the forfeiture of punishment, and therefore is not beside but directly against the law.

Fourth: in this clause — as we forgive our debtors — it is taken for granted that we may certainly know that we are in love and charity with men when we make reconciliation. Why then may we not certainly know that we repent and believe and are reconciled to God, which all Roman Catholics deny?

Fifth: in the last words — and lead us not into temptation — we pray not that God should free us from temptation, for it is sometimes good to be tempted, Psalm 26:1. But that we be not left to the malice of Satan and held captive of the temptation, for here to be led into temptation and to be delivered are opposed. Now hence I gather that he who is the child of God, truly justified and sanctified, shall never fall wholly and finally from the grace of God. And I conclude on this manner: that which we ask according to the will of God shall be granted — 1 John 5. But this the child of God asks — that he might never be wholly forsaken of his Father and left captive in temptation. This therefore shall be granted.

Sixth: this word Amen signifies a special faith touching all the former petitions — that they shall be granted, and therefore a special faith concerning remission of sins, which the Roman Church denies.

To come to the last place, to the institution of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper in 1 Corinthians 11:23. In which first of all the real presence is by many circumstances overthrown. Out of the words he took and broke, it is plain that what Christ took was not his body, because he cannot be said with his own hands to have taken, held, and broken himself — but the very bread. Again, Christ did not say under the form of bread, or in bread, but: This — that is, bread — is my body. Third: bread was not given for us but only the body of Christ, and in the first institution the body of

Christ was not then really given to death. Fourth: the cup is the new covenant by a figure — why may not the bread be the body of Christ by a figure also? Fifth: Christ ate the supper but not himself. Sixth: we are bidden to do it until he come — Christ then is not bodily present. Seventh: Christ bids the bread to be eaten in remembrance of him, but signs of remembrance are of things absent. Eighth: if the Popish real presence be granted, then the body and blood of Christ are either severed or joined together. If severed, then Christ is still crucified. If joined together, then the bread is both the body and blood of Christ — whereas the institution says the bread is the body and the wine is the blood.

Again, here is condemned the administration of the sacrament under one kind only. For the commandment of Christ is: drink you all of this — Matthew 26:27. And this commandment is rehearsed to the Church of Corinth in these words: do this as often as you drink it in remembrance of me — verse 25. And no power can repeal this commandment, because it was established by the sovereign head of the Church.

These few lines, as also the former treatise, I offer to the view and reading of them that favor the Roman religion, willing them with patience to consider this one thing: that their religion, if it were Catholic and Apostolic as they pretend, could not be contrary so much as in one point to the grounds of all catechisms that have been used in all churches confessing the name of Christ ever since the days of the Apostles. And whereas it crosses the said grounds in sundry points of doctrine — as I have proved — it is a plain argument that the present Roman religion is degenerate. I write not

this despising or hating their persons for their religion, but wishing unfeignedly their conversion in this world and their salvation in the world to come.

Finis.

THANKS FOR READING



If you spotted a typo or have feedback, the email is **sam@goodsoilapps.com** — or use the in-app feedback form in *Christian Reader*.