







BOSSUET'S HISTORY  
OF THE  
VARIATIONS OF THE PROTESTANT  
CHURCHES.





THE HISTORY

OF THE

VARIATIONS

OF THE

PROTESTANT CHURCHES.

BY

JACQUES BENIGNE BOSSUET,

BISHOP OF CONDOM AND MEAUX,

PRIVY-COUNSELLOR OF LOUIS XIV., PRECEPTOR TO THE DAUPHIN, AND CHIEF ALMONER TO  
THE DAUPHINESS.

SECOND EDITION.

IN TWO VOLUMES.

*TRANSLATED FROM THE FRENCH.*

VOL. I.

DUBLIN:

PRINTED BY RICHARD COYNE,

BOOKSELLER, PRINTER, AND PUBLISHER, TO THE ROYAL COLLEGE OF  
ST. PATRICK, MAYNOOTH.

1836.



# THE PREFACE.

---

## THE DESIGN OF THIS WORK.

1.—*A general idea of the Protestant Religion, and the variations of it.—The discovery of them useful to true doctrine and the peace of the human mind.—The Authors to whom reference is made in this History.*

IF Protestants knew thoroughly how their religion was formed; with how many variations and with what inconsistency their confessions of faith were drawn up; how they first separated themselves from us, and afterwards from one another; by how many subtilties, evasions, and equivocations they laboured to repair their divisions, and to re-unite the scattered members of their disjointed reformation; this reformation of which they boast would afford them but little satisfaction, or rather, to speak my mind more freely, it would excite in them only feelings of contempt. It is the history of these variations, these subtilties, these equivocations, and these artifices, which I design to write; but in order to render this detail more useful to them, some principles must be laid down which they cannot contravene, and which the current of a narration would not permit me to deduce, when once engaged in it.

2.—*Variations in faith a certain proof of falsehood.—Those of the Arians—Steadiness of the Catholic Church.*

When in expositions of faith variations were seen among Christians, they were ever considered as a mark of falsehood and inconsistency, if I may so speak, in the doctrine propounded. Faith speaks with simplicity; the Holy Ghost sheds pure light; and the truth which he teaches has a language always uniform. Whoever is but the least conversant in the history of the Church, must know she opposed to each heresy appropriate and precise expositions which she never altered; and if we attend to the expressions by which she condemned heretics, it will appear that they always pro-

## PREFACE.

ceed by the shortest and most direct route to attack the error in its source. She acts thus, because all that varies, all that is overlaid with doubtful or studiously ambiguous terms, has always appeared suspicious, and not only fraudulent, but even absolutely false, because it betrays an embarrassment with which truth is unacquainted.

This was one of the grounds on which the ancient doctors condemned the Arians, who were constantly making new confessions of faith, without ever being able to settle themselves. Since their first confession of faith, which was made by Arius, and presented by this arch-heretic to his bishop, Alexander, they never ceased to vary. With this did St. Hilary reproach Constantius, the protector of those heretics; and whilst this emperor called new councils to reform their creeds and frame new confessions of faith, this holy bishop addressed him in these forcible words\*: “Your case is similar to that of unskilful architects, who are never pleased with their own work. You do nothing but build up and pull down; whereas the Catholic Church, the first time it assembled, raised an immortal edifice, and gave in the symbol of Nice so full a declaration of truth, that to condemn Arianism for ever, nothing more is necessary than to repeat that creed.”

### 3.—*The character of heresies is to be changeable—A celebrated passage of Tertullian.*

But they are not the Arians alone who have varied in this manner. From the origin of Christianity all heresies have had the same character, and long before the time of Arius, Tertullian had said †: “Heretics vary in their rules; namely, in their confessions of faith; every one of them thinks he has a right to change and model what he has received according to his own fancy, as the author of the sect composed it according to his own fancy. Heresy never changes its proper nature in never ceasing to innovate; and the progress of the thing is like to its origin. What is permitted to Valentine is allowed to the Valentinians; the Marcionites have equal power with Marcion, nor have the authors of a heresy more right to innovate than their disciples. All changes in heresy, and when examined to the bottom, it is found, in course of time, entirely different in many points from what it had been at its birth.”

\* Lib. contra Const. N. 23, Col. 1254.

† De Præter, c. 42.

4.—*This character of heresy recognised in all ages of the Church.*

This character of heresy has been always observed by Catholics, and two holy authors of the eighth century\* have written “that heresy, however old, is always in itself a novelty; but that, the better to retain the title of being new, it innovates daily, and daily changes its doctrine.”

5.—*The charter of immutability in Faith of the Catholic Church.*

But whilst heresies always varying, agree not with themselves, and are continually introducing new rules, that is to say, new symbols, Tertullian says, “That in the church, the rule of faith is unalterable, and never to be reformed”†. It is so, because the church which professes to speak, and teach nothing but what she hath received, does not vary; and on the contrary, heresy, which began by innovating, daily innovates, and changes not its nature.

6.—*A principle of instability in all new doctrines.—Saint Paul.—Saint Chrysostom.*

Hence, St. Chrysostom speaking of this precept of the Apostle, “Shun profane babblings which will increase into more ungodliness, ‡” “avoid novelties in your discourses, for things do not stop there; one novelty begets another, and there is no end to error when once you have begun to err.”

7.—*Two causes of instability in heresies.*

In heresies, two things cause this disorder: one drawn from the nature of the human mind, which having once tasted the bait of novelty, ceases not to seek with disordered appetite this deceitful allurements; the other is drawn from the difference that exists between the works of God and those of man. The Catholic truth proceeding from God, has its perfection at once; heresy, the feeble offspring of the human mind, can be formed only by ill fitting patches. When, contrary to the precept of the wise man, we venture to remove § “the ancient landmarks set by our fathers,” and to reform the

\* Eth. et Beat. lib. 1. contra Eliss.

† Thom. 5 in 2, ad Tim.

‡ De Berg. vel. N, 1.

§ Proverbs xxii. 28.

doctrine once received among the faithful, we launch forth, without a thorough insight into the consequences of our attempt. That, which at the commencement, a false light, made us hazard, is found attended with such inconsistencies, as to oblige these reformers every day to reform themselves, so that they cannot tell when their own minds be at rest, or their innovations terminated.

8.—*What those variations are, which we undertake to shew in Protestant Churches.*

These are the solid and steady principles by which I undertake to demonstrate to Protestants the falsehood of their doctrine, from their continual variations, and the unstable manner in which they have explained their dogmas. I do not speak of the unsteadiness of individuals, but of the body of the church, in the books which they call symbolical; namely, those that have been made to express the consent of the churches; in a word, from their own confessions of faith, decreed, signed, and published; the doctrine of which has been given out as the doctrine containing nothing but the pure word of God, and which, notwithstanding, has been changed in so many different ways in its chief articles.

9.—*The Protestant party divided into two main bodies.*

But when treating of those who, in these latter ages, have called themselves Reformed, it is not my design to speak of the Socinians, nor the different societies of Anabaptists, nor of the other different sects which have sprung up in England and elsewhere, in the bosom of the new reformation; but of those two bodies only, one of which is composed of Lutherans, namely, those who have for their rule the confession of Augsburg; the other who follow the sentiments of Zuinglius and Calvin. The former, in the institution of the Eucharist, defend the literal sense; the latter the figurative. By this character chiefly shall I distinguish one from the other; though many other very weighty and very important differences exist between them, as will appear by what follows.

10.—*The variations of one party are a proof against the other, chiefly those of Luther and the Lutherans.*

The Lutherans will tell us here, that they are very little concerned in the variations and conduct of Zuinglian and

Calvinists; and some of those may imagine in their turn, that the inconstancy of Lutherans affects them as little: but both one and the other are mistaken, since the Lutherans can see in the Calvinists the consequences of those commotions which they excited; and, on the contrary, the Calvinists ought to remark in the Lutherans the disorder and uncertainty of that original which they have followed. But the Calvinists, in particular, cannot deny, that they have always looked upon Luther and the Lutherans, as the authors of their reformation, and not to speak of Calvin, who often mentioned Luther with respect, as the head of the reformation, we shall see, in the sequel of this history, that all the Calvinists (by this name I call the second party of Protestants), the Germans, English, Hungarians, Poles, Dutch, and all others in general, who assembled at Frankfort,\* through the influence of Queen Elizabeth, all these having acknowledged "those of the Confession of Augsburg," namely, the Lutherans, "as the first that gave a new birth to the church," acknowledge also the Confession of Augsburg as common to the whole party, "which they did not pretend to contradict, but to 'understand correctly;'" and this in one article only, that of the Supper; for this reason also naming amongst their fathers, not only Zuinglius, Bucer, and Calvin, but Luther and Melancthon, and placing Luther at the head of all the reformers.

After that, let them say that the variations of Luther and the Lutherans affect them not; we will tell them, on the contrary, that, according to their own principles, and their own declarations, to show the variations and inconsistencies of Luther and the Lutherans, is to point out the spirit of giddiness in the source of the reformation, and the head where it had been first conceived.

11.—*The collection of the Confessions of Faith, printed at Geneva.*

A long time since a collection of Confessions of Faith, has been printed at Geneva†, in which with that of the defenders of the figurative sense, namely, that of France and the Swiss, are also those of the defenders of the literal sense, namely, that of Augsburg and some others. What is still more remarkable is this, that though the confessions there collected be so different, and in many articles of faith condemn one another, in the preface to this collection, they are,

\* Act. Auth. Blond. p. 65.

† Syntagma Conf. Fidei. Gen. 1654.



notwithstanding, proposed "as one entire body of sacred divinity, and as authentic records, which men ought to have recourse to in order to know the ancient and primitive faith." They are dedicated to the kings of England, Scotland, Denmark, and Sweden, and those princes and republics by whom they are followed. That those kings and states should be separated from each other in communion, as well as in faith, is a matter of no consequence. Those of Geneva address them, notwithstanding, as true believers, "enlightened in these latter times by the special grace of God, with the true light of the Gospel," and then present them with all these confessions of faith, as "an eternal monument of the extraordinary piety of their ancestors."

12.—*The Calvinists approve of the Lutheran Confessions of Faith, at least, as containing nothing contrary to fundamental points.*

It is because these doctrines are equally adopted by the Calvinists, either as absolutely true, or at least as having nothing in them contrary to the foundation of faith; hence it follows, that when we shall see in this history the doctrine of the confessions of faith, not only of France and Switzerland, and the other defenders of the figurative sense, but of Augsburg and others set forth by the Lutherans, this doctrine must not be considered as foreign to Calvinism, but as a doctrine which the Calvinists have approved expressly as true, or left uncensured in the most authentic acts that have passed among them.

13.—*The Lutheran Confessions of Faith.*

I shall say less of the Lutherans, who, instead of being moved by the authority of those who defend the figurative sense, have nothing but a contempt and aversion for their sentiments. Their own inconstancy ought to confound them. When we should but read the titles of their Confessions of Faith, in this Geneva collection, and in the other books of the same kind, where they are collected together into a body, we would be astonished at their multitude. The first that appears is that of Augsburg, whence the Lutherans derive their name. It will be seen as presented to Charles V. in 1530, and after that to have been touched and retouched several times. Melancthon who had penned it, entirely altered the sense of it in the apology

which he wrote afterwards. This apology was subscribed to by the whole party. Thus it was changed in coming forth from the hands of its very author. From that time they never ceased reforming and explaining it in different ways; so difficult these reformers found it to satisfy themselves, and so little accustomed to teach precisely what was to be believed. But as if one confession of faith alone were not sufficient on the same subject, Luther judged it necessary for him to deliver his sentiments after another manner; and in 1537, he drew up the articles of Smalcald, in order to have them presented to the council which Paul III. had called at Mantua. These articles were signed by the whole party, and are inserted in what the Lutherans call the Book of Concord\*.

This explication did not fully satisfy. It was necessary to draw up the confession called Saxonie, which was presented to the Council of Trent in 1551, and that of Wirtemberg, which in 1552 was also presented to the same council.

To these are to be added the explications of the church of Wirtemberg, the birthplace of the Reformation, and the rest of them, which shall in order take their place in this history; particularly those of the Book of Concord, in the "Abridgment of Articles," and also in the same book, the "Explications Repeated." All these are so many several confessions of faith, authentically published by the party, embraced by some churches, impugned by others in points the most important; and yet these churches would wish to appear as forming one body, because, through policy, they dissemble their dissensions on ubiquity and other matters.

14.—*The Confessions of Faith of the Figurative-Sense Defenders, and the second party of Protestants.*

Nor was the other party of Protestants less fruitful in confessions of faith. At the same time that the Confession of Augsburg was presented to Charles V., those who dissented from it presented to him their own, published in the name of four cities of the empire, the first of which was Strasburg.

This so little pleased the defenders of the figurative sense, that every one would make his own: we shall see four or five after the fancy of the Swiss. But if the Zuinglian ministers had their way of thinking, others were no less singular in theirs: this diversity gave rise to the confession of France and Geneva. About the same time were published two

\* Concord. pp. 298, 730, 570, 778.

confessions of faith in the name of the Church of England ; as many in the name of the Kirk of Scotland. Fréderick III., Elector Palatine, would make his own separately and apart : this, with the others, took its place in the collection of Geneva. The Dutch would adhere to none of those already made : we have, therefore, a Dutch confession of faith approved by the Synod of Dort. But why should not the Calvinists of Poland have theirs ? Indeed, though they had subscribed the last confession of the Zuinglians, yet we still find they published another at the Synod of Czenger. Not satisfied with this, assembled at Sendomir, with the Lutherans and Vaudois, they agree to a new way of expounding the article on the Eucharist,—yet so that none of them departed from their former sentiments.

15.—*Other authentic Acts.—How these variations prove the weakness of the Protestant Religion.*

To omit the confession of faith framed by the Bohemians who wished to please both parties of the new reformation—I speak not of the treaties of concord which were made between the churches with so many variations and so many equivocations, they will appear in their proper place, with the decisions of national synods, and the other confessions of faith made in different circumstances. Great God ! Is it possible, that upon the same matters and the same questions, so many multiplied acts, so many decisions, and different confessions of faith are necessary ? And yet I cannot boast that I know all, and I know that I cannot find all. The Catholic Church never had occasion to oppose the same heresy a second time : but the churches of the new reformation, which has produced such a number, strange to say, and yet true, are not yet content ! And we shall see in this history that the Calvinists have new confessions, which have suppressed or reformed all the others.

These variations fill us with astonishment. They will appear worse when we learn the detail and the manner in which these acts, so authentic, were drawn up. We are amused—I speak it without exaggeration—with the name of a confession of faith—and nothing has been less serious in the new reformation than that which is most serious in all religion.

16.—*The Protestants are ashamed of so many Confessions of Faith.—The vain pretexts by which they endeavour to excuse them.*

This prodigious multitude of confessions of faith has alarmed those who made them; we shall see the weak reasons by which they endeavour to excuse them; but I cannot avoid mentioning those which have been set forth in the preface of the collection of Geneva\*, because they are general, and bear equally upon all the churches which call themselves reformed.”

The first reason assigned to establish the necessity of multiplying these confessions is, that as many articles of faith were attacked, it became necessary to oppose many confessions to this great number of errors. I agree to the justice of this reasoning, and at the same time, by a contrary reason, I demonstrate the absurdity of all these confessions of faith of the Protestants, since all, as it appears by reading the titles, only regard articles precisely the same; so that we can address them with St. Athanasius†, “Why a new council—new confessions—a new creed? What new question has been raised?”

Another excuse alleged is, that the whole world ought (as the apostle says,) to render an account of their faith, so that the churches spread in different places, have a right to declare their belief by a public testimony; as if all the churches in the world, however separated they may be, cannot agree in the same testimony, when they have the same belief; as, in fact, from the origin of Christianity we have witnessed a like consent in the churches. Who will shew me that the churches of the east have had in primitive times a confession different from that of the west? Has not the symbol of Nice served equally as a testimony against all the Arians—the definition of Chalcedon against all the Eutychians—the eight chapters of Carthage against all the Pelagians? and so of the rest.

But, say the Protestants, was there one of the reformed churches which could make a law for all the rest? No, certainly; all these new churches, under the pretext of shaking off domination, have deprived themselves of order, and are unable to preserve the principle of unity. But, in fine, if the truth governs all, as they boast, to unite them in one confession of faith, nothing more is necessary than that

\* Synt. Conf. Pref.

† Athan. de Syn. et Ep. ad Afr.

all should enter into the sentiment of him to whom God had given the grace first to explain the truth.

In fine, we read in the preface of Geneva, that if the reformation had produced but one confession of faith, this consent might have been taken for a studied combination; whereas, a concordance between so many churches, and confessions of faith, without agreement, is the work of the Holy Ghost. This agreement would indeed be surprising; but, unfortunately, it is not found in these confessions of faith; and from this history it will appear, that in a matter so serious there never was such inconstancy.

17.—*The Protestants of the two parties, in vain endeavour to re-unite under one sole and uniform Confession of Faith.*

This great evil was deeply felt in the reformation, and the attempt to remedy it proved fruitless. All the second party of Protestants held a general assembly to draw up a common confession of faith; but we see by the acts, that having no principle of unity, an agreement was impossible\*.

The Lutherans, who appeared more united in the confession of Augsburg, were not less embarrassed with different editions, and could find therein no better remedy†.

18.—*How much these varieties degenerate from the ancient simplicity of Christianity.*

We shall be tired, no doubt, of witnessing these variations, and so many false subtilties of the new reformation; so many cavils on words; so many different agreements; so many equivocations, and forced explanations, on which these have been founded. Is this, it will be often said, the Christian religion, which the Pagans have formerly admired as so simple, so pure, so precise in its dogmas? Is this the Christian religion, perfect and simple? No, certainly it is not. Ammian Marcellin was right when he said, that Constantius, by all his councils and all his symbols, had strayed from this admirable simplicity, and that he had weakened the whole vigour of the faith, by the perpetual fear which he entertained lest he should be deceived in his sentiments ‡.

\* Liv. 12.

† Ibid. 3, 8

‡ Ammian Marcel, lib. 21.

19.—*Why it will be very necessary in this history to speak of those whom the Protestants call the Reformers.*

While it is my intention to represent in this work the confessions of faith, and the other public acts, where the variations appeared not only of individuals, but of entire churches of the new reformation, at the same time I cannot avoid speaking of the chiefs of the party who have drawn up these confessions, or have made those changes. Thus Luther, Melancthon, Carolstad, Zuingle, Bucer, Ecolampadius, Calvin, and the others, will appear often in their places; but I shall not say anything which is not taken from their own writing, or authors above suspicion, so that there will not be in all this narrative any fact that is not certain and useful in elucidating the variations whose history I write.

20.—*Parts of this history whence they are drawn.—Why no history more certain and more authentic than this.*

With regard to the public acts of Protestants, besides their confessions of faith and their catechisms, which are in the hands of the whole world, I have found some others in the collection of Geneva; others in the book called the "Concord," printed by the Lutherans in 1654; others in the result of the national synod of the pretended reformers, which I have seen in an authentic form in the king's library; others in the Sacramentarian History, printed at Zurich in 1602, by Hospinian, a Zuinglian author, or, in fine, in other Protestant authors: in a word, I shall say nothing which is not authentic, and incontestable. As to the rest, to speak plainly, it is well known of what persuasion I am; for certainly I am a Catholic, as submissive as any other to the decisions of the church, and so disposed, that no one fears more to prefer his own private opinion to the universal judgment. After that, to pretend to be neutral or indifferent to the cause whose history I write, or to dissemble what I am, would be to offer a gross illusion to the reader; but with this sincere avowal, I maintain that Protestants cannot deny that I am entitled to belief, and that they will never read a history more indubitable than this; since in all that I have to say against their churches and their authors, I will mention nothing which is not clearly proved by their own witnesses.

21.—*Some objections that may be made against this work.*

I have not spared pains to transcribe them. The reader will perhaps complain that I have not spared his. Others will probably condemn my dwelling upon things which may appear trivial to them; but besides that those, who are accustomed to treat on matters of religion, well know, in a subject of such delicacy and importance, every thing, even to the least word, is essential; we ought to consider not what things are in themselves, but what they have been, and what they are in the minds of those with whom we have to deal; and, after all, it will be easily seen that this history is entirely of a description quite peculiar; that it ought to come forth to the world with all its proofs, and armed as it were on all sides; and in order to render it more convincing and useful, it was necessary to make it less amusing.

22.—*Some things which it was necessary to trace farther back; as the history of the Vaudois, of the Albigenes, of John Wickliff, and of John Huss.*

Though my plan may appear to confine me to the history of Protestants, in certain places I judged it necessary to ascend to matters of a more distant date; at that period especially, when the Vaudois and Hussites were seen to re-unite themselves with the Calvinists and Lutherans. In this place it was necessary to know the origin and sentiments of these sects, to point out their extraction, and to distinguish them from those with whom some have wished to confound them; to detect the Manicheism of Peter of Bucis, and the Albigenes, and shew how the Vaudois emanated from them; to give an account of the blasphemies of Wickliff, from whom Huss and his disciples took their birth; in a word, to reveal the shame of all these sectaries to those who glory in such predecessors.

23.—*Why the order of time is followed without distinction of the subject matter.*

As to the arrangement of this work, the disputes and decisions will, without the distinction of matter, be seen to proceed in it in the same order in which they happened. By this means, it is certain that the variations of Protestants, and the state of their churches, will be more clearly marked. By thus taking in at one view the circumstances of time and place, we shall obtain a clearer view of what may serve for the conviction or defence of the parties concerned.

24.—*The whole disputa regarding the Church put together.—  
The present state of this famous question, and to what  
terms it is reduced by the ministers Claude and Jurieu.*

There is but one controversy the history of which I give separately; it is that which regards the church. This is a matter of such importance, that by its decision alone all disputes might be terminated, were it not as much obscured in the writings of Protestants, as it is clear and intelligible in itself. To restore it to its native plainness and simplicity, I have collected, in the last book, all I had to mention on this subject; that the reader, having once seen the difficulty to the bottom, may perceive what obliged these new churches to change into so many shapes in succession,—what in the end is but one and the same. For, in a word, the whole matter at issue is to shew where the church was before the reformation. Naturally and accordingly to the commonly-received opinions of all Christians, it ought to be acknowledged as visible; and in their first confessions of faith, namely those of Augsburg and Strasburg, the first of each party, they went thus far. By this they obliged themselves to shew, as agreeing with them in one and the same belief, not private individuals scattered up and down, some on one point and some on another, but bodies of a church, namely, bodies composed of pastors and people. For a long time they amused men in saying, that the church indeed was not always in a state of splendour, but in all times there was, at least, some little assembly where truth made itself heard; at last they have well perceived they could not point out any one, either little or great, obscure or illustrious, which was of the Protestant belief, the subterfuge of an invisible church very opportunely occurred to them, and the dispute long turned upon this question. In our days they have more clearly perceived, that a church reduced to an invisible state was a chimera, irreconcilable with the plan of scripture, and common notions of Christians, and this bad position is now abandoned. The Protestants have been obliged to seek for their succession in the church of Rome. Two celebrated ministers of France vied with each other which should best cover the inconsistencies of this system, to use an expression then in fashion. It is well known, that those two ministers are M. Claude and Jurieu. These men were gifted with wit and learning, subtilty and address, and every qualification necessary to make a good defence. None put on a better countenance than they, nor classed their



adversaries, with a more haughty and disdainful air, with weak people and missionaries for whom they entertained so great contempt; the difficulty, however, which they would make appear so light, proved at last so great, that it raised a division in the party. At length they were obliged to acknowledge publicly, that in the church of Rome, as in other churches, eternal salvation with the essential succession of true Christianity were found—a secret which the policy of the party had so long kept concealed. They have given us great advantages besides; they were driven into such visible excesses; they have so far forgotten both the ancient maxims of the reformation, and their own confessions of faith, that I could not but relate this change in full. Having applied myself with great care to trace out exactly the plan of these two ministers, and shew plainly the state in which they have placed the question, I must acknowledge sincerely, that I have found in their writings, with the most dexterous shifts, as much erudition and as much subtilty as ever I have observed in all the Lutheran or Calvinistic authors with whom I am acquainted. If among Protestants it should be judged advisable, under the pretext of the absurdities into which they have been forced, to contradict and recall what they have granted, and again take shelter in the invisible church, or other retreats equally abandoned, this would be like the disorder of a defeated army, who, dismayed at their overthrow, should seek to re-enter those forts which they had been unable to maintain, at the peril of being soon forced out a second time: or like the restlessness of a sick person, who, after much turning to and fro in bed in search of a more easy place, comes back to that he had just left, where he soon finds himself as uncomfortable as before.

25.—*What complaints Protestants may make, and how frivolous.*

I have but one thing to fear: it is, if I may be allowed to speak it, lest I should lay too open to our brethren the weakness of their reformation. Some there are, who, seeing their religion so manifestly in the wrong, rather than be pacified, will be exasperated against us, though alas! I am far from imputing to them the misfortunes of their birth, and I pity much more than I blame them. But they will not fail to rise up against us. What recriminations will be prepared against the Church, and what reproaches against myself, probably, on the nature of this work? How many of our ad-

versaries, though without reason, will tell me, that departing from my own character and maxims, and converting disputes of religion into personal and particular accusations, I have abandoned that moderation, which they themselves have praised? But certainly, they will merit the blame,—if this history renders the reformation odious, honest minds will clearly see, that it is not I, but the thing itself that speaks. In a discourse in which with regard to matters of faith, I propose to show the most authentic acts of the Protestant religion, nothing less than personal facts can be the question in hand; and if these be found in their authors, whom they represent as men sent in an extraordinary manner to revive Christianity in the sixteenth century, a conduct directly opposed to such a design; if through the whole party they have formed, characters quite contrary to a reviving of Christianity be seen; in this part of the history, Protestants will learn not to dishonour God and his providence, by attributing to him a special choice which would be evidently bad.

26.—*What recriminations may be allowed them.*

We must bear with recriminations, together with all those inventions and calumnies with which our adversaries are accustomed to load us. I require of them but two conditions, which they must allow to be just. The first is, not to think of accusing us of variations in matters of faith, until after they have cleared themselves; for they cannot deny, that this course would not be an answer to this history, but would tend to bewilder and delude the reader; secondly, not to oppose reasonings or conjectures to certain facts; but certain facts to certain facts, and authentic decisions of faith to authentic decisions of faith.

And if by such proofs they shew us the least inconsistency, or the least variation, in the dogmas of the Catholic church, from her first origin down to us, that is from the foundation of Christianity, I will readily own to them that they are right, and I myself will suppress my whole history.

27.—*This History very conducive to the knowledge of Truth.*

It is not, however, my design to make a jejune and insipid recital of Protestant variations. I shall disclose their causes; I shall shew that no change happened among them, which does not argue an inconsistency in their doctrine,

and is not the necessary result of it. Their variations, like those of the Arians, will discover what they would have excused, what supplied, what disguised in their belief. Their disputes, their contradictions, and their equivocations, will bear witness to Catholic truth, which, from to time, must also be represented such as it is in itself, in order to make it appear by how many ways its enemies have been forced at length to draw near to it again. Thus, in the very midst of so many disputes, the dark and inevitable confusions of the new reform, Catholic truth, like a beautiful sun piercing through opaque clouds, will everywhere display its lustre; and this treatise, should the execution equal the desire with which God has inspired me, will be the more convincing demonstration of the justice of our cause, as it will proceed from principles and facts allowed for certain by all.

28.—*And to facilitate a reunion.*

In short, the contests and agreements of Protestants will point out to us in what, on one side or the other, they have placed the fundamentals of religion, and the point at issue: what they must aver, what, at least, they must support in conformity with their own principles. The Confession of Augsburg alone, with its apology, will decide more in our favour than one thinks, and, I presume, what is most essential, we shall convince the Calvinist, complaisant to some, inexorable to others, that what appears odious in the Catholic, and not so in the Lutheran, at bottom is not essentially different; when it will appear, that what is aggravated against one, is extenuated and tolerated in the other; this will prove sufficiently, that such conduct proceeds not from principle, but aversion, which has ever been the true spirit of schism. This trial to which the Calvinist subjects himself, will reach much further than he is aware. The Lutheran will also find disputes greatly lessened by the truths he already acknowledges, and this work, which at first might seem contentious, will tend more to promote peace than strife.

29.—*How Catholics ought to be affected by this History.*

As to the Catholic, he will everywhere praise the Almighty, for the continual protection he affords his church, in order to maintain her simplicity, and inflexible uprightness, amidst the subtilities, with which men strive to bewilder the truths of the Gospel.

The perverseness of heretics will be a great and instructing spectacle to the humble of heart. They will learn to despise that knowledge which puffs up, and that eloquence which dazzles; and the talents which the world admires will appear to them of little value, when they see such vain curiosities, such caprices in learned men, such dissimulation, such artifices in the most polite writers; so much vanity and ostentation, such dangerous illusions amongst those called men of wit; and finally, so much arrogance and passion, and consequently so many and so manifest errors in men that appear great, because they are followed by the crowd. They will deplore the errors of the human mind, and be convinced that the only remedy for these great evils, is to break off all attachment to private judgment, for it is this which distinguishes Catholic from Heretic. The property of the heretic, that is, of one who has a particular opinion, is, to be wedded to his own conceits: the property of the Catholic, that is, universal, is, to prefer the general sense of the whole church to his own sentiments; this is the grace for which we shall petition in behalf of those that err. We shall, however, be filled with a salutary and holy awe, when we contemplate the dangerous and slippery temptations with which God tries his Church, and the judgments which he exercises on her; nor shall we cease to pour forth prayers to obtain for her, pastors equally enlightened and exemplary, since it is through want of them that the flock, which has been redeemed at so great a price, has been so miserably ravaged.

THE HISTORY  
OF THE  
VARIATIONS OF THE PROTESTANT CHURCHES.

B O O K I.

[From the year 1517 to the year 1520.]

**Brief Summary:**—The beginning of Luther's disputes.—His agitations.—His submissions to the Church and Pope.—The foundations of his Reformation laid in imputed justice; his unheard of propositions; his condemnation.—His passion, furious threats, vain prophecies, and the miracles of which he boasts.—The Papacy to be overthrown all of a sudden, without violence.—He promises he will not permit men to rise in arms for the maintenance of his Gospel.

1.—*A reformation of the Church, desired many ages ago.*

A REFORMATION of ecclesiastical discipline had been desired several ages since. "Who will grant me," says St. Bernard, "before I die, to see the church of God such as she had been in the primitive times\*?" If this holy man had any thing to regret at his death, it was, that he had not witnessed so happy a change. During his whole life he bewailed the evils of the church: he never ceased to admonish the people, the clergy, the bishops, and the Popes themselves of them. Nor did he conceal his sentiments on this subject from his own religious, who partook of his affliction in their solitude, and extolled the Divine goodness in having drawn them to it so much the more gratefully, as the world was more universally corrupted †. Disorders had still increased since that time. The Roman church, the mother of churches, which for nine whole ages had, by setting the example of an exact observance of ecclesiastical discipline, maintained it throughout the universe to her utmost power, was not exempt from evil; and from the

\* Bern. Epist. 257, ad Eugen. Papam. nunc 238. N. 6.

† Guil. Durand. Episc. Mimat. Speculator dictus, Tract. de Modo Gen. Conc. celeb. tit. 1. part. 3 ejusd. part. Tit. 33, &c.

time of the council of Vienne, a great prelate, commissioned by the Pope to prepare matters there to be discussed, laid it down as a groundwork to this holy assembly, "to reform the church in the head and members." The great schism which happened soon after made this saying common, not only with particular doctors, Gerson, or Peter D'Ailly, and other great men of the time, but also with the councils; and nothing was more frequently repeated in those of Pisa and Constance. What happened in the council of Basil, where a reformation was unfortunately eluded, and the church reinvolved in new divisions, is well known. The disorders of the clergy, chiefly those of Germany, were represented in this manner to Eugenius IV. by Cardinal Julian. "These disorders," said he, "excite the hatred of the people against the whole ecclesiastical order, and should they not be corrected, it is to be feared lest the laity, like the Hussites, should rise against the clergy, as they loudly threaten us\*." If the clergy of Germany were not quickly reformed, he predicted, that after the heresy of Bohemia, and when it would be extinct, another still more dangerous would soon succeed; for it will be said, proceeded he, "that the clergy† are incorrigible, and will apply no remedy to their disorders. When they shall no longer have any hopes of our amendment," continued this great Cardinal, "then will they fall upon us. The minds of men are pregnant with expectation of what measures will be adopted, and are ready for the birth of something tragic. The rancour they have imbibed against us becomes manifest; they will soon think it an agreeable sacrifice to God to abuse and rob ecclesiastics, as abandoned to extreme disorders, and hateful to God and man. The little respect now remaining for the ecclesiastical orders will soon be extinguished. Men will cast the blame of these abuses on the court of Rome, which will be considered the cause of them, because it had neglected to apply the necessary remedy." He afterwards spoke more emphatically: "I see," said he‡, "the axe is at the root: the tree begins to bend, and instead of propping it whilst in our power, we accelerate its fall." He foresees a speedy desolation in the German clergy. The desire of depriving them of their temporal goods would form the first spring of motion. "Bodies and souls," said he, "will perish together. God hides from us the prospect of our dangers, as he is accustomed to do with those whom he destines for punishment; we run into the fire which we see lighted before us."

\* Epist. 1. Julian Card. ad Eug. iv. inter Op. Æu. Silv. p. 66.

† Ibidem.

‡ Ibidem.

2.—*This desired reformation regarded not faith, but only discipline.*

Thus, in the fifteenth century, did this Cardinal, the greatest man of his time, lament the abuses of those days, and foresee their alarming consequences. He seems to have foretold those evils in which Luther was about to involve all Christendom, beginning with Germany. Nor was he mistaken, when he supposed that a reformation which was despised, and a hatred redoubled against the clergy, would speedily bring forth a sect more terrible to the church than that of the Bohemians. Under the banner of Luther appeared this sect, and in assuming to themselves the title of Reformed, they boasted they had realized the wishes of Christendom, because a reformation had been long desired by the Catholic world, people, doctors, and prelates. In order to justify this pretended reformation, whatever had been said by the writers of the church against the disorders of the clergy and people, was collected with great industry.

But here is a manifest deceit in the passages cited; not one of these doctors even for once thought of changing the faith of the church, or of correcting her worship, which chiefly consisted in the sacrifice of the altar, or of subverting the authority of her prelates, and chiefly that of the Pope, which was the great end of this new reformation as founded by Luther.

3.—*The testimony of St. Bernard.*

Our reformers cite to us St. Bernard, who enumerating the grievances of the church, all those she sustained at the beginning during the persecutions, and those she suffered from heresies in their progress, and those she was exposed to in latter days, through the corruption of morals, allows the latter to be far more frightful\*, because they corrupt the very vitals, and spread infection through all the members of the church: whence, concludes this great man, the church may truly say with Isaiah, “her bitterest and most painful bitterness is in peace†;” when left in peace by infidels, and unmolested by heretics, she is most dangerously assaulted by the depraved morals of her own children.” Even this were sufficient to show that he did not deplore, as the reformers did, the errors into which the church had fallen, since, on the contrary, he represented it as safe on that side; but such

\* Bern. Serm. 33. in Cant. N. 10.

† Isaïe xxxviii. 17.

evils only as proceeded from relaxed discipline: accordingly, when, instead of discipline, the dogmas of the church were attacked by turbulent and restless men,—such as Peter of Bruis, as Henry, as Arnould of Bresse,—this great man would not suffer one of them to be weakened, but fought invincibly for the faith of the church, and the authority of the prelates\*.

4.—*The testimony of Gerson, and Cardinal Peter D'Aily, Bishop of Cambray.*

It was so with the other Catholic doctors, who in the succeeding ages lamented abuses, and demanded a reformation of them. Gerson was the most celebrated of these, and now proposed with more energy a reformation of the church in her head and members. In a sermon, which he made after the council of Pisa, before Alexander the Fifth, he introduces the church demanding of the Pope a reformation and re-establishment of the kingdom of Israel; but to show he complained of no error that could be observed in the doctrine of the church, he addresses the Pope in these words: “Why,” says he, “do you not send to the Indians†, whose faith may have been easily corrupted, as they are not united to the church of Rome, whence certainty of faith must be derived?” His master, Cardinal Peter D'Aily, sighed also for a reformation, but he fixed its foundation on a principle entirely different from that on which Luther would establish it, since he himself wrote to Melancthon, “that sound doctrine could not subsist, whilst the authority of the Pope existed;” and, on the contrary, the Cardinal thought “that the members of the church being separated from their head, during the schism, and there being no administrator, and apostolic director, namely, no Pope, that all the church acknowledged no hope could be entertained of effecting a reformation‡.” Thus one made the reformation to consist in the subversion of the papacy, and the other in the perfect re-establishment of that sacred authority, which was instituted by Jesus Christ to preserve unity amongst his members, and retain all in their respective duties.

5.—*Two ways of desiring the reformation of the Church.*

There were then two different sorts of persons, who called for

\* Bern. Serm. 65, 66 in Cant.

† Gers. Serm. de Ascens. Dom. ad Alex. V. vol. ii. p. 131.

‡ Ibid. 137.



the reformation ; one, the truly peaceable and true children of the church, without bitterness bewailed her grievances, and, with respect, proposed a reformation of them, and in humility bore with a delay. Far from desiring to effect this object by schism, they, on the contrary, looked on schism as the greatest of all evils. In the midst of these abuses, they admired the providence of God, who, according to his promises, knew how to preserve the faith of the church. And, though they could not accomplish a reformation of morals, free from all bitterness and passion, they deemed themselves happy that nothing prevented them from accomplishing it in themselves. These were the strong ones of the church, whose faith no temptation could shake nor induce to deviate from unity. Besides these, there were proud spirits, who, struck with the disorders they saw prevailing in the church, especially in her ministers, did not believe the promises of her eternal duration could subsist in the midst of such abuses ; whereas, the Son of God had taught to respect the chair of Moses, notwithstanding the evil actions of the Scribes and Pharisees who sat therein\*. These became proud, and thereby weak, yielding to the temptation which inclines to hate the chair itself, in hatred to those who sat upon it ; and, as if the wickedness of man could make void the work of God, the aversion they had conceived against the teachers, made them both hate the doctrines they taught, and the authority they had received from God to teach.

Such were the Vandois and Albigenses ; such were John Wickliffe and John Huss. The ordinary bait by which they induced weak souls into their nets, was the hatred with which they inspired them against the pastors of the church. Influenced by this spirit of bitterness, they sighed for a rupture. It is not therefore surprising that, in the time of Luther, when invectives and animosities were carried to the highest pitch, the most violent schism and apostacy of course ensued, that, perhaps, till then had ever been seen in Christendom.

#### 6.—*Luther's commencements and qualities.*

Martin Luther, an Augustinian Friar, by profession Doctor and Professor of Divinity in the University of Wittenberg, first excited these commotions. The two parties which called themselves reformed, have equally acknowledged him

\* Matth. xxiii. 2. 3.

to be the author of this new reformation. Not only his followers, the Lutherans, vied with each other in extolling him, but even Calvin, often admires his virtues, his magnanimity, his constancy, and the incomparable industry with which he opposed the Pope. He is the trump<sup>et</sup>, or rather he is the thunder, he is the lightning that awaked the world from their lethargy: it was not Luther that spoke, but God that thundered from his mouth\*.

True it is, he had a strength of genius, a vehemence in his discourses, a lively and impetuous eloquence, which captivated the people and bore all before him, an extraordinary boldness when supported and applauded, with an air of authority which made his disciples tremble, insomuch that neither in little things, nor in great, dared they venture to contradict him.

Here I should relate the beginnings of the quarrel in 1517, were they not known by all mankind. For who is ignorant of the publication of the Indulgences of Leo X., and the jealousy of the Augustinian Friars against the Dominicans, who, on this occasion, were preferred to them? Who does not know that Luther, an Augustinian Doctor, being selected to maintain the credit of his order, first attacked the abuses many made of indulgences, and the extravagances that were uttered from the pulpit on that subject? But he had too much fire to keep himself within these limits: from the abuses of the thing, he came to the thing itself. He went on step by step, and though always diminishing indulgences and reducing them almost to nothing by his mode of explaining them, however, he seemed to agree with his adversaries in the essential part; for when he began to write his propositions, one of them was couched in the following terms: "Whoever denies the truth of the indulgences of the Pope, let him be accursed†."

7.—*The ground-work of Luther's Reformation—What imputed Justice, and Justification by Faith mean.*

Meanwhile, one subject led him on to another. As that of justification and of the efficacy of the sacraments bordered nearly upon indulgences, Luther fell on these two articles; and this dispute soon became the most important.

\* Calv. II. Def. Cont. Vestph. Opusc. F. 785—787, et seq. Resp. Cont. Figh. Ibid. fol. 137—141, &c.

† Prop. 1517. 71. vol. i. Viteb.

Justification is that grace which, remitting to us our sins, at the same time renders us agreeable to God. • Till then, it had been believed that what wrought this effect proceeded indeed from God, but yet necessarily existed in man; and that to be justified,—namely, for a sinner to be made just,—it was necessary he should have this justice in him; as to be learned and virtuous, one must have in him learning and virtue. But Luther had not followed so simple an idea. He would have it, that what justifies us and renders us agreeable to God was nothing in us; but we were justified because God imputed to us the justice of Jesus Christ, as if it were our own, and because by faith we could indeed appropriate it to ourselves.

8.—*Luther's special Faith, and the certainty of Justification.*

But the mystery of this justifying faith had something in it that was very singular. It did not consist in believing in general in a Saviour, his mysteries, and his promises; but in believing most assuredly, each one in his heart, that all our sins are forgiven us. “We are justified,” said Luther without ceasing, “from the time we with certainty believe ourselves so.” The certainty which he required was not that moral certainty alone, which, grounded on reasonable motives, excludes trouble and perturbation; but an absolute and infallible certainty, by which the sinner is to believe himself justified with the same faith as he believes Christ came into the world.

Without this certainty there was no justification for the faithful; for they were told they could neither call on God nor trust in him alone, whilst they had the least doubt, not merely of the Divine goodness in general, but of that particular goodness by which God imputes to each of us the justice of Jesus Christ; and this is what he called special faith.

9.—*According to Luther, man is assured of his Justification, without being assured of his Repentance.*

Here a new difficulty arose, whether, in order to be assured of his justification, it was necessary, at the same time, that man should be satisfied with the sincerity of his repentance. This immediately occurred to every one; and, since God promised to justify the penitent only, if we are assured of our justification, it seems necessary that we should be certain of

the sincerity of our repentance. But Luther abhorred this last certainty; and so far from being assured of the sincerity of repentance, "one was not even assured," said he, "by reason of the most hidden vice of vain-glory or self-love, that he did not commit many mortal sins in his very best actions\*."

Luther went still much farther; for he had invented this distinction between the works of God and those of men, "that the works of men, however beautiful in appearance, might seemingly be good, yet were they grievous sins; on the other hand, the works of God, however deformed in appearance, might seemingly be bad, yet were they of an eternal merit†." Deceived by his antithesis and by this play of words, Luther imagined that he had discovered the true difference between the works of man and those of God; not reflecting that the good works of men are also the works of God, who, by his grace, produces them in us, which, according to Luther himself, should give them an eternal merit; but this is what he was resolved to avoid,—on the contrary concluding "That all the works of the just would be mortal sins were they not fearful of their being so; nor could there be any avoiding presumption, or having a true hope if, in every action they performed, they did not fear damnation‡."

Repentance, doubtless, is not compatible with mortal sins actually committed; for to be truly repentant of some grievous sins, and not of all, or to be sorry for them, whilst one commits them, is impossible. If, therefore, we are never certain, that in every good work we fall not into divers grievous sins—if, on the contrary, we ought to fear our constantly falling into such, we can never be assured of being truly penitent; and could we be assured of this, we need not, as Luther prescribes, fear damnation, unless we at the same time believe that God, contrary to his promise, would condemn to hell the contrite of heart. And if, on account of his own want of disposition, of which he was not assured, a sinner should happen to call in doubt his justification, Luther told him he was not assured of his good disposition, nor did he know, for example, whether he were truly penitent, truly contrite, truly afflicted for his sins; yet he was not the less assured of his entire justification, because it depended not on any good disposition on his part. On this account this new Doctor declared to the sinner, "Believe firmly that thou art absolved, and thou art so, whatever be thy contrition||."

\* Luther, T. i. Prop. 1518. Prop. 48.

† Prop. Heilss. 1518. Prop. 3, 4, 7, 11.

|| Serm. de Indulg. v. i. p. 52.

‡ Ibid.

This is equivalent to saying, whether you be penitent or not, you need not concern yourself. All consists, said he continually, “in believing, without hesitation, that you are absolved;” whence he concluded, whether the priest baptized or gave you absolution in earnest or in jest, is a matter of no consequence\*; because in the Sacraments there was only one thing to fear, namely, the not believing strongly enough that all your crimes were forgiven you, when you had once wrought on yourself to believe so.

10.—*The inconsistency of this Doctrine.*

The Catholics perceived that this doctrine laboured under a most grievous difficulty, because the believer, being obliged to hold himself assured of his justification, and not of his repentance, consequently ought to believe he might be justified in the sight of God, though he were not truly penitent, which opened the way to impenitence.

True it is, however (for nothing ought to be concealed), that Luther did not exclude from justification a sincere repentance, namely, the horror of sin, and the will to do good, and, in short, the conversion of the heart, and judged it as absurd, as we do, to be justified without contrition or repentance. Between him and Catholics, on this head, there appeared no difference, unless that the Catholics called these acts the dispositions of the sinner to justification, and Luther judged he styled them more justly, the necessary conditions. But this subtle distinction, at bottom, did not extricate him from the difficulty; for these acts are essential for the remission of sin, name them as you will, either condition, or disposition, or necessary preparation: so that the question still returned, How Luther could say the sinner ought to believe most assuredly that he was absolved, be his contrition what it may, that is, be his repentance what it may; as if the being penitent, or not, were a thing quite indifferent to the remission of sins.

11.—*Whether we may be assured of our Faith, without being assured of our Repentance.*

Here, then, was the great difficulty in the new dogma, or, in modern phrase, the new system of Luther. How was it possible to have assurance of the entire remission of sin, when not assured, nay, it was impossible one should be

\* Prop. 1518. Ibid. Serm. de Indulg.

certain of true repentance, and true conversion? But it was enough, said Luther, one was assured of faith. A new difficulty, to be assured of faith, and not of repentance; which faith, according to Luther, always produces. "But," answers he, "the faithful can say 'I believe\*,' and thereby his faith becomes sensible to him;" as if the same person might not in like manner say, "I repent," and so become alike assured of his repentance. "If, lastly, it be replied that the doubt will still remain, whether he repent or not as he ought to do, I say the same of faith; and the sum of the whole is this,—that the sinner must rest assured of his justification, without the possibility of an assurance that he hath fulfilled as he ought that necessary condition of obtaining it, which God required at his hands."

Here there was a new labyrinth. Although faith did not, in the opinion of Luther, dispose to justification (for he ever had an aversion to these dispositions), it was, however, the necessary condition, and the only means of appropriating to us Jesus Christ and his justice. If, therefore, after all the efforts that a sinner makes, in order to persuade himself fully that his sins are forgiven him through his faith, this question could arise within, Who will tell me, weak and imperfect as I am, whether or not I have that true faith which changes the heart? This is a temptation, according to Luther. We must believe, that by faith all our sins are forgiven us, without troubling ourselves whether this faith be such as God requires; nay, without so much as thinking of it. For this thought alone would be making the grace of justification depend on a thing which may be in us; which the gratuitousness, as I may say, of justification, according to him, would not suffer.

### 12.—*The Security which Luther blames.*

With this certainty of the remission of sin, advanced by Luther, he however declared there was a certain state dangerous to the soul, which he called security. "Let the faithful take care," says he, "that they come not to a security;" and immediately after, "There is a detestable arrogance and security in those who flatter themselves, and are not truly afflicted for their sins, which are still deeply rooted in their minds†." If to these two theses of Luther, we join that in which he said, as has been seen already, that, on account of self-love,

\* Ass. artic. damnat. v. ii, ad Prop. 14.

† 5 Disp. 1538. Prop. 44. 45. 1. T.

one could never be assured he did not commit many mortal sins in his very best actions, insomuch that he ought always to fear damnation\*, it might seem that this Doctor, at bottom, agreed with Catholics, and that this certainty, which he lays down, was not to be taken, as it has been by me, in the most rigorous sense. But in that we should be deceived; Luther literally maintains these two propositions, which appear so contrary—"Man is never assured that he grieves for his sins as he ought to do; and he must rest assured that he has gained the forgiveness of them." Whence follow those two propositions, which seem not less opposite: certainty is to be admitted, security is to be feared. But what is, then, this certainty, if it be not security? This was the inexplicable knot of the doctrine of Luther, which never could be unravelled.

13.—*The Answer of Luther, by the distinction of two kinds of Sin.*

For my part, all I could ever find in his works tending to unfold this mystery, is the distinction he makes between sins committed with knowledge, and those committed "without knowledge and against conscience—*lapsus contra conscientiam.*†" It seems, therefore, that Luther would have said, a Christian cannot be assured of his being exempt from sins of the first kind, but may be so with regard to the second; and if in the committing these he held himself assured of the remission of his sins, he fell into that pernicious security condemned by Luther; whereas, avoiding them, he may have a full assurance that all the rest, even the most hidden, are forgiven him; which is sufficient for that certainty which Luther would establish.

14.—*The Difficulty still remains.*

But still the difficulty returned; for, according to Luther, it remained indubitable that it is never known by man whether this vice of self-love, so hidden, does not infect the best of all his actions: on the contrary, in order to avoid presumption, he must look upon it as unquestionable that they are mortally infected with it: "that he flatters himself;" and that when he believes himself "truly grieved for his offences," it does not follow that he really is as much so as is necessary for the remission of them. If this be so, whatever he may think he feels within himself, he never knows whether sin reigns not in his heart, the more dangerously the more hidden

\* Prop. 1518, 48, v. i.

† Luth. *Themat.* v. i. p. 490. *Conf. Aug. cap. de bon. op. Synt. Gen. 2. part. p. 21.*

it is. We must, therefore, be brought to believe we may be reconciled to God whilst sin predominates in us, or there never will be any such thing as certainty.

### 15.—*The Contradiction of the Doctrine of Luther.*

Thus all we are told of the certainty man may have with respect to sin committed against conscience, is nothing to the purpose. Luther should have gone farther, and acknowledged that this sin which hides itself, this secret pride, this self-love, which lurks in so many shapes, and even assumes the form of virtue, may be, perhaps, the grand obstacle to our conversion, and the inevitable subject of that continual fear which, after St. Paul, is taught by Catholics. The same Catholics observed, that the answers on this subject were manifestly contradictory. Luther had advanced this proposition: "No man should answer the priest that he is contrite, that is, penitent\*." And as the proposition seems very strange, he cites these passages to support it: "I am not conscious to myself of anything, and yet I am not on that account justified †." David says, "Who knoweth his sins ‡?" St. Paul says, "He that commendeth himself is not approved, but he whom God commendeth §." From these texts Luther concluded that no sinner is so qualified as to answer the priest, "I am truly penitent;" and understanding it rigorously, and for an entire certainty, he was right. According to him, therefore, man was not absolutely assured he was penitent. According to him, however, he was absolutely certain his sins were forgiven him; he was absolutely certain, therefore, that forgiveness is independent of repentance. Catholics laboured in vain to understand these novelties: here is a prodigy, say they, in doctrine and morals, nor can the church bear this scandal ||.

### 16.—*The Sequel of the Contradictions of Luther.*

"But," said Luther, "we are assured of our faith, and faith is inseparable from contrition." To which was replied, "Allow, therefore, the faithful to answer for their contrition equally with their faith, or prohibiting one, prohibit the other." "But," proceeded he, "St. Paul has said, 'Examine yourselves whether you be in the faith; prove yourselves.' ¶ Therefore we feel faith," concluded Luther: "Therefore we feel it not," concluded his adversaries. If it be a matter

\* Assert. art. Damnat. ad art. 14. T. ii. † 1 Cor. iv. 4. ‡ Ps. xviii. 13.  
§ 2 Cor. x. 18. || Ibidem ad Prop. 12, 14. ¶ 2 Cor. xiii. 5.



of proof, if a subject of examination, it is not a thing we know from feeling, nor, as they say, from conscience. That which is called faith, continued they, may be, perhaps, nothing more than an illusory image of it, and a weak repetition of what has been read in books, or heard from the mouths of others. In order to be certain we have that lively faith which works the true conversion of the heart, we ought to be sure that sin no longer reigns in us; which Luther neither can nor will guarantee to us, whilst he guarantees what depends thereon, namely, the forgiveness of sins. Here is the contradiction, and the inevitable weakness of his doctrine.

17.—*The Continuation of them.*

Nor let this text of St. Paul be alleged: "What man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man, which is in him \*?" True it is, no other creature, neither man nor angel, sees anything in us but what we see: but it follows not from that we ourselves do always see it; otherwise, how could David have said what Luther objected—"Who knoweth his sins?" These sins, are they not in us? And since it is certain we do not always know them, man will be always a mystery to himself, and his own mind an eternal and impenetrable subject of doubt. It is therefore manifest folly to seek for a certainty of the forgiveness of our sin, if we be not certain that we have entirely withdrawn our hearts from it.

18.—*Luther forgot all that he had said well at the beginning of the Dispute.*

At the beginning of the dispute Luther spoke much better; for here are his first theses on Indulgences, in 1517, and at the first rise of the discussion: "None is assured of the truth of his confession, much less of the fullness of his pardon†." At that time, on account of the inseparable union of repentance and forgiveness, he acknowledged that the uncertainty of the one implied that of the other. He afterwards changed, but from good to bad; still retaining the uncertainty of contrition, he took away the uncertainty of forgiveness, and no longer allowed forgiveness to be dependant on repentance. Thus Luther reformed himself; such was his progress, as his anger against the church increased, and as he sunk deeper into schism. In everything he made it his study to take the reverse of the sentiments of the church. Far from endea-

1 Cor. ii. 2.

† Prop. 1517. Prop. 20. T. i., f. 50.

avouring, as we do, to inspire sinners with a fear of the judgments of God,\* to excite repentance in them, Luther went to such excess as to say, "That contrition, which looked back, in the bitterness of heart, on years past, weighing the grievousness of sins, their deformity, their multitude, beatitude lost, and damnation incurred, served only to make men greater hypocrites\*;" as if it were hypocrisy in the sinner to rouse himself from insensibility. But, perhaps, he meant no more than that these sentiments of fear were not sufficient, unless they are united with faith and the love of God. I acknowledge he afterwards explains himself thus †, but in contradiction to his own principles; for, on the contrary, he required (and this, as we shall hereafter see, is one of the fundamentals of his doctrine) that forgiveness of sin should precede love; and to establish this, abused the parable of the two debtors in the Gospel, of whom our Saviour said, "He to whom is forgiven the greatest debt loveth most‡." From this Luther and his disciples concluded, one did not love till after the debt, namely, the sin, was remitted to him. Such was the great indulgence preached by Luther, and opposed by him to those that were published by the Dominicans, and granted by Leo X. No occasion for exciting fear, no necessity for love; to be completely justified from all kind of sins, man required no more than to believe without hesitation that they were all forgiven him, and in a moment the affair was settled.

19.—*Luther's strange doctrine concerning the war against the Turks.*

Amongst the extraordinary things which he every day advanced, there was one that astonished the whole Christian world. Whilst Germany, threatened with the formidable arms of the Turk, was all in motion to oppose him, Luther established this principle—"That it was necessary, not only to will what God requires us to will, but all absolutely that God himself wills." Whence he concluded, "that to fight against the Turk, was to resist the will of God, who designed to visit us §."

\* Serm. de Indul.

† Luc. vii. 42, 43.

‡ Adver. execr. Anticrist. Bull. t. ii. fol. 93.

§ Prop. 1517, 98, f. 56.

20.—*Luther's outward humility, and his submission to the Pope.*

In the midst of so many bold propositions, nothing in the exterior was more humble than he—a man timid and retired. He said \*, “By force he had been drawn into the world, and rather by chance than design, thrown into those troubles.” His style had nothing uniform, was even unpolished in some places, and this on purpose. So far from promising immortality to his name and writings, he had never so much as sought it. Nay, he waited the decision of the Church respectfully, so far as to declare expressly, “should he not abide by her judgment, he consented to be treated as a heretic.” In a word, all he said breathed his submission, not only to the council, but to the holy see, and the Pope himself, who, moved by the clamour which the novelty of the doctrine had excited over all the church, had taken cognizance of the cause; and thus it was, that Luther appeared most respectful. “I am not so rash,” said he †, “as to prefer my private opinion to that of all other men.” As to the Pope, this is what he wrote to him in 1518, on Trinity Sunday: “Whether you give life or death, call me this or that way, approve or reprove as best seems fitting, I will hearken to your voice, as to that of Christ himself ‡.” For three entire years, all his discourses were filled with similar protestations: nay more, he referred himself to the decision of the universities of Basil, Fribourg, and Louvain. Awhile after, he joined that of Paris; nor was there a tribunal in the church which he would not acknowledge.

21.—*The reasons on which he grounded his submission.*

What he uttered concerning the authority of the holy see had the appearance of sincerity; for the reasons which he assigned for his attachment to this great see were, indeed, the most capable of affecting a Christian heart. In a book which he wrote against Sylvester Prierius, a Dominican, he begins with citing these words of Jesus Christ, “Thou art Peter,” and these, “Feed my sheep.” The whole world, says he, confesses, that from these texts proceeds the authority of the Pope. In the same place, after saying that the faith of the whole world ought to be regulated by that which the church of Rome professes, he thus proceeds: “I give

\* Resol. de Pot. Papæ. Præf. T. 1. f. 310. Præf. oper. ibid. 2.

† Cont. Prieri. t. i. f. 177.

‡ Protest. Luth. t. i. f. 195.

thanks to Jesus Christ, for preserving on earth this only church by a great miracle, and which alone may demonstrate that our faith is true, insomuch as never, by any one decree, hath she departed from the true faith." Even after the ardour of dispute had shaken a little these good principles, "the consent of all the faithful retained him in a reverence for the authority of the Pope." "Is it possible," said he, "for Jesus Christ not to be with this great number of Christians\*?" Thus he condemned the Bohemians, who separated from our communion, and protested it should never be his fate to fall into a like schism.

22.—*His sallies of passion, for which he begs pardon.*

However, there was something haughty and violent perceptible in all his writings. But though he attributed his passion to the violence of his adversaries, whose excesses, in that way, were not inconsiderable, yet he asked pardon for it. "I acknowledge" (thus he wrote to Cardinal Cajetan, legate then in Germany) "I have been transported indiscreetly, and have been wanting in due respect to the Pope. I am sorry for it. Though urged to it, I should not have answered the fool that wrote against me, according to his folly. Be so good," continued he, "as to represent the matter to the holy father; I desire no more than to hear the voice of the church, and to obey it."

23.—*A new protestation of submission to the Pope.—He offers Leo X. and Charles V. to be silent for the future.*

After his citation to Rome, and whilst appealing from the Pope ill informed to the Pope well informed, he did not cease to say, "that the appeal, inasmuch as it regarded him, did not seem necessary to him," he always abiding submissive to the judgment of the Pope, yet excused his going to Rome on account of the expense †. And moreover, said he, this citation before the Pope was needless to a man who waited for nothing but the decree of the Pope, in order to comply with it ‡.

In the course of this proceeding, on Sunday, the 28th of November, he appealed from the Pope to the council; but in his act he persisted in always saying, "that he neither presumed to doubt the supremacy or authority of the holy see, nor yet to say anything contrary to the power

\* Disput. Lips. t. i. f. 251.

† Ad Card. Cajetan.

‡ Ibid.

of the Pope well advised and well informed." And, indeed, on the third of March, 1519, he wrote again to Leo X., that "he did not design in anywise to interfere with his authority, or that of the church of Rome\*." And, provided a similar injunction were laid on his adversaries, he bound himself, as he had all along done, to an eternal silence; for he could not bear a partial judgment; and, if we may believe him, he would have remained satisfied with the Pope, had he but imposed on both parties an equal silence. So little was this reformation, so much boasted of since, deemed by him necessary to the welfare of the church. As for retractation, he would never hear it mentioned, however sufficient matter there was for it, as observed above. And yet, so far from exaggerating, I do not tell the whole. But, said he, "being once engaged, his Christian reputation would not suffer him to abscond in a corner," or to retreat. This was his excuse after the rupture commenced; but, during the contest, he assigned one, the more probable as it was more submissive. "For, after all," said he, "I see not what use would be my retractation, since it is not what I have said, but what the church will say to me, whom I shall not pretend to answer as an adversary, but to hear as a disciple †."

In the beginning of the year 1520, he spoke somewhat higher; the contest, too, grew warmer, and the party was increased. He wrote, therefore, to the Pope,—“I abhor disputes; I will attack no man, nor be myself attacked; if I be, having Jesus Christ for my lord and master, they shall not go unanswered: as for recanting what I have said, let no man look for it. Your holiness, with one word, may terminate all these contests, by bringing the cause to your own tribunal, and imposing silence on both parties ‡.” This is what he wrote to Leo X., dedicating to him, at the same time, the Book of Christian Liberty, full of new paradoxes, the dreadful effects of which we shall soon witness. The same year, after the universities of Louvain and Cologne had censured this, and the other books of Luther, he complained thus: “Wherein hath Leo, our holy father, offended these universities, that they should snatch out of his hands a book dedicated to his name, and laid at his feet, there to await his sentence?” In short, he wrote to Charles V., “that he would be an humble and obedient son of the Catholic Church, even unto death; and promised to hold his peace, if his enemies would but let him §.” He called

\* Luth. ad Leon. X. 1519.

† Ad Leon. X. t. ii. f. 2-6.

‡ Ad Card. Caj. t. i. p. 216.

§ Luth. ad Car. V. ib. 44.

the whole universe, and the two greatest powers thereof to witness, that these disputes might be terminated; and to this he bound himself in the most solemn manner.

24.—*He is condemned by Leo. X., and flies into horrible excesses.*

But this affair had made too great a noise to be dissembled. The sentence issued from Rome; Leo X. published his bull of condemnation, dated June 18, 1520; and, at the same time, Luther forgot all his submissions, as if they had been empty compliments. From that time he became furious; clouds of libels were scattered against the bull: first, appeared his notes and comments on it, filled with contempt; a second pamphlet bore this title, “Against the execrable Bull of Antichrist,” which he concluded with these words, “In the same manner that they excommunicate me, I excommunicate them again\*.” Thus did this new Pope pass sentence. He put out a third in “defence of the articles condemned by the bull †.” Far from retracting any of his errors, or in the least moderating his excesses, he went beyond them, and confirmed everything, even to this proposition, namely, Every Christian woman or child, in the absence of the priest, may “absolve, in virtue of these words of Jesus Christ,—All that he shall unbind, shall be unbound;” even to that wherein he said, that to fight against the Turk was to resist God. Instead of correcting so scandalous a proposition, he maintained it anew, and assuming the tone of a prophet, spoke thus: “If the Pope be not brought to an account, Christendom is ruined; he that can, let him flee to the mountains; or let this Roman homicide be slain. Jesus Christ shall destroy him by his glorious coming; it shall be he, and no other ‡” Thus, borrowing the words of the prophet Isaiah, “Oh Lord,” cried out this new prophet, “who believeth in thy word?” And concluded, in delivering to men this commandment, as an oracle sent from heaven: “Forbear ye to make war against the Turk, until the name of the Pope be taken from beneath the heavens; I have said it.”

25.—*His fury against the Pope and those Princes who supported him.*

This was plainly declaring to them, that henceforward the Pope was to be held as their common enemy, against whom

\* T. i. 88, 91.

† Assert. art. per Bull. damnat.

‡ Ibid. t. ii. Prop. 33.

all were to unite. But Luther spoke much plainer afterwards ; when disappointed that these prophecies did not proceed fast enough, he endeavoured to accelerate their accomplishment by these words ; “ The Pope is a wolf, possessed by an evil spirit ; from every village and every borough men must assemble against him ; neither the sentence of the judge, nor the authority of a council must be waited for ; no matter if Kings and Cæsars make war in his behalf ; he that rises in arms under a thief, does it to his own cost. Kings and Cæsars bear not themselves guiltless, by saying they are the defenders of the church, because they ought to know what is the Church \*.” In short, whoever had believed him, must have set all on fire, and reduced to one heap of ashes, both Pope and princes that supported him ; and what is still more strange, as many propositions as we have seen were as many theses of divinity, which Luther undertook to maintain. Nor was this an orator whom the warmth of the harangue might have betrayed into indeliberate conclusions ; but a doctor, that dogmatized in cold blood, and erected all his frenzies into theses.

Although he did not, as yet, exclaim quite so high in that libel which he published against the Bull, yet the commencement of that intemperance might have been discovered in it ; and it was the same passion which made him say, on the subject of the citation on which he did not appear, “ I defer my appearing there, till I am followed by five thousand horse, and twenty thousand foot ; then will I make myself be believed †.” All was of this character : and through his whole discourse appeared mockery and violence ; the two marks of exasperated pride.

He was reproved in the Bull, for maintaining some of the propositions of John Huss ; instead of excusing himself, as he would have done heretofore, “ It is true,” said he to the Pope, “ all that you condemn in John Huss I approve ; all that you approve I condemn. Here is the recantation you enjoin me ; do you require more ‡ ?”

The most burning fevers cause not more frantic ravings. This was called by the party the height of courage ; and Luther, in the notes he made on the Bull, told the Pope under the name of another, “ We know full well that Luther will not bate you an inch, because so great a courage cannot relinquish the defence of the truth he has once undertaken §.”

\* Disp. 1540, Prop. 59, et seq. t. i. f. 407.

† Adv. execr. Antchr. Bull. t. ii. f. 91.

‡ Ibidem, Prop. 30. f. 109.

§ Not, in Bull. t. ii. f. 56.

When, through hatred that the Pope had caused his works to be burned\* at Rome, Luther, in his turn, caused the Decretals to be burnt at Wittemberg; the acts recording this exploit, ordered by him to be registered, said, "That he had held forth with a surprising beautifulness of diction, and a happy elegance, in his mother tongue\*." With this charm he ravished and led away mankind. But, above all, he forgot not to mention it was not enough to have burnt those Decretals, and it had been much more to the purpose, if the like had been done to the Pope himself; "that is to say," added he, moderating a little his expression, "to the Papal chair."

26.—*How Luther came at last to reject the authority of the Church.*

When I consider so much passion after so much humility, I am at a loss whence this apparent humility could proceed in a man of such temper. Was it from artifice and dissimulation? Rather, was it not that pride, unacquainted with itself in its beginnings, and fearful at first, hides behind its contrary, till an occasion presents of appearing to advantage?

After the rupture was opened, Luther himself confesses "that in the beginning he was like one in despair, nor could man comprehend from what weakness God had raised him to such a courage; nor how, from such trembling, he came to so great strength†."

Whether God or the occasion made this change, I shall leave to the judgment of the reader, and, for my part, am content with the fact which Luther owns during this alarm: in one sense, it is very true that his humility was not feigned. What might cause one, however, to suspect artifice in his discourses, is, that occasionally he forgot himself so far as to say, "that he never would change his doctrine; and though he had referred his whole dispute to the determination of the supreme bishop, it was because respect ought to be observed towards him who bore so great a charge ‡." But whoever shall reflect on the interior conflicts of a man, whom pride on one side, and the remains of faith on the other, never ceased to distract interiorly, will not consider it at all impossible that such different sentiments should appear alternately in his writings. Be that

\* Exust. acta. t. ii. f. 123.

† Præf. Op. t. i. f. 49, 50, et seq.

‡ Flo. Lect. t. i. f. 212.



as it may, it is certain the authority of the Church restrained him for a long time, nor can we read without indignation, as well as pity, what he writes regarding it. "After," says he, "I had gotten the better of all the arguments which were opposed to me, one remained still which, with extreme difficulty and great anguish, I could scarce conquer even with the assistance of Jesus Christ; namely, that we ought to hear the church\*." Grace, I may say, with reluctance abandoned this unhappy man. He prevailed at length; and to complete his blindness, mistook Jesus Christ's abandonment of him, for the immediate assistance of his hand. Who would have thought, that refusing presumptuously to hear the church, contrary to the express command of Christ, should be attributed to the grace of Christ? After this fatal victory, which cost Luther so dear, he cries out like one set free from irksome bondage, "Let us break their bands asunder, and cast their yoke from us †;" for he made use of these words in answering the Bull; and in his last struggle to shake off church authority, not reflecting that this inauspicious canticle is what David put into the mouth of rebels, whose conspiracies were against the Lord, and against his anointed, Luther, in his blindness, applies it to himself, exulting that, exempt from all constraint, he may henceforward speak and decide, as he wishes, in all things. His despised submissions rankle in his breast;—he keeps no temper;—his sallies, that should scandalize his disciples, encourage them; they catch, by hearing, the contagious phrenzy; so rapid a motion reaches soon to a great distance; and numbers look on Luther as sent by God for the reformation of mankind.

27.—*Luther's Letter to the Bishops—his pretended extraordinary mission.*

Then he applies himself to maintain his mission as extraordinary and divine. In a letter he wrote to the bishops, "falsely so styled," said he, he assumed the title of Ecclesiastes or Preacher of Wittemberg, which none had ever given him; nor does he pretend anything else, but that he gave it himself; that so many bulls, and so many excommunications, so many condemnations from the pope and emperor, had stript him of all his former titles, and defaced the character of the beast in him; yet he could not remain without a title, and

\* Præf. Oper. Luth. t. i. f. 49.

† Not. in Bull, t. i. f. 63. Ps. ii, 3.

had therefore given himself this, as a token of the ministry to which God had called him, and which he had received not from man, nor by man, but by the gift of God, and by the revelation of Jesus Christ\*. Here we have his vocation as immediate, and as extraordinary, as that of St. Paul. On this foundation, at the beginning, and throughout the entire body of the letter, he qualifies himself “Martin Luther, by the grace of God, Ecclesiastes of Wittenberg †;” and declares to the bishops, lest they should pretend ignorance, that this is his own title which he bestows on himself, with an egregious contempt of them and Satan; and that he might, with as good a claim, have called himself evangelist by the grace of God; for Jesus Christ most certainly named him so, and considered him as Ecclesiastes.

By virtue of this celestial mission he did every thing in the church: he preached, he visited, abrogated some ceremonies, left others remaining, instituted and deposed. He that never was more than a priest, dared to make, I do not say other priests, which itself would be an attempt unheard of in the entire Church since the origin of Christianity; but what is much more unheard of, even a bishop. It was deemed expedient by the party to invade the bishopric of Nuremberg. Luther went to this city, and by a new consecration ordained Nicholas Amsdorf bishop of it, whom he had already made minister and pastor of Magdeburg. He did not, therefore, make him bishop, in the sense he sometimes calls by that name all pastors, but he made him bishop, with all the prerogatives annexed to this sacred name, and gave him that superior character which himself had not: but all was comprised in his extraordinary vocation; and an evangelist, sent immediately from God like another Paul, could do all he pleased in the church.

28.—*Luther's arguments against the Anabaptists, who preached without ordinary mission and miracles.*

Such attempts as these, I know very well, are esteemed nothing in the new reformation. These vocations and missions, so much respected in all ages, are nothing more, after all, than formalities to these new doctors, who require only what they call essentials; but these formalities established by God, preserve what is essential. They are formalities, if they please, but in the same sense the sacraments are so—divine formalities, which are the seals of the promise, and

\* Ep. ad falso nominat. ordin. Episcoporum, t. ii. f. 305. † Ibid. 14. 220.

the instruments of grace. Vocation, mission, succession, lawful ordination, are alike with them to be called formalities. By these sacred formalities God seals the promise he made to his church of preserving her for ever. "Go, teach and baptize; and lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the world\*:" with you, teaching and baptizing; not with you here present only, and whom I have immediately chosen, but with you in the persons of those who shall be for ever substituted in your place by my appointment. Whoever despises these formalities of legitimate and ordinary missions, may, with the same reason, despise the sacraments, and confound the whole order of the church. And without entering further into this subject, Luther, who said he was sent with an extraordinary title immediately from God as an evangelist and apostle, was not ignorant himself that that extraordinary vocation ought to be confirmed by miracles. Therefore, when Muncer, with his Anabaptists, assumed the title and function of a pastor, Luther would not suffer the question to turn on what he might call essential, or admit he should prove his doctrine from the Scriptures; but ordered he should be asked, "Who had given him commission to teach?" "Should he answer—God; let him prove it," says Luther, "by a manifest miracle; for when God intends to alter any thing in the ordinary form of mission, it is by such signs that he declares himself†."

Luther had been educated in good principles, and could not avoid sometimes returning to them. Witness the treatise which he wrote of the authority of magistrates, in 1534. This date is remarkable, forasmuch as four years after the Augsburg Confession, and fifteen after the rupture, it cannot be said that the Lutheran doctrine had not at that time taken its form; and yet Luther there declared again, "That he had much rather a Lutheran should leave the parish, than preach there against his pastor's consent; that the magistrate ought not to suffer either private assemblies, or any to preach without lawful vocation; if they had suppressed the Anabaptists when they began to spread their doctrine without vocation, the many evils which desolated Germany would have been prevented; that no man truly pious should undertake anything without vocation, which ought to be observed so religiously, that even a gospeller (for so he calls his own disciples) might not preach in the parish of a papist or a heretic, without the consent of him who was pastor of it;" "which he spoke," proceeds he, "in warning to the magistrates, that

\* Mat. xxviii. 20.

† Sleid, lib. v. Edit. 1555—69. In Ps. lxxxii. de Magis. t. iii.

they might shun those prattlers, who brought not good and sure testimonials of their vocation, either from God or men; without this, though they preached the pure gospel, or were angels dropt from heaven, yet they ought not to be admitted." This is to say, sound doctrine is not sufficient; but, besides this, one of two things is requisite, either miracles to testify God's extraordinary vocation, or the authority of those pastors who were already qualified to confer the ordinary vocation in due form.

When Luther wrote this, he was well aware it might be asked, whence he himself had received his authority? and therefore answered, "He was a doctor and a preacher who had not intruded himself, nor ought he to cease to preach, after it had been forced upon him, neither could he dispense with himself in teaching his own church; but for other churches, he did no more than communicate his writings to them, which was but what charity required."

29.—*What were the miracles by which Luther pretended to authorize his mission.*

But when he spoke with this assurance of his church, the question was, who had given him a charge of it; and how that vocation, which he had received with dependance, on a sudden became independent of the whole ecclesiastical hierarchy? However that be, Luther, for this time, was willing his vocation should be ordinary, at other times, when he was more sensible of the impossibility of maintaining it, he styled himself, as above, God's immediate envoy, and boasted he was deprived of all these titles which had been conferred on him by the church of Rome, that he might enjoy so celestial a vocation. Then, as for miracles, he was at no loss: he would have the great success of his preaching considered miraculous; and, at his renouncing the monastic life, he wrote to his father, who seemed a little shocked at this change, that God had withdrawn him from that state by visible miracles. "Satan," says he, "seems to have foreseen from my infancy all that one day he was to suffer from me. Is it possible, that I, of all mortals, should be the only one he attacks at this time? Formerly, you were desirous of taking me from the monastery; God hath taken me thence without you. I send you a book wherein you will see, by how many miracles and extraordinary instances of his power he hath absolved me from monastic vows\*." These wonders

\* De Vot. Monas. ad Johannem Lut. Parent. suum. t. ii. 263.

and prodigies were not only the boldness, but also the unlooked for success of his undertaking. It was this he gave for miraculous, and his disciples were persuaded of it.

30.—*Sequel of Luther's boasted miracles.*

They even accounted it supernatural that a *petty monk* had conceived the courage to attack the Pope, and stood intrepid amidst so many enemies. The people took him for a hero, a man from heaven, when they heard him defy threats and dangers, and say, "though he absconded for a while, the devil knew full well" (a fine witness) "it proceeded not from fear;—that when he appeared at Worms before the emperor, nothing was capable of terrifying him; and though he had been assured of meeting there as many devils ready to seize him as were tiles on the house-tops, he would have dared them all with the like resolution\*." These were his ordinary expressions. He had always in his mouth the devil and the pope, as enemies he was about to crush; and his disciples discovered in these words a divine ardour, a celestial instinct, and the enthusiasm of a heart influenced with the glory of the gospel.

When some of his party undertook, as we shall see, during his absence, and without consulting him, to destroy images at Wittenberg,—“I am quite unlike these new prophets,” said he, “who think they do something marvellous and worthy of the Holy Ghost, when they pull down statues and pictures. For my part, I have not lent my hand to the overthrowing of the least single stone; I have set fire to no monastery, yet, by my mouth and my pen, almost all monasteries have been laid waste; and the report is public that I alone, without violence, have done more injury to the Pope, than any King could have done with all the power of his kingdom†.” These were the miracles of Luther. His disciples admired the force of this plunderer of monasteries, never reflecting that this formidable strength might be the same with that of the angel whom St. John calls the “destroyer ‡.”

31.—*Luther acts the Prophet: promises to destroy the Pope immediately without suffering the taking of arms.*

Luther assumed the tone of a prophet against those who opposed his doctrine. After admonishing them to submit

\* Ep. ad Frid. Sax. Ducem. apud Chyt. l. x. p. 247.

† Frider. Duc. Elect. &c., t. vii. p. 507—509.

‡ Apoc. ix. 11.

to it, he threatened at last to pray against them. "My prayers," said he, "will not be Salmoneus's thunder, no empty rumbling in the air. Luther's voice is not to be stopt so, and I wish your highness find it not to your cost\*." Thus he wrote to the Prince of the House of Saxony. "My prayer," continued he, "is an impregnable bulwark, more powerful than the devil himself. Had it not been for that, long ago, Luther would not be so much as spoken of; and men will not stand astonished at so great a miracle!" When he threatened any with the divine judgments, he would not have it believed he did it upon general views. You would have said that he read it in the book of fate. Nay, he spoke with such certainty of Papacy's approaching downfall, that his followers no longer doubted of it. Upon his assertion, it was deemed certain that two antichrists, the Pope and the Turk, were clearly pointed out in Scripture. The Turk was just falling, and the attempts he was then making in Hungary were to be the last act of this tragedy. As for the Papacy, it was just expiring, and the most he could allow was two years reprieve: but above all, let them beware of employing arms in this work. Thus he spoke, whilst yet but weak; and prohibited all other weapons than the word, in the cause of his gospel. The Papal reign was to expire on a sudden by the breath of Jesus Christ;—namely, by the preaching of Luther. Daniel was express on the point; St. Paul left no doubt; and Luther, their interpreter, would have it so. Such prophecies are still in fashion. The failure of Luther prevents not our ministers from venturing at the like event now; they know the infatuation of the vulgar, ever destined to be charmed with some spell. These prophecies of Luther stand in his works upon record to this day, an eternal evidence against those who so lightly gave them credit †. Sleidan, his historian, relates them with a serious air. He lavishes all the elegance of his fine style, all the purity of his polished language, to represent to us a picture which Luther had dispersed throughout Germany ‡, the most foul, the most base, the most disgraceful that ever was. Yet, if we believe Sleidan, it was a prophetic piece; nay, the accomplishment of many of Luther's prophecies had been seen already, and the remainder of them was still in the hands of God.

Luther was not looked on as a prophet by the people

\* Ep. ad George Duc. Sax. t. ii. f. 491.

† Assert. art. Damnât. t. v. f. 3. ad Prop. 33. Ad. lib. Amb. Cathar. ib. f. 161. Cont. Reg. Aug. ib. 331, 332, et seq.

‡ Sleid. l. iv. 70. xiv. 225. xvi. 261, &c.

alone. The learned of the party would have him esteemed such. Philip Milancthon, who, from the beginning of the disputes, had entered himself on the list of his disciples, and was the most able as well as the most zealous of them all, conceived at first a firm persuasion that there was something in this man extraordinary and prophetic; and, notwithstanding all the weaknesses he discovered in his master, he was a long time before he could relinquish the conviction; and, speaking of Luther, he wrote to Erasmus, "you know we ought to prove and not to despise prophecies\*."

32.—*The boastings of Luther, and the contempt he entertained for all the Fathers.*

This their new prophet, however, fell into unheard-of extravagances. He was always in extremes. Because the prophet made terrible invectives by God's commandment, he becomes the most profuse of abusive language, and the most violent of men. Because St. Paul, for man's good, had extolled the gifts of God in his own ministry with that confidence which proceeded from manifest truth, confirmed by divine miracles from above, Luther spoke of himself in such a manner, as made all his friends blush for him. They, however, grew accustomed to it, and called it magnanimity, admired the holy ostentation, the holy vauntings, the holy boasts of Luther; and Calvin himself, though prejudiced against him, styled them so †. Elated with his learning, superficial in reality, but great for the time, and too great for his salvation and the peace of the church, he set himself above all mankind, not his contemporaries only, but the most illustrious of past ages.

In the question of free will, Erasmus objected to him the consent of the Fathers and all antiquity. "You do very well," said Luther; "boast to us of ancient Fathers, and rely on what they say, when you have seen that all of them together have neglected St. Paul; and buried in a carnal sense, have kept themselves, as on set purpose, at a distance from this morning star, or rather from this sun." And again: "What wonder that God hath left all the nations of the earth, and all the churches, to go after their own ways?" What a consequence! If God abandoned the gentile world to the blindness of their hearts, does it follow that churches, delivered from it with such care, must be abandoned like them. Yet this is what Luther says in his book of "Man's Will enslaved." And what deserves still more to be observed

\* Mel. lib. iii, Epist. 65.

† Defen. Cont. Vestph. opusc. f. 788.

here, is, that in what he there maintains, not only against all the Fathers, and all the churches, but against all mankind, and their unanimous consent,—namely, that there is no such thing as free will, he is abandoned, as will be seen, by all his disciples, and that even in the Confession of Augsburg; which shows to what excess his rashness was carried, since he treated with such outrageous contempt all churches and Fathers, in a point where he was so manifestly in error. The praises which these holy doctors have, with one voice, bestowed on chastity, rather disgust than move him. St. Jerome is not to be endured for recommending it. He pronounces that all the holy Fathers, together with him, would have done much better, if they had married. In other matters he is not less extravagant. In a word, Fathers, Popes, councils, general and particular, in everything and everywhere, are esteemed nothing by him, unless they concur in his sentiments. He disposes of them in a moment, by quoting Scripture, interpreted in his own way, as if, before his time, men had been ignorant of Scripture; or the Fathers, who so religiously kept and studied it, sought not, but neglected, its true sense.

### 33.—*His buffoonery and extravagances.*

To such a degree of extravagance did Luther now arrive: from that excessive modesty he professed at first, he passed to this extreme. What shall I say of his buffooneries, no less scandalous than degrading, with which he stuffed his writings? Let but one of his most partial disciples take the trouble to read that one discourse he composed against the Papacy, in the time of Paul III., certain I am he would blush for Luther. He will there find throughout the whole, I do not say so much fury and transport, but such wretched puns, such low jests, and such filthiness, and that of the lowest kind, as is not heard but from the mouths of the most despicable of mankind. “The Pope,” says he, “is so full of devils, that he spits and blows them from his nose.” Let us not finish what Luther was not ashamed to repeat thirty times. Is this the language of a reformer? But the Pope was in question: at that name alone he fell into all his fury, and he was no longer master of himself. But may I venture to relate what follows in this foolish invective? It must be done, though abhorrent to my feelings, that it may appear, for once, into what paroxysm of fury the chief of this new reformation fell. I will, then, force myself to transcribe these words, addressed by him to the Pope:—“My little



Paul, my little Pope, my little ass, walk gently: 'tis freezing; thou wilt break a leg; thou wilt befoul thyself; and they will cry out, O the devil! how the little ass of a Pope has befouled himself\*!" Pardon me, Catholic readers, for repeating these irreverences. Pardon me, too, ye Lutherans, and reap at least the advantage of your own confusion. But after these foul ideas, it is time to see the beautiful parts. They consist in thus playing on words: *cœlestissimus*, *scelestissimus*; *sanctissimus*, *satanissimus*: and it is what you find in every line. But what will you say of this fine figure? "An ass knows that he is an ass, a stone knows that it is a stone; but these little asses of Popes do not know that they are asses †." And lest the same should be returned upon him, he obviates the objection: "And," says he, "the Pope cannot take me for an ass; for he knows very well that, through God's goodness, and by his particular grace, I am more learned in Scripture than he and all his asses put together ‡." To proceed; here the style begins to rise: "Were I a sovereign of the empire, [where will this fine beginning lead him?] I would make but one bundle of both pope and cardinals, and place them altogether in the little ditch of the Tuscan sea; this bath would cure them, I pass my word for it, and give Jesus Christ for security §." Is not the sacred name of Jesus Christ brought in here much to the purpose? Enough is said; let us be silent, and tremble under the dreadful judgments of God, who, in punishment of our pride, has permitted that such gross intemperance of passion should have so powerfully swayed to seduction and error.

### 34.—*Sedition and violence.*

I say nothing of seditious and plunderings, the first fruits of the preachings of this new evangelist. These served but to foment his vanity. The gospel, said he, and his disciples after him, has always caused disturbances, and blood is necessary for its establishment ||. Calvin defends himself the same way. Jesus Christ, all of them cried out, came to send a sword into the midst of the world ¶. Blind! not to perceive, or unwilling to learn, what sword was sent by Jesus Christ, and what blood was shed on his account. True it is, the wolves, in the midst of whom Christ sent his disciples, were to spill the blood of his innocent sheep; but did he say the sheep should cease to be sheep—should form sedi-

\* Papapismus.

† Ibid.

‡ Adv. Papism., p. 474.

§ Ibid.

|| De Serv. Art. f. 431, &c.

¶ Matt. x. 34—47.

tious confederacies, and, in their turn, spill the blood of the wolves? The sword of persecutors was drawn against his faithful; but did they draw the sword,—I do not say to assault their persecutors,—but to defend themselves against their onsets? In a word, seditious were raised against the disciples of Jesus Christ; but the disciples of Jesus Christ, during three hundred years of an unmerciful persecution, never so much as raised one. The gospel rendered them modest, peaceable, submissive to the lawful powers, even though these powers were hostile to the faith; and filled them with true zeal—not that bitter zeal which opposes sourness to sourness, arms to arms, violence to violence. Supposing, then, if they please, Catholics to be unjust in persecuting; those who gave themselves out for reformers, on the model of the church apostolic, ought to have begun their reformation with an invincible patience: but, on the contrary, said Erasmus, who witnessed the birth of their beginning, “I behold them coming out from their sermons, with fierce looks and threatening countenances, like men that just came from hearing bloody invectives and seditious speeches.” Accordingly, we find “these evangelical people always ready to rise in arms, and equally as good at fighting as disputing\*.” Perhaps the ministers may grant us, that the Jewish and the idol priests gave room for as bitter satires as those of the church of Rome, however hideous they may represent them to have been. When did it ever happen that St. Paul’s new converts, on their return from hearing his sermons, fell to pillaging the houses of these sacrilegious priests, as the auditors of Luther and his disciples have been known to do so frequently at their separation, promiscuously flying to the plunder of all ecclesiastics, without distinction of good or bad? What do I say of idol priests? The very idols themselves were spared, in some measure, by the Christians. When did it happen at Ephesus or Corinth, when they absconded, after St. Paul’s or the apostles’ preaching, that they overthrew so much as one of them? On the contrary, the town-secretary of Ephesus bears witness to his fellow-citizens, that St. Paul and his companions “did not blaspheme against their goddess †;” namely, that they spoke against false deities, without raising disturbances, or breaking the public peace. Yet I cannot but believe the idols of Jupiter and Venus were full as odious as the images of Jesus Christ, of his blessed mother, and his saints, which our reformers trampled under foot.

\* Lib. xix. 113, 24, 31, 47. p. 2053, &c.

† Acts xix. 37.

## BOOK II.

[From the year 1520 to 1529.]

---

A brief Summary.—Luther's variations on Transubstantiation.—Carlostadius begins the Sacramentarian contest.—The circumstances of this rupture.—The Boors revolt; the part Luther acts.—His Marriage, of which himself and his friends are ashamed.—The extremes into which he runs on Free Will, and against Henry VIII., king of England.—Zuinglius and Æcolampadius appear.—The Sacramentarians prefer the Catholic to the Lutheran doctrine.—The Lutherans take up arms, contrary to all their promises.—Melancthon is afflicted at it.—They unite themselves under the name of Protestants.—Fruitless projects of agreement between Luther and the Zuinglians.—Conference of Marpurg.

---

1.—*The Book of the Captivity of Babylon.*—*Luther's Sentiments concerning the Eucharist, and his great desire of destroying the reality.*

THE first treatise, in which Luther fully discovered himself, was that he composed in 1520, of the captivity of Babylon. In it he loudly exclaimed against the church of Rome, which had but just condemned him; and amongst the dogmata, whose foundations he aimed to destroy, one of the first was transubstantiation. He would most willingly have undermined the real presence, had he been able; and every one knows what he himself declares in his letter to those of Strasburgh, where he writes, that “it would have been a great pleasure to him, had some good means been afforded him of denying it, because nothing could have been more agreeable to the design he had in hand of prejudicing the Papacy\*.” But God sets hidden boundaries to the most violent minds, and permits not innovators to afflict his church equally with their desires. Luther was irrecoverably struck with the force and simplicity of these words—“This is my body, this is my blood: this body given for you, this blood

\* Ep. ad Argentin. t. vii. f. 501.

of the New Testament, this blood shed for you, and for the remission of your sins \*;” for thus ought these words of our Lord to be translated, in order to give them their full force. The church had believed without difficulty, that Jesus Christ, to consummate his sacrifice and the figures of the old law, had given us his proper flesh sacrificed for us. She judged the same of the blood shed for our sins. Accustomed from her infancy to mysteries incomprehensible, and to ineffable tokens of the divine love, the impenetrable miracles included in the literal sense had not shocked her faith; nor could Luther ever persuade himself, either that Jesus Christ would have obscured, on set purpose, the institution of his sacrament, or that simple words were susceptible of such violent figures, or could possibly have any other sense than that which naturally entered into the minds of all christians in the east and the west; insomuch, that they never could be diverted from it, either by the sublimity of the mystery, or the subtilties of Berengarj us and Wickliff.

2.—*The change of Substance attacked by Luther, and his gross way of explaining it.*

He was determined, however, to mix with it something of his own. All those who, to his time, had well or ill explained the words of Jesus Christ, had acknowledged they wrought some sort of change in the sacred gifts. Those that would have the body there in a figure only, said that our Saviour's words wrought a change which was purely mystical, so that the consecrated bread became the sign of the body. Those that maintained the literal sense, with a real presence, by an opposite reason, admitted accordingly an effectual change. For which reason, the reality, together with the change of substance, had naturally insinuated itself into the minds of men; and all christian churches, in spite of whatever sense could oppose, had come into a belief so just and so simple. Luther, however, would not be directed by such a rule. \* “I believe,” says he, “with Wickliff, that the bread remains; and with the Sophists (so he called our divines), I believe the body is there †.” He explained his doctrine in several ways, which, for the most part, were very gross. One time he said the body was with the bread, as fire is with red-hot iron. At other times he added these expressions, “that the body was in the bread, and under the bread, as wine is in and under the vessel;”—from this

\* Matt. xxvi. 28. Luke xxii. 19, 20. 1 Cor. xi. 24. † De Capt. Bab. t. ii.  
VOL. I. E

the celebrated propositions *in, sub, cum*; importing that the body is in the bread, under the bread, and with the bread. But Luther was very sensible that these words, "This is my body," required something more than placing the body in this, or with this, or under this; and to explain "This is," he thought himself obliged to say that these words—"This is my body," imported,—this bread is substantially and properly my body: a thing unheard of, and embarrassed with insuperable difficulties.

### 3.—*Impanation asserted by some Lutherans—rejected by others.*

However, in order to surmount them, some of Luther's disciples maintained, that the bread was made the body of our Lord, and the wine his precious blood, as the Divine Word was made man: so that, in the Eucharist, a true impanation was made, as in the Virgin's womb a true incarnation. This opinion,\* which had appeared at the time of Berengarius, was renewed by Osiander, one of the principal Lutherans;—a thing unintelligible to man. Every person saw, that for bread to be the body of our Lord, and wine his blood, as the divine Word is man, by that kind of union which divines call personal or hypostatic, how necessary it was that, as man is the person, the body should also be the person, and the blood likewise; which destroys the very principles of reasoning and of language. The human body is part of the person, but not itself the person, nor the whole, nor, as they speak in schools, the suppositum. The blood is still less so; and this is in no respect the case when personal union can find admittance. Every one is not learned enough rightly to employ the term hypostatic union: but when it is once explained, every person must perceive to what it can be applied. So Osiander was left to defend alone his impanation and invination, and to say as much as he pleased, This bread is God; for he went to that excess\*. But so strange an opinion required not refutation: it fell of itself by its own absurdity; nor was it approved by Luther.

### 4.—*Luther's variations on Transubstantiation—a new way of deciding in matters of faith.*

Yet what he himself said led the direct way to it. No one could conceive how bread, remaining bread, could be at the same time the true body of our Lord, as he asserted, without

\* Mel. lib. ii. Ep. 447.

admitting, between both, this hypostatic union rejected by him. But he was resolute in rejecting it; and yet united both substances, even so far as to say one was the other.

At first, however, he spoke but doubtfully of the change of substance; and though he preferred the opinion which retains the bread, to that which changes it into the body, the matter seemed but trivial to him. "I permit," says he, "both one and the other opinion; the scruple is the only thing I take away\*." Such was the decision of this new pope; transubstantiation and consubstantiation were alike indifferent to him. In another place, having been upbraided with making the bread remain in the Eucharist, he owns as much: but, adds he, "I do not condemn the contrary opinion; I only say it is not an article of faith †." But in the answer he made to Henry VIII., King of England, who refuted his Captivity, he soon advanced much further. "I had taught," says he, "it was a matter of no importance whether, in the sacrament, bread remained or not: but now I transubstantiate my opinion; I say it is an impiety and a blasphemy to hold that the bread is transubstantiated;" and he carries his condemnation to an anathema ‡. The motive which he alleges for this change is remarkable. This is what he writes in his book to the Vaudois: "True it is, I believe it an error to say the bread does not remain, although this error hath hitherto appeared to me of light importance; but now that we are too much pressed to admit this error without the authority of Scripture, to spite the Papists, I am determined to believe that the bread and wine remain." This is what drew on Catholics the anathema of Luther. Such were his sentiments in 1523. We shall see whether he will persist hereafter in them; but it may not be amiss to observe, even in this place, that a letter is produced by Hospinian, in which Melancthon accuses his master of allowing transubstantiation to certain churches in Italy, to whom he had written on that subject. The date of this letter is in 1534, twelve years after he had answered the King of England.

5.—*Strange flights of passion in the books against Henry VIII., King of England.*

Now his transports of passion against this prince were so violent, that the Lutherans themselves were ashamed of

\* De Cap. Babyl. t. ii. f. 66. † Resp. ad art. extract, ibid. 172.

‡ Contra Reg. Ang. T. 11.

them. There was nothing but atrocious contumelies, and outrageously giving him the lie in every page—"He was a fool, an idiot, the most brutal of all swine and asses\*." Sometimes he addresses him in this terrible manner: "Beginnest thou to blush, Henry?—no longer king, but sacrilegious wretch!" His beloved disciple, Melancthon, durst not reprove, and knew not how to excuse him. Some even of his own disciples were scandalized at the outrageous contempt with which he treated all that the universe had esteemed most grand, and at his capricious manner of deciding in controversies in faith. To define one way, and then all on a sudden, the very opposite, merely in despite of the Papists, was too visibly abusing the authority which was given him, and insulting, as we may say, the credulity of mankind. But he was complete master in his own party, and they dared not disapprove whatever he said.

6.—*A Letter of Erasmus to Melancthon concerning Luther's transports.*

Erasmus, astonished at the extravagance of passion which he had endeavoured in vain to moderate by his advice, in a letter to his friend Melancthon explains the causes of it:—"What shocks me most in Luther is," says he, "that whatever he takes in hand to maintain he carries to extremity and excess. Warned of his excesses, so far from moderating them, he runs on more headstrong; and seems to have no other design than to proceed to still greater intemperance. By his writings (adds he) I know the man's temper as much as if I had lived with him—a fiery and impetuous spirit. You see an Achilles, whose warmth is invincible, through the whole tenour of them. You are no stranger to the artifices of the Enemy of mankind. Add to this, so great success, so declared an approbation, so universal applause of his audience,—against such allurements a modest mind would scarce stand uncorrupt†." Although Erasmus never left the communion of the church, yet he maintained amid these disputes of religion a particular character, which makes Protestants give him credit for those facts of which he was witness. But it is on other grounds most certain, that Luther, elated with the victory which he thought he had already gained over the power of Rome, no longer kept himself within bounds.

\* Cont. Reg. Ang. 333.

† Erasm. lib. vi. Epist. 3, ad Luther, lib. xiv. Ep. 1, &c.—Id. lib. xix. Ep. 3, ad Melanct.

7.—*Division amongst the pretended Gospellers—Carlostadius attacks Luther and the reality.*

Strange! that he and his party should have looked upon the prodigious number of their followers, as they all did, for a mark of divine favour, without reflecting that St. Paul had foretold of heretics and seducers, that “their speech spreadeth like a cancer\*,” that “they grow worse and worse, erring and driving into error †.” But the same St. Paul says also, that their progress is limited, “they shall proceed no farther ‡.” The unhappy conquests of Luther were checked by the division which broke out among these new reformers. It has been long since said, that the disciples of innovators believe they have a right to innovate after the example of their masters §; the leaders of rebels meet with rebels as rash as themselves. But without more reflections, to speak the simple fact, Carlostadius, whom Luther had so much commended ||, however unworthy he may have been, and whom he called his venerable preceptor in Jesus Christ, found himself able to oppose him. Luther had attacked the change of substance in the Eucharist,—Carlostadius attacked the reality, which Luther had not dared to undertake.

Carlostadius, if we believe the Lutherans, was a brutal, ignorant person, yet artful and turbulent; void of piety, without humanity, and rather a Jew than a Christian. This is what Melancthon, a man moderate and naturally sincere, says of him. But without citing the Lutherans in particular, his friends as well as enemies are agreed he was the most restless and impertinent of men. No more proof of his ignorance is necessary than the exposition he gave of the Eucharistic institution, where he maintained that, by these words, “This is my body,” Jesus Christ, without any regard to what he gave, meant no more than to show himself seated at table, as he then was with his disciples;—so ridiculous a conceit, that one has a difficulty to believe it ever entered into the mind of man ¶.

8.—*Origin of the contests between Luther and Carlostadius. —Luther's pride.*

Before he had given this monstrous interpretation, two great contests had already happened between him and

\* 2 Tim. ii. 17.

† Ibid. iii. 13.

‡ Ibid. iii. 9.

§ Tert. de Præscr. c. 42.

|| Ep. Dedic. Comm. in Gal. ad Carlostad.

¶ Zuin, Ep. ad. Matt.



Luther. For in 1521, whilst Luther lay concealed for fear of Charles V., who had put him under the ban of the empire, Carlostadius had thrown down images, taken away the elevation of the blessed sacrament, and even low masses, and set up communion under both kinds in the church of Wittenberg, where Lutheranism began. Luther did not so much disapprove of those changes, but rather judged them as done in an improper time, and in themselves unnecessary. But what provoked him the most, as he shows plainly in the letter he wrote on the subject, was, that Carlostadius had despised his authority \*, and would have set himself up for a new doctor. Remarkable are the sermons he made on this occasion; for, without naming Carlostadius, he reproached the authors of these enterprises, that they had acted without mission, as if his own had been more valid. "Easily," said he, "could I defend them before the Pope, but I know not how to justify them before the devil, when this evil spirit shall, at the hour of death, oppose against them these words of Scripture, 'Every plant that my father hath not planted shall be rooted up;' and again, 'They did run, and it was not I that sent them.' What will they answer then? They shall be cast down into hell."

9.—*Luther's sermon, wherein to spite Carlostadius and those who followed him, he threatens to retreat and re-establish the mass.—His extravagances in boasting of his power.*

Thus spoke Luther whilst he yet lay concealed. But coming forth from his Patmos (for so he called the place of his retreat), he made a quite different sermon in the church of Wittenberg. He there undertook to prove that hands ought not to be employed in the reforming of abuses, but the Word alone. "It was the word," said he, "whilst I slept quietly, and drank my beer with my dear Melancthon and Arnsdorf, that gave the Papacy such a shock as never was given by prince or emperor. Had I been inclined (he proceeds) to have done things in a tumultuary way, all Germany should have swam in blood; and when at Worms, I could have put things into such a state that the emperor himself had not been safe in it." This is what history had not informed us of. But people once prejudiced believed every thing; and so sensible was Luther of his being master, that he had courage to tell them in full audience, "more-

\* Ep. Luth. ad Gasp. Gustol. 1522.

† Serm. quid Christiano præstandum, t. vii. f. 273.

over, if you pretend to continue doing things by these common deliberations, I will unsay, without hesitation, all that I have written or taught. I will make my recantation, and leave you. Remember, I have said it; and, after all, what hurt will the popish mass do you?" One thinks himself in a dream when he reads these things in the writings of Luther printed at Wittemberg; you return to the beginning of the volume to see if there be no mistake, and say in astonishment,—What is this new gospel? Could such a one as this pass for a reformer? Will men never open their eyes? Is it, therefore, so difficult a thing for man to confess his error?

10.—*Luther decides in the most important matters from spite.—The elevation; two kinds.*

Carlostadius, on his side, did not remain quiet, but, provoked at being so warmly treated, laboured to combat the real presence, as much to attack Luther as from any other motive. Luther also, though he had thoughts of laying aside the elevation of the host, yet retained it out of spite to Carlostadius, as he himself declares, "and lest," proceeds he, "it might seem we had learned something from the devil\*."

He spoke not more moderately of communion under both kinds, which the same Carlostadius had introduced by his private authority. Luther, at that time, held it for a thing quite indifferent. In the letter he wrote on the reformation of Carlostadius, he reproaches him "with having placed Christianity in things of no account,—communicating under both kinds, taking the sacrament into the hand, abolishing confession, and burning images †." And again, in 1523, he says in the formulary of the mass, "If a council did ordain or permit both kinds, in spite of the council we would take but one, or take neither one or the other, and would curse those who should take both, in virtue of this ordinance ‡." Behold what was called Christian liberty in the new reformation! Such was the modesty and humility of these new Christians!

11.—*How the war was declared between Luther and Carlostadius.*

Carlostadius being driven from Wittemberg, was obliged to retire to Orlemond, a town of Thuringia, subject to the

\* Luth. par Confess. Hospin. part ii. f. 188.

† Epist. ad Gasp. Gustol.

‡ Form. Miss. t. ii. 384, 386.

Electors of Saxony. At this time all Germany was in a flame. The boors, revolting against their lords, had taken up arms, and implored the aid of Luther. Besides their following his doctrine, it was supposed that his book of Christian liberty had not a little contributed to inspire them with rebellion, by that bold manner with which he spoke against laws and legislators\*. For, though he defended himself by saying, that he meant not to speak of magistrates, or of civil laws, it was, however, true that he made no distinction between secular and spiritual powers; and to pronounce in general, as he did, that a Christian was not subject to any man, was, till the interpretation came, nourishing the spirit of insubordination in the people, and giving dangerous views to their leaders. Add to this, that to despise the powers supported by the majesty of religion, is to leave others destitute of support. The Anabaptists, another shoot of the doctrine of Luther, who were formed by pushing his maxims to their greatest extent, mixed in the tumult of the boors, and began to turn their sacrilegious inspirations to manifest rebellion. Carlostadius was infected with these novelties, at least Luther accuses him of it; and true it is, he held a great intimacy with the Anabaptists, murmuring continually with them, as well against the Elector as against Luther, whom he called a flatterer of the Pope, chiefly on account of what little he had preserved of the mass and real presence†; for the contest was, who should most condemn the church of Rome, and depart furthest from the doctrine. These disputes having raised great commotions at Orlemond, Luther was sent there by the prince to appease the tumult. In his way he preached at Jena, in the presence of Carlostadius, whom he failed not to charge with sedition. From this began the rupture. The memorable account of which I shall relate exactly as it is found in the works of Luther, as it is acknowledged by the Lutherans, and as Protestant historians have delivered it‡. The sermon of Luther being over, Carlostadius went and visited him at the Black Bear, where he lodged, a place famous in this history for giving birth to the Sacramentarian war between the new-reformed. There, amongst other discourses, Carlostadius having excused himself in the best manner he was able as to sedition, he declares to Luther he could not bear his opinion of the real presence. Luther, with a disdainful air, defies him to write against him, promising him, at the same time, a florin of gold if

\* De Libert. Christ. t. ii. f. 10, 11.

† Sleidan, lib. v. xvii.

‡ Luth. T. 11. Jen. 447, Calixt. Judic. N. 49. Hosp. 2. Part. ad an. 1524. f. 32.

he would undertake it. The money is produced. Carlostadius puts it into his pocket. They shake hands mutually, promising each other fair play. Luther drinks to the health of Carlostadius, and to the success of the fine work he was about to publish. Carlostadius pledges him in a bumper; and thus was the war declared. German-like, the twenty-second of August, 1524. The parting of the champions was as remarkable. "May I see thee broken on a wheel!" says one; "Mayest thou break thy neck before thou leavest town!" says the other\*. The entry of Luther had not been less extraordinary: for upon his arrival at Orlemond, Carlostadius had ordered it so, "that he was received with great vollies of stones, and almost smothered with dirt." Such is the new gospel! Such the acts of the new apostles!

12.—*The wars of the Anabaptists, and that of the revolted peasants.—The share that Luther had in these revolts.*

Soon after occurred more bloody battles, but, perhaps, not more dangerous. The revolted peasants had met together to the number of forty thousand. The Anabaptists rose in arms with unheard of fury. Luther, called upon by the peasants to pronounce upon the claims they had against their lords, acted a very strange part. On one hand, he wrote to the peasants, that God had forbid sedition. On the other hand, he wrote to the lords, that they exercised such a tyranny "as the people could not, would not, ought not to endure†." By these last words, he rendered back to sedition those arms which he seemed to have taken from it. A third letter, written in common to both sides, laid the fault on both, and denounced the dreadful judgments of God against them, should they not dispose matters amicably. Here his weakness was blamed. Soon after, occasion was given of reproaching him with intolerable cruelty. He published a fourth letter, exciting the princes, powerfully armed, "to exterminate, without pity, those miserable wretches who had not followed his advice, and to spare those only who should voluntarily lay down their arms:" as if a seduced and vanquished populace were not a fit object of compassion, but ought to be treated with as much rigour as the heads that misled them. But Luther would have it so; and when he saw so cruel a sentiment was condemned, incapable of owning himself ever in the wrong, he made a book expressly to prove that truly "no mercy at all ought to be showed rebels, nor were even those to be forgiven, whom the multitude had drawn by force

\* Epist. Luth. ad Argent. t. vii. f. 502.

† Sleid. lib. v. Ibid. 75.

into any seditious action\*." Then were seen those famous battles which cost Germany so much blood. Such was its state when the Sacramentarian dispute added new fuel to the flames.

13.—*The Marriage of Luther, which had been preceded by that of Carlostadius.*

Carlostadius, who began it, had already introduced a novelty singularly scandalous; for he was the first priest of any reputation that took a wife; and this example was attended with surprising effects in the sacerdotal order, and in the monasteries. Carlostadius was not as yet at variance with Luther. The marriage of this old priest was laughed at, even among the party; but Luther, who earnestly desired to do the same, uttered not a word. He was fallen in love with a nun of quality, and singular beauty, whom he had taken out of her convent. It was a maxim of the new reformation, that vows were a Jewish practice, and none of them less obligatory than that of chastity. The Elector Frederick suffered Luther to speak after this manner, but could not bear that he should reduce these opinions to practice. He had nothing but contempt for those priests and religious who married, contrary to the canons, and that discipline which had been revered so many ages. Therefore, not to lose his credit with that prince, Luther was obliged to have patience during the prince's life; but he was no sooner dead than Luther married his nun. This marriage happened in 1525, that is, in the height of the civil wars of Germany; at which time the Sacramentarian disputes were inflamed to the utmost violence. Luther was then forty-five years old; and this man, who, under the shelter of religious discipline, had passed his whole youth blameless in continency, in so advanced an age, and whilst he was hailed throughout the universe as the restorer of the Gospel, blushed not to abandon so perfect a state of life, and look behind him. Sleidan passes lightly over this fact. "Luther," says he, "married a nun, and thereby gave room for fresh accusations from his adversaries, who called him madman, and slave of Satan†;" but he does not disclose the whole secret: nor were they only Luther's adversaries who blamed his marriage; he himself was ashamed of it; his disciples, the most devoted to him, were surprised at it; and all this we learn from a curious letter of Melancthon to his intimate friend, the learned Camerarius.

14.—*A remarkable Letter of Melancthon to Camerarius on Luther's marriage.*

It is written all in Greek, for so they corresponded on secret matters. He informs him, that “Luther, when least expected, had taken Boren to wife (this was the nun's name), without the least intimation of it to his friends : but that, one evening, having invited Pomeranus the minister to supper, together with a painter and a lawyer, he had the usual ceremonies performed ; that it was astonishing to see that at so miserable a time, when good men had so much to suffer, he could not command himself so as to compassionate, at least, their misfortunes ; but on the contrary, seemed so regardless of the miseries that threatened them, as to suffer his reputation to be weakened, even at a time when Germany stood most in need of his prudence and authority.” Then he relates to his friend the causes of this marriage : “that he very well knows Luther was no enemy to human nature, and that natural necessity, he really believes, was what engaged him in this marriage ; therefore, he ought not to wonder that Luther's magnanimity should thus be mollified ; that this manner of life is low and common, but holy : and after all, the scripture allows marriage as honourable ; in the main, there is no crime in it ; and if more than this be laid to Luther's charge, it is a manifest calumny.” This he says on account of a rumour which had spread of the nun's being with child, and ready to lie in when Luther married her, which proved false. Melancthon was therefore in the right to justify his master on this head. He adds, “that all that can be blamed in this action of his, is the unseasonable time in which he did so unexpected a thing, and the pleasure he thereby gave his enemies, who only seek to accuse him. In conclusion, he beholds him full of trouble and vexation for this change, and does what he can to comfort him.”

It is plain enough how much Luther was ashamed of, and concerned at his marriage, and how greatly Melancthon was struck, notwithstanding all the respect he had for him. What he adds in the conclusion, intimates, likewise, how much he believed Camerarius would be affected, since he says he was desirous of preventing him, “lest through his zeal for the continuation of Luther's glory, always untarnished and reproachless, he should give himself over to too much trouble and dejection at this surprising news.”

They had at first regarded Luther as a man superior to all

ordinary weaknesses. That which he evinced by this scandalous marriage dejected them. But Melancthon comforts his friend and himself as well as he is able, by reason that "there may, perhaps, be something in it that is hidden and divine; that he has certain marks of Luther's piety; and some humiliations befalling them may turn to good, there being so much danger in elevated stations, not only for the ministers of holy things, but for all mankind in general; and after all, the greatest saints of antiquity had their failings; and, lastly, that we ought to embrace the word of God for its own sake, not for the merits of those who preach it, there being nothing more unjust than to blame the doctrine for the faults into which its teachers fall."

Doubtless, the maxim is good; but they ought not to have laid much stress on personal defects—not built so much on Luther, whom, however presumptuous, they experienced to be so weak; nor, lastly, have boasted to us so much of their reformation, as the marvellous work of God's hand, seeing the chief instrument of this wondrous work was a man, not only so vulgar, but swayed by such violent passions.

#### 15.—*A notable diminution of Luther's authority.*

It may easily be judged from the conjuncture of affairs, that the unseasonableness of time at which Melancthon is so much disturbed, and that unfortunate diminution of Luther's glory, which he is troubled should happen then when most required, regarded, it is true, those horrible disasters, by which Luther foreboded the ruin of Germany; but more especially bore a relation to the Sacramentarian dispute, which Melancthon well knew would weaken the authority of his master. And, indeed, Luther was not believed innocent of the disturbances of Germany, as they originated with those who followed his gospel, and appeared animated by his writings; besides, we have seen that, at the commencement, he had as much encouraged as restrained these rebel peasants. The Sacramentarian contest also was esteemed the effect of his doctrine. Catholics reproached him that, by exciting so great a contempt for church authority, and shaking this foundation, he brought every thing into question. "See," said they, "what it is to place the authority of deciding in the hands of every private person; to have given the scripture for so plain and easy, that, to understand it, no more is necessary than to read it, without consulting church or antiquity." All these things grievously troubled Melancthon; he, that was naturally a

man of discernment, saw a division rising in the midst of the reformation, which not only rendered it odious, but enkindled in it an endless war.

16.—*A dispute on Free Will between Erasmus and Luther.—  
Melancthon bewails the transports of Luther.*

Other things happened at the same time, which gave him great anxiety. The dispute about free will had grown warm between Erasmus and Luther. Erasmus was held in great esteem throughout all Europe, though he had many enemies on all sides. At the beginning of these troubles, Luther used all his efforts to gain him, and wrote to him in such respectful terms as approximated even to meanness\*. At first Erasmus favoured him, yet not to such an extent as to leave the church. When he saw the schism manifestly declared, he abandoned him entirely, and wrote against him with great temper. But Luther, instead of imitating him, published so acrimonious a reply, as induced Melancthon to say, "I wish to God Luther had been silent. I had hopes that old age would have rendered him more mild; and I see that, pushed on by his adversaries, and the disputes into which he is obliged to enter†, he daily grows more violent." As if a man, who called himself the reformer of the world ought so soon to forget his character as not to remain master of himself, whatever might be the provocation! "That torments me strangely (said Melancthon); and if God lend not his helping hand, these disputes will be attended with an unfortunate event‡." Erasmus, finding himself treated so rudely by one to whom he had been so mild, said, pleasantly enough, "I thought marriage would have tamed him;" and deplored his fate in seeing himself, notwithstanding his meek temper, "condemned, old as he was, to fight against a savage beast, a furious wild boar."

17.—*The blasphemies and audaciousness of Luther in his treatise on Man's Will enslaved.*

The outrageous language of Luther did not constitute his greatest excess in those books he wrote against Erasmus. The doctrine itself was horrible; for he not only concluded that free will was totally extinguished in mankind since their fall—a common error in the new reformation—"but, moreover, that it is impossible any other should be free but God; that his presence and divine providence are the cause of all things

\* Ep. Luth. ad Erasm, inter Erasm. Ep. Lib. vi. 3.

† Ep. Mel. lib. iv. Ep. 23.

‡ Lib. xviii. Ep. 11, 22.



falling out by the unchangeable, eternal, and inevitable will of God, who thunder-strikes and breaks to pieces all free will: that the name of free will is a name which appertains to God alone, incompatible either with man, with angel, or any other creature\*.”

From these principles he was obliged to make God the author of crimes; nor did he conceal the thing, saying in express terms, that “free will is a vain title; that God works the evil in us, as well as the good; that the great perfection of faith consists in believing God to be just, although, necessarily, by his will, he renders us worthy of damnation, so as to seem to take pleasure in the torments of the wretched †.” And again: “God pleases you when he crowns the unworthy; he ought not to displease you when he condemns the innocent ‡:” he adds for conclusion, “that he said these things not by way of examination, but by way of deciding; that he meant not to subject them to the decision of any person; but advises the whole world to submit to them.”

It is not surprising that such excesses troubled the modest mind of Melancthon; not that he himself, at the commencement, had not approved these prodigies of doctrine, having himself said with Luther, “that God’s foreknowledge renders free will absolutely impossible; and that God was not less the cause of the treason of Judas, than of the conversion of St. Paul.” But besides that he had been drawn into these opinions, rather by the authority of Luther, than his own choice, nothing was more opposed to his character than such opinions, established in so violent a manner, and he knew not where he was, when he witnessed the transports of his master.

18.—*New transports against the King of England.—Luther boasts of his own meekness.*

He saw them redoubled at the same time against the king of England. Luther, who had conceived a somewhat good opinion of this prince, because of his mistress Anne Boleyn, who was favourable enough to Lutheranism, had so far relented as to make excuses to him for his violence at first §. The king’s answer was not such as he expected. Henry VIII. reproached him with the levity of his temper, the errors of his doctrine, his scandalous and shameful marriage. Then Luther, who never humbled himself except to induce others to crouch to him, and never failed to attack those who did not do so immediately,

\* De Serv. arb. t. ii, 426, 429, 431, 435.

† Ibid. f. 444.

‡ Ibid. f. 465.

§ Epist. ad Reg. Ang. t. ii. 92.

answered the king, "That he was sorry for having treated him so mildly; that he did it at the request of his friends, in hopes such sweetness might be serviceable to this prince; with the same view he had formerly written to the Legate Cajetan, to George Duke of Saxony, and to Erasmus, but he found it succeeded badly; for which reason he should not be guilty of the like fault for the future\*."

Amidst all these excesses, he even boasted of his extreme meekness. "For, relying on the ever firm support of his learning, he yielded not in pride either to emperor, or king, or prince, or Satan, or the whole universe; but if the king would lay aside his majesty, to treat more freely with him, he should find that he would conduct himself humbly and meekly to the most inferior persons; a true sheep in simplicity, that could believe no evil of any one."

19.—*Zuinglius and Ecolampadius undertake the defence of Carlostadius.—Who Zuinglius was: his doctrine on the salvation of heathens.*

What could Melancthon think, in his own temper the most peaceable of men, when he saw the outrageous pen of Luther raise up so many enemies abroad, whilst the Sacramentarian contest created him so many formidable ones at home?

And indeed, at this time, the best pens of the party were directed against him. Carlostadius had found such defenders as placed him above the reach of contempt. Eagerly attacked by Luther, and driven from Saxony, he had retired to Switzerland, where Zuinglius and Ecolampadius took up his defence. Zuinglius, minister of Zurich, had begun to disturb the church, on account of indulgences, as well as Luther, but some years after him. He was a daring man, whose fire surpassed his learning;—in language, clear and intelligible; nor excelled by any of the pretended reformers, in a precise, uniform, and coherent way of expressing his thoughts; nor, indeed, did any carry them to a greater length, or with more presumption.

As the character of his genius will be better known by his own sentiments than my words, I shall produce a part of the most finished piece of his whole works: it is the "Confession of Faith," which, a little before his death, he sent to Francis I. There, explaining the article of life everlasting, he says to this prince, "that he must hope to see the assembly of all men that ever have been holy, valiant, faithful, and virtuous,

\* Ad maled. Reg. Angliæ. Resp. t. ii. 493, Sleid. lib. vi. p. 80. † Ibid. 494, 495.

from the beginning of the world. There you will see," he proceeds, "both Adams—the redeemed and the Redeemer. You will there see an Abel, an Enoch, a Noah, an Abraham, an Isaac, a Jacob, a Juda, a Moses, a Joshua, a Gideon, a Samuel, a Phineas, an Eliah, an Elisha, an Isaiah, with the Virgin Mother of God, whom he announced; a David, an Hezekiah, a Josiah, a John Baptist, a St. Peter, a St. Paul. You will there see Hercules, Theseus, Socrates, Aristides, Antigonus, Numa, Camillus, the Catos and Scipios. There you will see your predecessors and all your ancestors who have departed this world in the faith. In a word, not one good man, one holy spirit, one faithful soul, whom you will not there behold with God. What more beautiful, what more glorious, more agreeable, can be imagined, than such a sight\*?" What man had ever dreamt of thus placing Jesus Christ confusedly with the saints? And in the train of patriarchs, prophets, apostles, and our Saviour himself, even Numa, the father of Roman idolatry, even Cato, who killed himself like a maniac, and not only so many worshippers of false divinities, but even the gods, the heroes whom they worshipped? I cannot conceive why he did not rank amongst them Apollo, or Bacchus, and Jupiter himself; and if such crimes prevented him as poets lay to their charge, were those of Hercules less infamous? This is what heaven is composed of, according to this head of the second party of the Reformation: this is what he wrote in a confession of faith, dedicated by him to the greatest King in Christendom; and what Bullinger, his successor, has given us as "the masterpiece and last song of this melodious swan." † And is it not astonishing that such as these could pass for men sent in an extraordinary manner by God for the reformation of his church.

20.—*The frivolous Answer of those of Zurich in defence of Zuinglius.*

Luther did not spare him on this head, but declared openly "that he despaired of his salvation; because, not satisfied with continuing to impugn the sacrament, he had become a heathen by placing impious heathens, even Scipio the Epicurean, even Numa, the devil's instrument in founding idolatry among the Romans, in the number of blessed souls. For what does baptism avail us—what the other sacraments, the Scriptures, and Jesus Christ himself, if the impious, the idolaters, and the Epicureans, are saints and in bliss? And what is this

\* Christ. Fidei clara expos. 1536, p. 27.

† Præf. Bulling.

else than teaching, that every man may be saved in his own faith and religion \* ?”

To answer him was no easy task. Nor did they answer him at Zurich in any other way than by a wretched reprimand, accusing him also of placing amongst the faithful Nebuchadnezzar, Naaman the Syrian, Abimelech, and many others, who, born out of the Covenant and race of Abraham, were however saved, as Luther says, “by a fortuitous mercy of God †.” But not to defend this “fortuitous mercy of God,” which in reality is something strange, it is one thing to have said with Luther, that there may have been men out of the number of Israelites, who knew God; another thing, to place with Zuinglius in the number of blessed souls, such as worshipped false divinities; and if the Zuinglians were right in condemning the excesses and violence of Luther, there was much more reason to condemn this prodigious extravagance of Zuinglius. For, in short, this was not one of those mistakes into which a man may be betrayed in the heat of discourse: he was writing a confession of faith, and intended to make a simple and brief exposition of the Apostles’ Creed; a work that, above all others, required a mature consideration, exact doctrine, and a settled head. It was in the same strain he had before spoken of Seneca “as of a most holy man, in whose heart God had written the faith with his own hand ‡,” because he had said in his letter to Lucilius “that nothing was hidden from God.” Thus we have all the platonick, peripatetic, stoic philosophers enrolled amongst the saints, and full of faith, because St. Paul acknowledges they had understood the invisible things of God by the visible works of his power §; and what furnishes this Apostle with reasons to condemn them in his Epistle to the Romans, has justified and sanctified them, in the opinion of Zuinglius.

### 21.—*The Error of Zuinglius upon original Sin.*

To teach such extravagances as these, a man must have no notion of Christian justice, or of the corruption of our nature. And, indeed, Zuinglius was quite a stranger to original sin. In that confession of faith, which he sent to Francis I., and in four or five treatises which he made expressly to prove the baptism of the little children against anabaptists, and explain the effect of baptism in this infant age, he does not so much as speak of its cancelling original sin, which, however, is allowed by all Christians to be the chief fruit of their bap-

\* Parv. Conf. Luth. Hosp. p. 2. 187.

† Luth. Hom. in Gen. c. iv. 20.

‡ Oper. ii. 6. Declar. de Pec. Orig.

§ Rom i. 19.

tism. He had done the same in all his other works; and when this omission of an effect so considerable was objected to him, he shows that he did so designedly, because, in his opinion, *no sin is taken away by baptism*. He carries still farther his rashness, when he says, "It is no sin, but a misfortune, a vice, a distemper; that nothing is weaker or more distant from the Scripture sense, than to say, original sin is not only a distemper, but also a crime\*." In conformity to these principles, he decides that men indeed are born "prone to sin from their self-love," but not sinners, except improperly, by taking the penalty of sin for sin itself: and this "proneness to sin," which cannot be sin, makes, according to him, the whole evil of our origin. In the sequel of his discourse, it is true, he acknowledges that all men would perish, were it not for the grace of the Mediator, because this proneness to sin would not fail in time to produce it, were it not stopped; and it is in this sense he acknowledges that all men are damned by the "force of original sin;" a force which consists not, as we have just now seen, in making men truly sinners, as all Christian churches have decided against Pelagius, but in making them only "prone to sin," through the weakness of their senses and self-love, which the Pelagians and heathens themselves would not have denied.

The decision of Zuinglius, on the remedy of this evil, is not less strange; for he maintains that it is taken away from all men whatever, by the grace of Jesus Christ, independently of baptism: insomuch that original sin damns no man, not even the children of the heathens. As to those, though he dares not fix their salvation in the same degree of certainty with that of Christians and their children, he says however, that, like the rest, as long as they are incapable of the law, they are in the state of innocence, alleging this text of St. Paul—"where no law is, there is no transgression†." "Now," proceeds this new doctor, "it is certain that children are weak, without experience, and ignorant of the law, and are not less without law than St. Paul, when he said, 'I lived without the law heretofore‡.' Therefore, as there is no law for them, neither is there any transgression of the law, and, by consequence, no damnation. St. Paul says, that he lived without the law once, but there is no age in which man is more in this state than his infancy; consequently, it must be said, with the same St. Paul, that without the law sin was dead in them§." Just so disputed the Pelagians against the church. And although, as above stated, Zuinglius here speaks

\* Declar. de Pcc. Orig. † Rom. iv. 15. ‡ Rom. vii. 9. § Rom. vii. 8.

with greater assurance of the children of Christians than of others, he, however, in reality speaks of all children whatever, without exception. It is plain to what point his proof is directed; and, certainly, since the time of Julian there never was a more complete Pelagian than Zuinglius.

22.—*The error of Zuinglius on Baptism.*

Nay, the Pelagians acknowledged, that baptism could at least give grace, and remit the sins of the adult. Zuinglius more rash than they, ceases not to repeat what has been already told of him, "that baptism takes away no sin, and gives no grace." "It is the blood of Jesus Christ," says he, "that remits sins, therefore, it is not baptism." Here an instance may be seen of that perverted zeal the reformation had for the glory of Jesus Christ. It is more clear than day, that to attribute the remission of sins to baptism, which is the means of taking them away established by Jesus Christ, does no more injury to Jesus Christ, than you offer to a painter, by attributing the fine colouring and the beautiful touches of his picture to the pencil he makes use of. But the reformation carries its vain reasonings to such excess, as to imagine it gives glory to Jesus Christ, to destroy the efficacy of these instruments which he employs. And to continue so gross an illusion to the utmost extremity, when a hundred passages from the Scriptures were objected to Zuinglius, where it is said, that baptism saves us, that it remits our sins; he thinks he has fully satisfied by answering, that baptism is here taken for the blood of Jesus Christ, of which it is the sign.

23.—*Zuinglius accustomed to wrest the Scripture in every thing.—His contempt for antiquity, the source of his error.*

Such licentious explications make everything one wishes to be found in Scripture. It is not surprising that Zuinglius there finds that the Eucharist is not the body, but the sign of the body, though Christ has said, "This is my body;" since he is able to find that baptism does not indeed give the remission of sins, but figures it to us as already given; though the Scripture has said a hundred times, not that it figures, but gives it to us. It is no matter of surprise that the same author, to destroy the reality which incommoded him, eludes the force of these words, "This is my body;" since to destroy original sin, which shocked him, he was able to evade these words; "all have sinned in one man," and again, "by the disobedience of one man many were made sinners\*." But

\* Rom. v. 12, 19.

still more strange is the confidence of this author in supporting his new interpretations against original sin, 'with a manifest contempt of all antiquity. "We have seen," says he, "the ancients teach another doctrine concerning original sin: but in reading them it is easily perceived how obscure and embarrassed, not to say entirely human, rather than divine, is all they say on that head. For my part, this long time I have not leisure to consult them." In 1526 he composed this treatise; and for many years before, he had no leisure to consult the ancients, nor go back to the fountain-head. Meanwhile he reformed the church. Why not, will our Reformers say? And what had he to do with the ancients, since he possessed the Scriptures? But on the contrary, here is an instance how little safety there is in searching the Scriptures, when one pretends to understand them, without having recourse to antiquity. By understanding the Scriptures in such a manner, Zuinglius discovered there was no original sin, that is to say, there was no redemption; and the scandal of the cross was made void; and pushed his notions to such a length, as to place amongst the saints those, who, indeed, whatever he might say, had no part with Jesus Christ. Thus is the church reformed, when men undertake its reformation without concerning themselves about what was the sense of past ages; and, according to this new method, it is easy to arrive at a reformation like that of the Socinians.

#### 24.—*The character of Œcolampadius.*

Such were the heads of the new reformation. Men of talent, it is true, and not deficient in literature, but bold, rash in their decisions, and puffed up with their vain learning: men who delighted in extraordinary and particular opinions, and, therefore aimed, not only to raise themselves above those of their own age, but also above the most holy of ages past. Œcolampadius, the other defender of the figurative sense amongst the Swiss, was both more moderate, and more learned; and if Zuinglius appeared by his vehemence another Luther, Œcolampadius more resembled Melancthon, whose particular friend he was also. In a letter, which, when a youth, he wrote to Erasmus, you observe the marks of a piety equally affectionate and enlightened, together with much wit and politeness\*. From the feet of the crucifix, before which he had been accustomed to pray, he wrote such tender things to Erasmus on the ineffable sweetness of Jesus Christ, whom this pious image represented so lively to his imagination, that there

\* Ep. Erasm. Lib. vii. Ep. 42, 45.

is no reading it without being affected. The reformation which came to trouble these devotions, and account them idolatry, began at that time; for it was in 1517, that he wrote this letter. He entered into religion in the first heat of these disturbances, with much courage and reflection; at an age, as Erasmus observes, too advanced for any imputation of youthful precipitancy\*. We also learn from the letters of Erasmus, that he was greatly enamoured with the course of life he had undertaken, and relished God in peace of mind, and therein lived quite remote from the novelties that were then spreading. However, (such is human weakness, so great the contagion of novelty,) he left his monastery, preached the new reformation at Basil, where he was pastor, and tired of celibacy, like the rest of the reformers, married a young girl, with whose beauty he was enamoured. "This is the way," said Erasmus "they choose to mortify themselves †;" he could not but admire these new apostles, who were sure to abandon the solemn profession of celibacy to take wives; whereas, the true apostles of our Saviour, according to the tradition of all the fathers, in order to attend to God and the Gospel only, left their wives to embrace celibacy. "It seems," said he, "as if the reformation aimed at nothing more than to strip a few monks of their habits, and to marry a parcel of priests; and this great tragedy terminates at last in a conclusion that is entirely comical, since, just like comedies, all ends in marriage ‡." The same Erasmus complains, in other places §, that after his friend *Æcolampadius* had abandoned his tender devotion, together with the church and monastery, in order to embrace this impious and contemptible reformation, he was no longer the same man; instead of candour, which this minister professed whilst he acted of himself, nothing but artifice and dissimulation could be found in him, after he had once entered into the spirit of the party.

25.—*The progress of the Sacramentarian doctrine.*

After the Sacramentarian dispute had been raised in the manner we have seen, *Carlostadius* scattered abroad little tracts against the real presence; and, although on all hands they were allowed to be replete with ignorance, yet they were relished by the people already charmed with novelty. *Zuinglius* and *Æcolampadius* wrote in defence of this new doctrine: the first with much wit and vehemence; the other

\* *Erasm. Lib. xiii. Ep. 12, 14. Lib. xiii. 27.* † *Lib. xix. Ep. 41.*

‡ *Ep. Erasm. Lib. xix. § Lib. xviii. Ep. 23, 19, 113, 31, 47. Col. 2057, &c.*

|| *Ibid. Lib. xix. Ep. 113, 31, 59. p. 2106.*



with much learning, and so sweet an eloquence, that “ were it possible, says Erasmus, and would God have permitted it, it were capable of seducing even the elect\*.” God put them to this trial; but his promises and truth upheld the simplicity of the faith of the church against human reasoning. A little after Carlostadius was reconciled with Luther, and appeased him by saying that what he had taught upon the Eucharist, was rather by the way of proposing and examining, than deciding†. This man’s life was one uninterrupted scene of feuds; and the Swiss, who received him a second time, were never able to calm his turbulent temper.

His doctrine spread more and more, but on more plausible interpretations of our Saviour’s words than what he had formerly given. Zuinglius said, “ the good man said well enough, there was some hidden sense in these divine words, but could never find out what it was.” He and Œcolampadius, with somewhat different expressions, agreed on the whole, that these words, “ This is my body,” were figurative: “ Is,” said Zuinglius, is as much as to say, signifies; “ body,” said Œcolampadius, is the sign of the body. Their leaders, Bucer and Capito, became zealous defenders of the figurative sense. The reformation divided itself; and those who embraced this new party were called Sacramentarians. They were also named Zuinglians, either because Zuinglius had first supported Carlostadius, or because his authority prevailed in the minds of the people, who were led away by his vehemence.

26.—*Zuinglius careful to take from the Eucharist whatever was raised above the senses.*

We must not be surprised that an opinion so favourable to human sense became so fashionable. Zuinglius said positively, there was no miracle in the Eucharist, or any thing incomprehensible; that the bread broken represented to us the body immolated; and the wine, the blood shed: that Jesus Christ, at the institution of these sacred signs, had given them the name of the thing itself: that it was not, however, a simple spectacle, nor signs wholly naked, for as much as the remembrance of, and faith in, the body immolated and the blood shed, supported our souls; that the Holy Ghost meanwhile sealed in our hearts the remission of sins; and therein consisted the whole mystery. Human reason and

\* Lib. 18. Ep. 9.

† Hosp. 2 part. ad an. 1225—f. 40.

sense had nothing to suffer from this explication\*. The Scripture was all the difficulty: but when one side opposed "This is my body," the other answered, "I am the vine; I am the door; the rock was Christ." True it is, these examples came not to the point. It was not in proposing a parable, or explaining an allegory, that Jesus Christ said, "This is my body; this is my blood." These words, entirely detached from the context, carried their full meaning in themselves,—a new institution was in hand,—which ought to be made in simple terms, and yet no place in Scripture had been found, where the sign of the institution received the name of the thing itself the moment it was instituted, and without any previous preparation.

27.—*Of the Spirit which appeared to Zuinglius, to furnish him with a passage, where the sign of the institution received immediately the name of the thing instituted.*

This argument tormented Zuinglius; he sought day and night for a solution. In the mean time, however, mass was abolished, in opposition to all the exertions of the town-secretary, who disputed powerfully for the Catholic doctrine and the real presence. Twelve days after, Zuinglius had this dream, with which he and his disciples have been so much upbraided. In it he tells us, that imagining he was disputing against the town-secretary, who pressed him closely, on a sudden, he saw a phantom, white or black, appear before him†, who spoke these words,—“Coward, why answerest thou not what is written in Exodus,—‘The Lamb is the passover ‡,’—intimating it was the sign?” This is the celebrated passage so often repeated in the writings of the Sacramentarians, in which they thought to have found the name of the thing given to the sign, and in the very institution of the sign; and thus it was conceived by Zuinglius, who availed himself of it. His disciples will contend, when he said he knew not who suggested this thought, whether he was white or black, he meant only, that it was an unknown person, and true it is, the Latin terms will bear this explication. But, besides that concealing himself, so as not to discover what he was, is the natural character of an evil spirit, Zuinglius was also manifestly in error:—these words, “The Lamb is the passover,” by no means signify it was the figure of the passover. It is a common Hebraism, where the word sacrifice is understood;

\* Zuing. Conf. Fid. ad Franc. et Epist. ad Car. 5.

† Hosp. ii. p. 25, 26. Exod. xii. 11.

‡ Exod. xii. 11.

so sin merely is the sacrifice for sin; and barely pass-over is the sacrifice of the passover; which the Scripture itself explains a little farther on, where it says at full length, not that the Lamb is the passover, but the sacrifice of the passover. This most certainly was the sense of that place in Exodus. Other examples were afterwards produced, as we shall see in due time; but this was the first. There was nothing in it, as we see, that should much comfort the mind of Zuinglius, or that showed him the sign at the very institution received the name of the thing. He awoke, however, at this new explication of his unknown friend, read the place of Exodus, and went to preach what he had discovered in his dream. Men were too well prepared not to believe him: the mists which still remained on their minds were dissipated.

28.—*Luther writes against the Sacramentarians, and why he treated Zuinglius more severely than the rest.*

It provoked Luther to see, not only individuals, but whole churches of the new reformation, now rise up against him. But he abated nothing of his accustomed pride. We may judge from these words,—“I have the Pope in front; I have the Sacramentarians and Anabaptists in my rear; but I will march out alone against them all; I will defy them to battle; I will trample them under my feet.” And a little after,—“I will say it without vanity, that for these thousand years the Scripture has never been so thoroughly purged, nor so well explained, nor better understood, than at this time it is by me\*.” He wrote these words in 1525, a little after the contest had commenced. In the same year he composed his book “against the heavenly prophets;” thereby ridiculing Carlostadius, whom he accused of favouring the visions of the Anabaptists. This book consisted of two parts. In the first he maintained the impropriety of breaking down images; that in the law of Moses nothing was prohibited as the object of adoration, but the images of God; that the images of crosses and of saints were not comprehended in this prohibition; that none under the gospel were obliged to destroy images by force, because that was contrary to gospel-liberty; and those who destroyed them were doctors of the law, and not of the gospel. By this reasoning he justified us from all those accusations of idolatry, with which we were unreasonably charged on this

\* Ad Maled. Reg. Ang. t. ii. 498.

head. In the second part he attacked the Sacramentarians. But Œcolampadius he treated with moderation at the commencement; yet he attacked Zuinglius with violence. This doctor had written, that before the name of Luther was known, he had preached the gospel—that is, the reformation in Switzerland—ever since the year 1516; and the Swiss gave him the glory of this beginning, which Luther arrogated to himself\*. Offended at these words he wrote to those of Strasburg, “that he durst assume to himself the glory of first preaching Jesus Christ, but that Zuinglius wished to deprive him of that glory. How is it possible (proceeds he) to be silent, whilst these men disturb our churches and impugn our authority? If they are unwilling to suffer their own to be weakened; for the same reason they ought not to weaken ours.” In conclusion, he declares, “there is no medium, either he or they must be the ministers of Satan†.”

29.—*The words of a celebrated Lutheran on the jealousy of Luther against Zuinglius.*

An ingenious Lutheran, and the most celebrated of those that have written in our days, here makes this reflection:—“Those who despise all things, and expose not only their fortunes, but their lives, often are not able to raise themselves above glory, so flattering are its charms, so great is human weakness. On the contrary, the higher a man’s courage is elevated the more does he covet praises—the more concerned to see those bestowed on others, which he believes due to himself‡. It should not be, therefore, a matter of surprise, if a man of Luther’s magnanimity wrote those things to those of Strasburg.”

30. *Luther’s strong arguments for the real presence; and how he boasts of them.*

In the midst of these strange transports, Luther, by powerful arguments, confirmed the faith of the real presence. Both the Scripture, and ancient tradition, supported him in this cause. He demonstrated, that to convert so simple, so precise words of our Saviour to a figurative sense, under pretext that there were figurative expressions in other places of the Scripture, was to open a way by which the whole Scripture, and all the mysteries of our religion, would be

\* Zuing. in explan. artic. 18 Ges. in Bibl. etc. Calix. Judic. 53.

† T. ii. Jen. epist. p. 202.

‡ Calix. Judic. n. 53.

turned to figures; that the same submission was, therefore, required here, with which we receive the other mysteries, without attending to human reasoning, or the laws of nature, but to Jesus Christ and his words only; that our Saviour spoke not, in the institution, either of faith or the Holy Spirit, but said, "This is my body," and not that faith would make you partake of it; wherefore, the eating, of which Jesus Christ there spoke, was not a mystical eating, but an eating by the mouth; that the union of faith was consummated out of the sacrament\*; nor could it be believed that Jesus Christ gave us nothing that was particular by such emphatic words †; that, it is evident, his intention was to render certain his gift, by giving us his person; that the remembrance he recommended to us of his death, excluded not his presence, but obliged us to receive this body and this blood as a victim immolated for us; that the victim became ours, indeed, by manducation; that, in reality, faith ought then to intervene, in order to make it profitable to us; but to show that, even without faith, the word of Jesus Christ had its effect, there needed but to consider the communion of the unworthy. He urged here forcibly the words of St. Paul, when, after relating these words, "This is my body," he condemned so severely those "who discerned not the body of the Lord, and who rendered themselves guilty of his body and blood ‡." He added, that St. Paul meant to speak throughout of the "true body," and not of the body in figure; and that it was evident from his expressions, that he condemned those impious persons of insulting Jesus Christ, not in his gifts, but immediately in his person.

But where he manifested his greatest strength, was in demolishing the objections which were raised against these heavenly truths. He asked of those who objected to him, "flesh profiteth nothing §," with what assurance they durst say, that the flesh of Jesus Christ profiteth nothing, and apply to this life-giving flesh what Jesus Christ said of the carnal sense, or, at most, of the flesh taken after the manner in which the Capharnaites understood it, or evil Christians received it, not uniting themselves thereto by faith, nor receiving at that same time that spirit and life with which it abounds? When they presumed to ask him, What, therefore, did this flesh avail taken by the mouth of the body, he again asked of these proud opponents, What did it avail

\* Serm. de Corp. et Sang. Christ. defen. Verbi Cœnæ, t. vii. 277, 381.

† Cat. Mag. de Sac. alt. Concord. p. 551.

‡ 1 Cor. xi. 24, 28, 29.

§ John vi. 63.

that the Word was made flesh? Could not truth have been announced, nor mankind redeemed, but by this means? Are they acquainted with all God's secrets, to say unto him, he had no other way by which to save man? And who are they, thus to set laws to their Creator, and prescribe to him the means by which he would apply his grace to them? If, at last, they opposed against him human reasons, how a body could be in so many places at once—a human body, whole and entire, in so small a space? He destroyed all these engines levelled against God, by asking, how God preserved his unity in the trinity of persons? how, of nothing, he had created heaven and earth? how he had clothed his Son in a human body? how he made him be born of a virgin? how he delivered him up to death? and how he was to raise up all the faithful on the last day? What did human reason pretend by opposing these vain difficulties against God, which he blasted with a breath? They say that all the miracles of Jesus Christ are sensible\*. But who has told them that Jesus Christ did resolve never to work any other? When he was conceived by the Holy Ghost in the womb of a virgin, to whom was this, the greatest miracle of all, become sensible? Could Mary have known what it was she bore in her womb, had not the angel announced the divine secret to her? But when the divinity dwelt corporeally in Christ Jesus, who saw it, or who comprehended it? Now who sees him at the right-hand of his Father, from whence he exerts his omnipotence over the whole universe? Is this what obliges them to wrest, to break to pieces, to crucify the words of their Master? I do not comprehend, say they, how he can execute them literally. They prove to me very well, by this reason, that human sense agrees not with God's wisdom; I allow it; I agree with them: but I never knew before that nothing was to be believed but what we discovered by opening our eyes, or what human reason can comprehend.

Lastly: when it was said to him, that this matter was not of consequence, or of sufficient importance for breaking peace:—who then obliged Carlostadius to begin this quarrel? What forced Zuinglius and Ecolampadius to write? May that peace for ever be accursed, that is made to the prejudice of truth! By such arguments he often silenced the Zuinglians. It must be acknowledged, he had a great strength of genius; he wanted nothing but the rule, which can be had no where but in the Church, and under the yoke of a legitimate autho-

\* Serm. quòd verba stent. *ibid.*

riety. Had Luther continued obedient to that yoke, so necessary for the regulation of all minds, but especially for fiery and impetuous minds like his, he might have kept his writing free from those transports, those buffooneries, that brutal arrôgance, those excesses, or rather extravagances; and the force with which he treated some truths, would not have contributed to seduction. It is for this reason we see him still invincible, when he sets forth the ancient doctrines he had learned in the bosom of the Church; but pride closely pursued his victories. So much was this man captivated with himself for having fought so strenuously for the proper and literal sense of our Saviour's words, that he could not refrain from boasting of it. "The Papists themselves," said he, "are obliged to allow me the praise of having defended the doctrine of the literal sense much better than they. And, in reality, I am assured, were they all melted down into one mass, they never would be able to maintain it with the strength that I do\*."

31.—*The Zuinglians prove against Luther that Catholics understand the literal sense better than he.*

He was mistaken; for although he fully proved that the literal sense was to be maintained, he knew not how to understand it in all its simplicity; and the supporters of the figurative sense demonstrated to him, that if the literal sense were to be followed, transubstantiation would carry it. This is what Zuinglius, and all the defenders of the figurative sense, in general, proved most clearly. They observe, that Jesus Christ has not said, "My body is here, or my body is under this, and with this, or this contains my body, but only, This is my body." Thus, what he is to give the faithful, is not a substance which contains his body, or which accompanies it, but his body, "without any other foreign substance †." Neither has he said, "This bread is my body," which is another of Luther's explications; but he has said, "This is my body," by an indefinite term, to show that the substance he gives is no longer bread, but his body.

And when Luther explained "This is my body;" that is, this bread is my body, really and without figure, contrary to his intentions, he destroyed his own doctrine. For we may very well say with the Church, that bread becomes the body, in the same sense that St. John has said, "the water was made wine ‡," at the marriage-feast in Cana of Galilee,

\* Epist. Luth. ad Hosp. 2 Part, ad An, 1534, f. 132.

† Hosp. ad an. 1527, f. 49.

‡ John ii, 9.

namely, by the change of one into the other. In the same manner may it be said, that what is bread in appearance, is, in effect, the body of our Lord; but that true bread, remaining such, should be at the same time the true body of our Lord, as Luther maintained, the defenders of the figurative sense proved to him, as did the Catholics, that it was a reasoning void of sense, and concluded that he ought either to admit a moral change only, together with them, or a change of substance, together with the Papists.

32.—*Beza proves the same truth.*

It is for this reason that Beza, at the Conference of Montbeliard, maintains against the Lutherans, that of the two explications which adhere to the literal sense—namely, that of the Catholics, and that of the Lutherans, “It is that of the Catholics which departs least from the words of the institution of the Lord’s Supper, were they to be expounded word for word.” He proves it by this reason: because “the Transubstantiators say, that by virtue of these divine words, that which before was bread, having changed its substance, becomes immediately the body itself of Jesus Christ, to the end that, by this means, this proposition may be true, “This is my body.” “Whereas the exposition of the consubstantiators, saying, that these words, ‘This is my body,’ do signify my body is essentially in, with, or under this bread, declares not what is become of the bread, and what that is, which is the body, but only where it is\*.” This reason is plain and intelligible. For it is clear, that Jesus Christ, having taken bread in order to make it something, must have declared to us what kind of something he did intend to make it; it is not less evident, that the bread became that which the Almighty did intend to make it. Now these words show he intended to make it his body, whatever that is understood, since he said, “This is my body.” If, therefore, this bread is not become his body in figure, it is become so in effect; and there is no way to avoid admitting either the change in figure, or the change in substance.

Thus, if we only understand simply the words of Jesus Christ, the doctrine of the Church must be embraced; and Beza is correct in stating, that it is attended with less difficulties, as to the manner of speaking, than that of the Lutherans, that is to say, it is more agreeable to the literal sense †. Calvin frequently confirms the same truth; and, not

\* Conf. de Mont. Imp. à Gen. 1587, p. 52.

† Ibid.



to dwell on the sense of individuals, a whole synod of Zuinglians have acknowledged it.

33.—*A whole Synod of Zuinglians in Poland establishes the same truth.*

It is the Synod of Czenger, a town in Poland, published in the Collection of Geneva. This synod, after having rejected Papistical Transubstantiation, shows “that the Lutheran Consubstantiation is untenable,” because, “as the wand of Moses was not a serpent but by transubstantiation, and the water in Egypt was not blood, nor, at the marriage of Cana, wine, without a change; so the bread of the supper cannot be the body of Christ substantially, if it be not changed into his flesh, by losing the form and substance of bread\*.”

It was good sense that dictated this decision. In fact, the bread remaining bread, can be no more the body of our Lord, than the wand remaining a wand, could be a serpent, or than the water remaining water, could be blood in Egypt, or wine at the marriage of Cana. If, therefore, what was bread becomes the body of our Lord, either it becomes so in figure by a mystical change, according to Zuinglius's doctrine, or it becomes so, in effect, by a real change, as is maintained by Catholics.

34.—*Luther understood not the force of these words, “This is my body.”*

Thus, Luther, who boasted that he alone had defended the literal sense better than all the Catholic divines, was greatly mistaken; since he did not even comprehend the true ground which holds us to this sense, nor understand the nature of those propositions which operate what they express. Jesus Christ says to that man, “Thy son liveth †.” Jesus Christ says to that woman, “Thou art loosed from thine infirmity ‡.” In speaking, he does what he says: nature obeys; things are changed, and the sick person becomes sound. But words, which regard only accidental things, as health and sickness, operate only accidental changes. Here, where a substance is concerned, for Jesus Christ said, “This is my body, This is my blood,” the change is substantial; and by an effect as real as it is surprising, the substance of the bread and of the wine is changed into the substance of the body and the blood.

\* Syn. Czeng. tit. de Cœnâ, in Synt. Gen. part 1.

† John iv. 50, 51.

‡ Luke xiii. 12.

Consequently, when we follow the literal sense, we must not only believe that the body of Jesus Christ is in the mystery, but also that it makes the whole substance of it; and this is what the words themselves lead us to, Jesus Christ not having said, my body is here, or this contains my body, but this is my body; and he would not even say, this bread is my body, but this, indefinitely. And in the same manner as if he had said, when he changed the water into wine; that which you are going to drink is wine, it ought not to be understood that he had preserved together both water and wine, but that he had changed the water into wine; so when he declares, that what he presents is his body, it ought not in any way to be understood that he mixes his body with the bread, but that he effectually changes the bread into his body. To this the literal sense leads us, as the Zuinglians themselves acknowledge, and this it is which Luther could never understand.

35.—*The Sacramentarians proved to Luther that he admitted a kind of figurative sense.*

On account of not understanding it, this great defender of the literal sense fell necessarily into a kind of figurative sense. According to him, "This is my body," imported, this bread contains my body, or this bread is joined with my body; and, by this means, the Zuinglians forced him to acknowledge, in this expression, that grammatical figure which substitutes that which containeth for that which is contained, or the part for the whole\*. Then they pressed him in this way: if it be lawful for you to admit in the words of the institution, that figure which puts the part for the whole, why will you prevent us from admitting in them that figure which substitutes the thing for the sign? Figure for figure, the metonymy which we acknowledge is worth full as much as the synecdoche which you receive. These gentlemen were humanists and grammarians. All their books were soon filled with the synecdoche of Luther, and the metonymy of Zuinglius; it was necessary for Protestants to engage on one side or other of these two figures of rhetoric; and it appeared manifest, that none but the Catholics, equally distant from one and the other, and admitting in the eucharist neither bread nor a bare sign, justly established the literal sense.

\* Vid. Hosp. 2 Part. 12, 35, 47, 61, 76, 161, &c.

36.—*The difference between doctrine invented, and doctrine received by tradition.*

Here was perceived the difference between the doctrines introduced anew by particular authors, and those which come in their natural channel. The change of substance had of itself spread over both the east and the west, entering into all minds together with the words of our Lord, without ever causing any disturbance; neither were those who believed it, ever marked by the Church as innovators. When it was contested, and men laboured to wrest the literal sense with which it had spread over the whole earth, not only the church remained firm, but also her very adversaries were seen to combat for her, whilst they combated against each other. Luther and his followers proved invincibly that the literal sense ought to be retained. Zuinglius, with his party, established with no less force, that it could not be retained without the change of substance: thus they agreed in this only, to prove against each other, that the church, which they had abandoned, had more reason on her side than any of them: by I know not what force of truth, all those who abandoned her retained something of it, and the Church which kept the whole, gained the victory.

37.—*The Catholic sense is visibly the most natural sense.*

Hence it clearly follows, that the interpretation of Catholics, who admit the change of substance, is the most natural and the most simple; both because it is followed by the greatest number of Christians, and because of these two, who impugn it by different ways, one of them, that is Luther, undertook to oppose it purely out of a spirit of contradiction, and in spite of the church; and the other, that is Zuinglius, agrees, that if with Luther the literal sense is to be received, the change of substance must be received also with the Catholics.

38.—*Question: whether the Sacrament be destroyed in Transubstantiation?*

Afterwards, the Lutherans, once engaged in error, confirmed themselves therein with this argument, that it is destroying the sacrament, to take from it, as we do the substance of bread and wine. I am obliged to acknowledge I have not found this reason in any of the writings of Luther;

and, indeed, it is too weak and too far-fetched to occur immediately to the mind; for it is known that a sacrament, that is, a sign, consists in that which appears, not in the interior or substance of the thing. It was not necessary to show Pharaoh seven real kine, and seven ears of real corn, to notify to him the fertility and the famine of seven years. The image that was formed in his mind was quite sufficient for that purpose; and if we must come to things with which the eyes have been affected, in order that the dove should represent the Holy Ghost, and that chaste love with all its sweetness, which he inspires into holy souls, it was not at all necessary that it should be a real dove which descended visibly upon Jesus Christ; it was sufficient it had the whole exterior: in the same manner, in order that the Eucharist might specify to us, that Jesus Christ was our bread and our drink, it was sufficient that the characters and ordinary effects of these aliments were preserved: in a word, it was enough, there was nothing changed with regard to the senses. In the signs of the institution, that which denotes their force is the intention declared by the words of the institutor; now, by saying over the bread, "This is my body," and over the wine, "this is my blood," and seeming, by virtue of these divine words, actually invested with all the appearances of bread and wine, he shows clearly enough, that he is truly a nourishment, who has taken on him the resemblance of it, and under that form appears to us. If, to the reality of the sacrament true bread and true wine be necessary, it is likewise true bread and true wine that are consecrated; and which, by consecration, are made the true body and true blood of our Redeemer. The change that is made in the interior, without any alteration of the exterior, makes also one part of the sacrament—namely, of the sacred sign; inasmuch as this change become sensible by the words, makes us see that by the words of Jesus Christ operating in a Christian, he ought to be most really, though in a different manner, changed inwardly, retaining only the exterior of other men.

39.—*How the names of bread and wine may remain in the Eucharist.—Two rules drawn from Scripture.*

Thereby those passages are explained, in which the Eucharist is called bread, even after consecration; and this difficulty is manifestly solved, by the rule of changes, and the rule of appearances. By the rule of changes, the bread become the body, is called bread, as in Exodus, the wand become a ser-

pent, is called a wand, and the water become blood, is called water. These expressions are made use of to show at once, both the thing which was made, and the material employed to make it of. By the rule of appearances, in the same manner that, in the Old and New Testament, the angels who appeared under human shape, are called; at the same time, angels\*, because they are so, and men, because they appear so; so the Eucharist will be both called the body, because it is so, and bread, because it so appears. If, then, one of these two reasons is sufficient to preserve to it the name of bread without prejudicing the change, the concurrence of both will be much stronger. And no difficulty should be imagined of discerning truth amidst these different expressions; for, when the Holy Scripture explains the same thing by different expressions, to prevent all ambiguity, there is always a principal place, to which the rest are to be reduced, and where things are expressed, such as they are, in precise terms. What if these angels be called men in some places? there will be a place where it will be clearly seen that they are angels. What if this blood and this serpent be called water and wand? you will find the principal place, where the change will be specified; and it is by that the thing should be defined. What will be the principal place, by which we are to judge of the Eucharist, if it be not that of the institution, where Jesus Christ made it to be what it is? So, when we would name it with relation to what it was, and what it appears, we may call it bread and wine; but when we would name it with respect to what it is in itself, it will have no other name than that of body and blood. And it is by this it ought to be defined, since it can never be anything else than what it is made by the all-powerful words which gave it being. Both of you, as well Lutherans as Zuinglians, do, contrary to nature, explain the principal text by other places, and both of you, departing from the rule, do separate still to a greater distance from one another, than you do from the Church which you chiefly aimed to oppose. The Church, which follows the natural order, and reduces all the passages where the Eucharist is mentioned, to that which, beyond dispute, is the principal and foundation of all the others, holds the true key of the mystery; and triumphs not only over both one and the other, but also over the one by the other.

\* Exod. vii. 12, 18.

40.—*Luther dismayed at these disputes; his dejection deplored by Melancthon.*

In effect, during these Sacramentarian disputes, those who called themselves Reformed, notwithstanding their common interest, which at times united them in appearance, waged a more cruel war against each other than against the Church itself, mutually calling each other “furies, maniacs, slaves of Satan, greater enemies to the truth and the members of Jesus Christ, than the Pope himself;” which to them was saying everything.

In the mean time, the authority which Luther was desirous of maintaining in the new Reformation, that had arisen under his standard, was becoming contemptible. He was overwhelmed with grief; and that haughtiness, which he showed exteriorly, could not support him under that dejection of mind which he felt interiorly; on the contrary, the more haughty he was, the more insupportable it was to him to be despised by a party, of whom he wished to be the sole leader. The concern he felt communicated itself to Melancthon; “Luther,” says he, “causes in me great troubles, by the long complaints he makes to me of his afflictions; writings, judged not contemptible, have quite dejected and disfigured him; through the compassion I have for him, I find myself afflicted to the utmost extremity, for the calamities of the church. The doubtful vulgar divide themselves into contrary sentiments; and had not Jesus Christ promised to be with us even to the consummation of ages, I should apprehend the utter destruction of religion from these dissensions; for nothing is more true than the sentence which says, through much disputing, truth escapes from us\*.”

41.—*Luther teaches Ubiquity.*

Strange agitations of a man, who hoped to see the church repaired, and now sees her ready to fall by the very means taken for her re-establishment! What comfort could he find in the promises made to us by Jesus Christ of being always with us? It is for Catholics to nourish themselves with this faith; for them, who believe the Church can never be overcome by error, however violent the assault, and who, in fact, have ever found her to be invincible. But how can they advance claims to this promise in the new Reformation, whose first foundation, when they separated

\* Luth. ad Jac. Præp. Brem. Hosp. 82. Luth. Maj. Conf. ibidem. Zuing. Resp. ad Luth. Hosp. 44. Lib. iv. Ep. 76, ad Camer.

from the church, was that Jesus Christ had so forsaken her, as to let her fall into idolatry? Moreover, though it is true that truth remains always in the Church, and becomes the more purified in proportion as it is attacked, Melancthon was right in thinking, that by much disputation individuals fell into error. There was no error so monstrous, into which the heat of dispute had not impelled the passionate mind of Luther. It made him embrace that monstrous opinion of ubiquity. These are the arguments on which he grounded this strange notion. The humanity of our Lord is united to his divinity; therefore, the humanity, as well as the other, is everywhere: Jesus Christ, as man, is seated at the right hand of God; the right hand of God is everywhere; therefore, Jesus Christ as man, is everywhere. As man, he was in heaven before he had ascended into it. He was in the monument when the angels said he was not there. The Zuinglians fell into a worse extreme, by saying that God had it not even in his power to put the body of Jesus Christ in several places. Luther runs into another excess, and maintains that this body was necessarily in every place; that is what he taught in a book already mentioned, which he wrote in 1527, in order to defend the literal sense, and what he ventured to insert in a "Confession of Faith," which he published in 1528, under the title of "The Great Confession of Faith \*."

42.—*Luther declares anew that it imports little whether the substance of bread be admitted or taken away; the gross divinity of this Doctor, at which Melancthon is scandalized.*

He says, in this last book, that it is of little importance, whether the bread be admitted in the Eucharist or not; but that it was more reasonable to acknowledge therein. "A carnal bread and a bloody wine—*panis carneus et vinum sanguineum.*" This was the new language, by which he expressed that new union he placed between the bread and the body. These words seemed to aim at impanation, and often such fell from him, which had a further tendency than he meant. But, at least, they proposed a certain mixture of bread and flesh, of wine and blood, which appeared very gross, and was insupportable to Melancthon—"I have spoken," says he, "to Luther, concerning this mixture of the bread and the body, which appears a strange paradox to many people."

\* Serm. quod verba stent. t. iii. Jen. Conf. Maj. t. iv. Jen. Calix. Jud. N. 40. et seq.

He answered me peremptorily, that he would alter nothing in it; and, for my part, I do not think it proper to meddle any more in this affair\*." Which is as much as to say, he was not of Luther's mind, yet dared not to contradict him.

43.—*The Sacramentarian contest upset the foundations of the Reformation.—Calvin's words.*

Meanwhile, the excesses into which they fell on both sides of the new reformation, discredited it with men of good sense. This dispute alone destroyed the common foundation of each party. They believed they could terminate all disputes by the Scripture alone, and would have no other judge than that; and the whole world was witness, there was no end to their disputes on Scripture, even on one passage of it, than which none ought to be more clear, since it regarded a last will and testament. They exclaimed one to the other, "All is clear, and nothing more is necessary than to open your eyes." By this evidence of Scripture, Luther discovered that nothing was more impious and daring than to deny the literal sense; and Zuinglius found nothing more gross and absurd than to follow it. Erasmus, whom both were desirous of gaining, said the same to them that all Catholics did:—"You all appeal to the pure word of God, and believe yourselves its true interpreters. Agree, then, amongst yourselves before you set laws to all mankind‡." Whatever excuse they invented, they were quite ashamed that they could not agree, and in the bottom of their hearts, all thought the same that Calvin wrote to his friend Melancthon,—“It is of great importance, that the least suspicion of the divisions, which are amongst us, pass not to future ages; for it is ridiculous beyond anything that can be imagined, after we have broken off from the whole world, we should so little agree amongst ourselves ever since the beginning of our reformation‡.”

44.—*The Lutherans take up arms under the Landgrave's command, who owns that he is in the wrong.*

Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, very zealous for the new gospel, had foreseen this disorder, and from the beginning of the rupture endeavoured to effect a reconciliation. As soon as he saw the party sufficiently strong, and, moreover, threatened by the emperor and the Catholics, he began to form designs

\* Lib. iv. Ep. 76, 1528. † Lib. xviii. 3, xix. 3, 113, xxxi. 59. p. 2102.

‡ Calvin. epist. ad Mel. p. 145,



of a confederacy. The maxims laid down by Luther for the foundation of his reformation, to seek no support from arms, were soon forgotten. They rose in arms under pretext of an imaginary treaty, said to have been made between George Duke of Saxony, and the other Catholic princes, to exterminate the Lutherans\*. The matter indeed was adjusted; the Landgrave was satisfied with the great sums of money, which some ecclesiastical princes were obliged to pay down, to indemnify him for raising forces, which he himself acknowledged he had done on false reports.

Melancthon, who did not approve of this conduct, found no other excuse for the Landgrave, but the reluctance he felt to let it appear that he had been deceived, and had nothing more to say in his defence, than that an "evil shame†" had influenced him. But other thoughts gave him much more uneasiness. They had boasted among themselves that Papacy should be destroyed, without making war and shedding blood. Previous to the time of the Landgrave's tumult, and a little after the revolt of the peasants, Melancthon had written to the Landgrave himself, "That it was better to suffer everything than to take up arms in the gospel cause‡;" and now it happened, that those who had laboured so much to convince the world of their pacific principles, were the first to run to arms, and that on a false report, as Melancthon himself acknowledges§. Accordingly, he adds, "When I see what a scandal the good cause is liable to, I am almost overwhelmed with this concern||." Luther was far from these sentiments: though in Germany it was known as certain, and Protestant authors have acknowledged it¶, that this pretended treaty of George of Saxony was a mere illusion, Luther wished to believe it true; and wrote several letters and libels, in which he is so transported against that prince, even as to call him, "of all fools, the greatest fool; a proud Moab, who always undertook what was above his strength," adding, that he would pray to God against him: then that he would give notice to the princes to exterminate such people, who wished to see all Germany in blood\*\*:" that is to say, lest the Lutherans themselves should be placed in that condition, and begin by exterminating such princes as were opposed to their designs.

This George Duke of Saxony, so insulted by Luther, was

\* Sleid. Lib. vi. 92. Mel. Lib. iv. Epist. 70. † Ibid.  
 ‡ Mel. Lib. iii. Epist. 16. § Lib. iv. Ep. 70, 72. Ibid. 72. || Ibid.  
 ¶ Mel. ibid. Sleid. ibid. Dav. Chyt. in Saxon. ad an 1528. p. 312.  
 \*\* Luth. Ep. ad Vences. Lync. t. vii. et ap. Chyt. in Sax. p. 312 et 982.

as much opposed to the Lutherans, as his kinsman the Elector was favourable to them. Luther prophesied against him with all his strength, regardless that he was of the same family with his lord and master; and, it is plain, that it was not his fault that his prophecies were not fulfilled with the edge of the sword.

45.—*The name of Protestants.—The conference of Marburg, where the Landgrave labours in vain to reconcile both parties of Protestants.—1529.*

This armament of the Lutherans, which in 1528 made all Germany tremble, had raised their pride to such a height, that they judged themselves in a condition to protest openly against the decree, published against them the year following in the Diet of Spire, and to appeal from it to the emperor, to the future general council, or to that which should be held in Germany. It was on this occasion they re-united themselves under the name of Protestants; but the Landgrave, who had more sagacity, more capacity, and more valour than any of them, perceived that the diversity of sentiments would be an everlasting obstacle to that perfect union, which he desired to form amongst them; therefore, the same year that the decree passed at Spire, he procured the conference of Marburg, where he caused all the leaders of the new reformation to meet, namely, Luther, Osiander, and Melancthon, on one side; Zuinglius, Ocolampadius, and Bucer, on the other, to pass over those less distinguished. Luther and Zuinglius were the only speakers; for the Lutherans, long before this, were silent when Luther was present; and Melancthon frankly acknowledges that he and his companions were but “mute figures\*.” They thought not then of amusing each other with equivocal explications, as they did afterwards. The true presence of the body and blood was plainly maintained on one side, and denied on the other. On both sides it was understood, that a presence in figure, and a presence by faith, was not a true presence of Jesus Christ, but a moral presence—a presence improperly so called, and in metaphor. They agreed, in appearance, on all articles, except the Eucharist. I say in appearance, for it is clear from two letters, which, during this conference, Melancthon wrote to his princes to give them an account of it, that, in reality, they very little understood each other’s meaning.—“We discovered (says he), that our adversaries under-

\* Mel. Lib. iv. Ep. 88.

stood very little of Luther's doctrine, although they endeavoured to imitate his language\*;" that is, they agreed through complaisance, and in words, though in reality they understood not each other; and the truth is, Zuinglius had never comprehended anything of Luther's doctrine on the sacraments, nor of his imputed justice†." Those of Strasburg, with Bucer their minister, were also accused of not having good sentiments, that is, as they meant it, not Lutheran enough on this head, and so it afterwards appeared, as we shall soon perceive. The truth of the thing is, Zuinglius and his companions were somewhat troubled about these matters, and spoke whatever might please Luther, having nothing in their thoughts but the real presence. As to the manner of treating things, Luther, as usual, spoke with haughtiness. Zuinglius showed much ignorance, so far as to ask several times, "How a wicked priest could perform a sacred thing ‡?" Luther pressed him closely, and made him see from the example of baptism that he knew not what he said. When Zuinglius and his companions saw they could not prevail on Luther to admit their figurative sense, they entreated him at least to hold them for brethren, but were sharply repulsed. "What fraternity do you ask of me," replied Luther, "if you persist in your belief? It is a sign you doubt of it, since you desire to be their brethren who reject it §." Thus ended the conference. However, they promised mutual charity. Luther interpreted this charity such as we owe to enemies, and not such as is allowed to those of the same communion. "They were indignant," said he, "to see themselves treated like heretics." They agreed, however, to write no more against each other. "But it was only to give time," continued Luther, "to come to themselves."

This agreement, such as it was, continued but a short time; on the contrary, by the different accounts that were given of this conference, their minds were more exasperated than before. The proposal of fraternity made by the Zuinglians was considered by Luther a stratagem, and he said, "that Satan so reigned in them that they had it no longer in their power to advance anything but lies ||."

\* Ibid. Ep. ad Elect. Sax. et ad Hen. Duc. et ap Luth. T. iv. Jen.

† Hosp. Ibid.

§ Luth. Ep. ad Jen. Præp. Bremens. Ibid.

|| Luth. Ep. ad Jen.

† Mel.

## BOOK III.

[From the year 1529 to the year 1530.]

A brief summary.—The Confessions of Faith of both parties of Protestants.—That of Augsburg composed by Melancthon.—That of Strasburg, or of the Four Towns, by Bucer.—That of Zuinglius.—Variations in that of Augsburg concerning the Eucharist.—The ambiguity of that of Strasburg.—Zuinglius alone plainly asserts the figurative sense.—The term substance, why applied to explain the reality.—The Apology of the Augsburg Confession penned by Melancthon.—The Church calumniated in almost every point, chiefly in that of Justification, Operation of the Sacraments, and Mass.—The merit of good works acknowledged on both sides; also Sacramental Absolution, Confession, Monastic Vows, with many other Articles.—The Church of Rome many ways acknowledged in the Confession of Augsburg.—A demonstration, from the Augsburg Confession and Apology, that the Lutherans would return to us, did they but lay aside their calumnies, and well comprehend their own doctrine.

### 1.—*The famous Diet of Augsburg, where the Confessions of Faith are presented to Charles V.*

In the midst of all these differences, preparations were making for the famous Diet of Augsburg, which Charles V. had called in order to pacify the troubles which this new gospel had raised in Germany. He came to Augsburg the 15th of June, 1530. This period is remarkable; for then it was, for the first time, that the Confessions of Faith, published under the name of each party, appeared in form. The Lutherans, defenders of the literal sense, presented to Charles V. the Confession of Faith, called 'the Confession of Augsburg'. The four towns of the empire, Strasburg, Meiningen, Lindau, and Constance, which defended the figurative sense, gave in their Confessions of Faith separately to the same prince. This was called the Confession of Stras-

burg, or of the four towns; and Zuinglius, who was not inclined to be silent on so solemn an occasion, although he was not of the body of the empire, also sent to the emperor his Confession of Faith.

2.—*The Confession of Augsburg digested by Melancthon, and presented to the emperor.*

Melancthon, the most eloquent, the most polite, and at the same time the most moderate of all the disciples of Luther, drew up the Augsburg Confession in concert with his master, on whom they had prevailed to approach near the place of the diet. This Confession was presented to the emperor in Latin and High Dutch the 25th of June, 1530, subscribed by John, Elector of Saxony, by six other princes, of whom one of the chief was Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, and by the towns of Nuremberg and Reutlingen, to which four other towns associated themselves. It was read publicly in the diet, in presence of the emperor; and agreed that no copy of it should be spread abroad, either printed or written, but by his orders\*. Many editions of it have been since made, as well in the German as the Latin language, all materially differing; and yet it has been received by the whole party.

3.—*Of the Confession of Strasburg, or of the Four Towns, and of Bucer who formed it.*

Those of Strasburg, with their associate defenders of the figurative sense, offered to subscribe it, excepting only the article of the Lord's Supper. They were not admitted on those terms, so they compiled their own particular confession, which was drawn into form by Bucer.

He was a man of sufficient learning, of a pliant mind, and more fruitful in distinctions than the most refined scholastics; an agreeable preacher; his style something heavy; but the advantage of his figure and sound of voice gained upon his hearers. He had been a Dominican, and was married, like the rest, and even, as I may say, more so than the others, for on the death of his first wife he proceeded to a second, and so to a third marriage. The holy fathers received not to priesthood any person who, whilst a layman, had been twice married. Bucer, both a priest and a religious, during his new ministry married three times without scruple. This circumstance recommended him to the party; they wished by

\* Chyt. Hist. Confess. Aug.

these daring examples to confound the superstitious observances of the ancient church.

It does not appear that Bucer had concerted any thing with Zuinglius; the latter with the Swiss spoke plainly and openly; Bucer's thoughts were wholly intent on compounding matters, and never was man so fertile in equivocations. Yet neither he nor his party could at that time unite themselves with the Lutherans, and the new reformation made two bodies visibly separate by two different confessions of faith.

After they had been drawn up, these Churches seemed to have assumed their last form, and it was time, at least at that juncture, to hold themselves steady; but, on the contrary, here it was they betrayed most their variations.

4.—*Of the Confession of Augsburg, and its Apology; the authority of these two pieces throughout the whole party.*

The Augsburg Confession is the most considerable of all in every respect. Besides that it was first presented and subscribed by a greater body, and received with more ceremony, it has also this advantage, that it was considered afterwards, not only by Bucer, and by Calvin himself in particular, as a work common to the Reformation, but also by the whole party of the figurative sense assembled in a body, as will appear from what follows. The Emperor had caused some Catholic divines to refute it; Melancthon made its Apology, which he enlarged a short time after. This Apology, however, must not be regarded as a particular work, since it was presented to the Emperor in the name of the whole party who laid before him the Confession of Augsburg, and the Lutherans have held no assembly since that time to declare their belief in which the Confession of Augsburg and Apology were not placed by them upon equal authority, as appears from the acts of the assembly of Smalkald in 1537, and from others.\*

5.—*The tenth article of the Confession of Augsburg, which relates to the Lord's Supper, expressed four different ways.—The Variation of the two first.*

It is certain, the intention of the Confession of Augsburg was to establish the real presence of the body and blood; and as the Lutherans say in the Book of Concord, "it was then expressly designed to reject the error of the Sacra-

\* Præf. Apol. in Lib. Concord, p. 48. Act. Smal. ibid., 356. Epitome Act. ib. 571. Solid Répét. ibid., 633, 726.

mentarians, who, at the same time, presented their own particular Confession of Augsburg\*." But the Lutherans were so far from speaking in a uniform manner on this subject, that, on the contrary, we see at first sight the tenth article of their confession, which is that in which they design to establish the reality, we behold, I say, this tenth article couched in four different forms, being scarcely able to discern which is the most authentic, since they all appeared in editions which had the marks of public authority.

Of these four ways we see two in the Geneva Collection, where the Confession of Augsburg is delivered to us as it was printed in 1540, at Wittemberg, the birth place of Lutheranism, in the presence of Luther and Melancthon. We there read the article of the last supper two different ways. In the first, which is that of the Wittemberg edition, it is said, that "with the bread and wine, the body and blood of Jesus Christ are truly given to those who partake of the supper†." The second speaks not of bread and wine, and is expressed in these terms; "They (the Protestant churches) believe that the body and blood are truly distributed to those who eat, and disapprove of those who teach the contrary‡."

Here is a variation at the first step of sufficient importance, since the last of these expressions agrees with the doctrine of the change of substance, and the other seems calculated to oppose it. The Lutherans, however, stopped not there; and although, of the two ways of expressing the tenth article, which appear in the Geneva Collection, they have followed the last in their Book of Concord, at the place where the Augsburg Confession is there inserted; however, this same tenth article is seen two other ways expressed in the same book §.

6.—*Two other ways in which the same Article is couched, and their differences.*

And truly, the Apology of the Augsburg Confession will be found in this book, where the same Melancthon who had drawn it up, and defends it, transcribes the article in these terms: "In the Lord's Supper the body and blood of Jesus Christ are truly and substantially present, and are truly given together with the things that are seen, that is, with the bread and wine, to those who receive the sacrament."

In fine, we also find these words in the same book of Con-

\* Concord, p. 728.

† Conf. Aug. art. 10.

‡ Conf. Aug. art. 10. Syntagm. Gen. 2 part, p. 13.

§ Conf. Aug. art. 10, in lib. Concord, p. 13.

cord : " The article of the supper is thus taught from the word of God in the Augsburg Confession : that the true body and the true blood of Jesus Christ are truly present, distributed and received in the holy supper, under the species of bread and wine ; and those are disapproved of who teach the contrary\*." And it is in this manner also that the tenth article is delivered in the French version of the Confession of Augsburg, printed at Frankfort in 1673†.

If these two ways of expressing the reality be compared, there is no person who does not see that this of the Apology expresses it in stronger words than did the two preceding ones from the collection of Geneva, but at the same time departs farther from transubstantiation ; and that the last, on the contrary, accommodates itself to the expressions which the Church makes use of, that Catholics might subscribe it.

7.—*Which of these ways is the original one.*

If it be asked, which of these four different ways is the original one presented to Charles V., the thing admits of no small doubt.

Hospinian maintains the last to be the original, because it is that which appears in the impression which was made in the year 1530, at Wittemberg, that is in the seat of Lutheranism, the abode of Luther and Melancthon †.

He adds the cause why this article was changed, because it too openly favoured transubstantiation, signifying the body and blood to be truly received, not with the substance, but under the species of bread and wine, which is the very expression made use of by Catholics.

And this is the very thing which enforces the belief that the article was thus expressed at first, since it is certain from Sleidan and Melancthon, as well as from Celestin and Chytræus, in their histories of the Confession of Augsburg, that the Catholics contradicted not this article in the refutation of the Augsburg Confession, which they there made by the order of the Emperor §.

Of these four ways, the second was that which was inserted in the Book of Concord ; and it might seem that this was the most authentic, because the princes and states who subscribed this book, seem to affirm in the preface that they transcribed the Augsburg Confession, as it is still to be found in the archives of their predecessors, and in those of the empire ||.

\* Apol. Conf. Aug. Conc. p. 157.

† Solid. Répét.

‡ Hospin. part 2, p. 94, 132, 173.

§ Sleid. Apol. Conf. Aug. ad Art. 10. Chytr. Hist. Conf. Aug. Cœlest Hist. Conf. Aug. t. iii.

|| Præf. Con.



But, upon more exact inquiry, this will be found inconclusive, since the authors of this preface only say, that having compared their copies with the archives, "they found that theirs was wholly and throughout of the same sense with the Latin or German originals;" which shows the pretension of agreeing in substance with the other editions, but not the positive fact, that is, that the words are throughout the same; otherwise, such different ones would not be found in another part of the same book, as we observed before.

Be that as it may, as the Confession of Augsburg could be presented to the emperor but in one way, it is strange there should appear three so different from that, and altogether as authentic, as we have just seen, and that so solemn an act should be so many times altered by its authors in an article so essential.

8.—*The Fifth way in which this same Tenth Article is expressed in the Apology of the Confession of Augsburg.*

But they stopped not in so fine a way, but immediately after the Confession of Augsburg, they gave to the emperor a fifth explication of the article of the supper, in the Apology for their Confession of Faith, drawn up at their order by Melancthon.

In this Apology, Melancthon being careful to express in formal terms the literal sense, approved, as has been seen, by the whole party, was not content to have already acknowledged a true and substantial presence, adding, that Christ was "corporeally given to us," and that this was the "ancient and common" sentiment, not only of the "Church of Rome," but also of the "Greek Church\*."

9.—*The manner in which the Reality is explained by the Apology, tends at the same time to establish the Change of Substance.*

And although this author but little favours the change of substance even in this book, yet his dislike to it is not so great, but that he makes honourable mention of the authorities which establish it; for in order to prove his doctrine of the "corporeal presence," from the sentiment of the eastern church, he cites the canon of the Greek mass, when the priest prays expressly, says he, that the proper body of Jesus Christ be made in the change of bread, or by the change of bread. Far from condemning anything in this prayer, he makes use of it as a record whose authority he

\* Apolog. Confess. Aug. in Art. 10. p. 157.

owns; and with the same judgment produces the words of Theophylast, archbishop of Bulgaria, who affirms that the bread is not the figure only, but is truly changed into flesh\*. It so happens, that of three authorities which he adduces to confirm the doctrine of the real presence, two there are which assert the change of substance; so necessarily do these two truths follow each other, so natural a connexion is there between them. When these passages, which appeared at the first publication, were afterwards mutilated in some editions by the enemies of transubstantiation, it was because they were displeased that they could not establish the reality, which they approved, without admitting transubstantiation at the same time, which they had been determined to deny.

10.—*The evasion of the Lutherans, with regard to these Variations.*

Such were the uncertainties into which the Lutherans fell at their commencement; no sooner did they undertake to give a settled form to their church, by a confession of faith, than they were so irresolute, that they immediately published an article of such importance as that of the Eucharist, in five or six different forms. They were not more unchangeable, as shall be seen, in the other articles; and what they commonly answer, that the council of Constantinople added also to that of Nice, avails them nothing; for the truth is, a new heresy rising up after the council of Nice, which denied the divinity of the Holy Ghost, it was necessary to add some words for its condemnation; but in our present case, where nothing new occurred, it was nothing but want of steadiness which introduced among the Lutherans the variations we have seen.

11.—*The Sacramentarians are not more steady in explaining their Faith.*

If the defenders of the figurative sense reply, that their party fell not into similar inconsistencies, let them not flatter themselves with this persuasion. In the "Diet of Augsburg," where the confessions of faith commence, it has been demonstrated that the Sacramentarians at first produced two different ones; and we shall soon see the diversity of them. In course of time they were not less fruitful in different confessions of faith than the Lutherans, and have appeared no less embarrassed, no less uncertain, in the defence of the figurative, than the others in that of the literal sense.

\* Apol. Aug. Conf.

This is what may justly surprise us ; for it would seem that a doctrine so easy to be understood, according to human reason, as is that of the Sacramentarians, should afford no embarrassment to those who undertook to explain it. But it is because the words of Jesus Christ naturally make an impression of reality on the mind, which all the refined subtilties of the figurative sense are not able to destroy. As, therefore, the greatest part of those who opposed it, could not divest themselves of this entirely ; and, on the other hand, were desirous to please the Lutherans, who retained it, we must not be surprised, that, with their figurative interpretations, they mingle so many expressions which savour of the reality ; nor that, having left the true idea of the real presence taught them by the Church, they were so pressed to please themselves with the terms they had chosen, in order to retain some image of it.

12.—*The indefinite and ambiguous expressions of the Confession of Strasburg, on the article of the Lord's Supper.*

This was the cause which introduced those equivocations, we shall see, into their Catechisms and Confessions of Faith. Bucer, the great architect of all these subtilties, gave a slight specimen of them in the Strasburg Confession ; for though unwilling to make use of the same terms as the Lutherans to explain the real presence, he affects to say nothing that might be expressly contrary to it, and expresses himself in words ambiguous enough to bear that sense. Thus he speaks, or rather makes those of Strasburg and the others to speak : “ When Christians repeat the supper, which Jesus Christ made before his death, in that manner he instituted it, he gives to them, by the sacraments, his true body and blood to eat and drink truly, to be the food and drink of souls \*.”

In reality, they say not with the Lutherans, “ That this body, and this blood, are truly given with the bread and wine ;” and yet less, “ that they are truly and substantially given ;” Bucer, as yet, had not proceeded so far ; but he says nothing contrary to it, and nothing, in fact, which a Lutheran, and even a Catholic might not approve. We all consenting to this, “ that the true body and true blood of our Lord are given to us to eat and drink truly,” not for the food of bodies, but, as Bucer said, for the food of souls. So this confession kept itself within general expressions ; and even when it says, “ We truly eat and drink the true body

\* Conf. Arc. Gent. c. xviii. de Cœna. Synt. Gen. part i. p. 195.

and true blood of our Lord," it seems to exclude eating and drinking by faith; which, indeed, is no more than a metaphorical eating and drinking: so much were they afraid of acknowledging that the body and blood are only spiritually given, and of inserting into a confession of faith, what to Christians was so great a novelty. For although the Eucharist, as well as the other mysteries of our salvation, had a spiritual effect for its end, it had, like the other mysteries, that which was accomplished in the body for its foundation.—Jesus Christ was to be born, to die, to be spiritually risen again in the faithful; yet he was also to be born, to die, and to rise again really, and according to the flesh. In the same manner, we were to partake spiritually of his sacrifice; yet also we were corporally to receive the flesh of this victim, and to eat of it indeed. We were to be united spiritually to the heavenly spouse; yet his body which he gave to us in the Eucharist, in order to a mutual possession of ours, was to be the pledge and seal, as well as the foundation of this spiritual union; and this divine marriage, as well as the ordinary ones, though in a far different way, was to unite minds by uniting bodies. To speak therefore of the spiritual union was, in reality, to explain the last end of this mystery; but to that intent, the corporal union, on which the other was grounded, ought not to have been forgotten. At least, since it was that which separated the churches, they ought, in a confession of faith, to have spoken distinctly for or against it,—a course which Bucer had not sufficient resolution to pursue.

13.—*The progress of these same ambiguities, and the remarkable effect they had on those towns that subscribed to them.*

He was fully sensible he should be reprov'd for his silence; and to obviate the objection, after having said in general, "That we truly eat and drink the true body and true blood of our Lord, for the food of our souls," he makes those of Strasburg say, "that keeping themselves at a distance from all dispute, and all curious and superfluous enquiry, they call back the mind to that only which profits; and which by our Saviour was alone regarded, namely, that, feeding on him, we may live in him, and by him: \*" as if explaining the principal end proposed by our Saviour were sufficient, without speaking one way or the other of the Real Presence, which the Lutherans, as well as Catholics, granted to be the means.

\* Conf. Argent. c. 18. de Cena. Synt. Gen. part 1. p. 195.

Having declared these things, they conclude, by protesting “that they are calumniated when they are accused of changing the words of Jesus Christ, and mutilating them by human interpretations, or of administering nothing in their supper but mere bread and wine, or of despising the Lord’s Supper; for, on the contrary,” they say, “we exhort the faithful to give ear to the words of the Lord with a simple faith, by rejecting all false comments, and all human inventions, and by adhering closely to the sense of the words, without hesitating in any way; finally, by receiving the sacraments for the food of their souls.”

Who condemns not, with them, superfluous refinements, human inventions, false comments on the words of our Lord? What Christian does not profess to adhere closely to the sense of these divine words? But since this sense had been the subject of disputation for six whole years, and so many conferences had been held to settle it, they ought to have determined what it was, and what were those false glosses which were to be rejected. What advantage is it to condemn that in general, and by indefinite terms, which is rejected by all parties? and who sees not, that a confession of faith requires decisions more clear and more precise? Certainly, were we to judge of Bucer’s sentiments, and those of his brethren, by this Confession of Faith only, and knew not from other sources that they were not favourable to the Real and Substantial Presence, we might believe they were not, at least, far from it. They have terms to flatter those who believe it, others by which to escape if pressed; in a word, we may say, without doing them an injustice, that whilst confessions of faith are generally made to explain our thoughts on the disputes which disturb the peace of the church, these, on the contrary, by lengthened discourses and tedious circumlocution, discovered the secret of saying nothing distinctly on the subject of discussion.

From thence an odd effect followed: namely, that of the four towns which had united themselves by this common confession of faith, and had all embraced, at that time, sentiments contrary to the Lutherans, three, namely, Strasburg, Memingen, and Lindau, without scruple, a short time afterwards, went over to the doctrine of the Real Presence: so well had Bucer succeeded by his ambiguous discourses in rendering their minds pliant, so that they could easily turn to any side. \*

14.—*The Confession of Faith of Zuinglius very clear and free from all equivocation.*

Zuinglius dealt more frankly. In the Confession of Faith which he sent to Augsburg, and which received the approbation of all the Swiss, he declared plainly, "That the body of Jesus Christ, after his ascension, was no where else but in Heaven; nay, could be no where else; that truly, in the Supper, it was, as it were, present by the contemplation of faith, and not really, or by its essence\*."

To defend this doctrine, he wrote a letter to the Emperor and the Protestant Princes, where he establishes this difference between him and his adversaries; that these would have "a natural and substantial body, and he a sacramental body †." He is uniform in the use of the same language; and in another Confession of Faith, which, at the same time, he directs to Francis the First, he explains, "This is my body," "of a symbolical, mystical, and sacramental body; of a body by denomination and signification;" "in the same manner," says he, "as a queen, shewing amongst her jewels her nuptial ring, says readily, 'This is my king, that is, this is the ring of the king my husband, wherewith he hath espoused me. ‡'" "I know not of any queen that ever used such an odd phrase; but it was not easy for Zuinglius to find, in ordinary language, such a mode of speaking as he would ascribe to our Saviour. Nay, he acknowledges no more in the Eucharist than a moral presence, which he calls "Sacramental and Spiritual." He always places the force of the sacraments in this, "that they assist the contemplation of faith; that they serve for a bridle to the senses, and make them concur better with the thoughts." As to the manducation, "which the Jews understood in the same sense with the Papists," according to him, "it ought to cause the like horror a father would feel who had his son given him to eat." In general, "faith has a horror of a visible and corporal presence, which makes St. Peter say, 'depart from me, O Lord;' Jesus Christ must not be eaten in this carnal and gross way: a faithful and religious soul eats his true body sacramentally and spiritually." Sacramentally, that is to say, in sign; spiritually, that is, by the contemplation of faith, which represents to us Jesus Christ suffering, and shews us he is wholly ours.

\* Conf. Zuing. int. Oper. Zuing. et ap. Hosp. ad an. 1530; 101, et seq.

† Epist. ad Cæs. et Princ. Prot. ibid.

‡ Conf. ad Franc. I.

15.—*The state of the question appears clearly in the Confession of Zuinglius.*

It is not our business here to complain, that he calls our manducation gross and carnal, though so much elevated above the senses; nor that he would raise a horror of it, as a cruel and bloody object. These are the usual reproaches which those of his party have ever made to us and the Lutherans. We shall see, by what follows, how those who now reproach will justify us; it is enough that we here observe, that Zuinglius speaks plainly. From these two Confessions of Faith we learn in what the difficulty precisely consists; on one side, a presence in sign, and by faith: on the other, a real and substantial presence; and this it is which separated the Sacramentarians from Catholics and Lutherans.

16.—*What reason there was for making use of the word Substance in the Eucharist; that it is the same which made it necessary in the Trinity.*

It will now be easy to comprehend what was the reason why the defenders of the literal sense, both Catholics and Lutherans, used so much the words “true body, real body, substance, proper substance,” and others of a similar nature. They made use of the word “real and true,” to signify that the Eucharist was not a mere sign of the body and blood, but the very thing itself.

For this reason, also, they employed the word substance; and if we trace it up to its origin, we shall find, that what introduced this word into the mystery of the Trinity, rendered it likewise necessary in the mystery of the Eucharist. Before the subtilties of heretics had confounded the true sense of these words of our Saviour, “I and my Father are one\*,” the perfect unity of the Father and Son was believed to be sufficiently expressed by this text of scripture, without the necessity of always saying they were one in substance; but ever since the time that heretics would persuade the faithful the unity of the Father and Son was only a unity of concord, of thought, of affection, it was deemed expedient to banish these pernicious equivocal terms by establishing consubstantiality—namely, the unity of substance. This term, which was not in scripture, was judged necessary to the right understanding of it, and keeping at a distance the dangerous

\* John x. 30.

interpretations of those who adulterated the simplicity of God's word.

By adding these expressions to scripture, it was not pretended it explained itself, in respect of that mystery, obscurely or ambiguously; but it grew out of the necessity which existed of opposing by these express words the evil interpretations of heretics, and of preserving that natural and primitive scripture sense, which would immediately have made impression on the mind, were not the ideas confused by prejudice or false subtilties.

It is easy to apply this to the subject of the Eucharist. Had the natural and just sense, without refinement, been preserved of these words, "This is my body, this is my blood," we should have thought we had sufficiently explained a real presence of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist, by saying, that what he there gives is his body and blood; but since it has been said that Jesus Christ was then present in figure only, or by his spirit, or by his virtue, or by faith, then to remove all ambiguity it was believed necessary to say, that the body of our Lord was given to us in its proper and true substance, or, what comes to the same, that he was really and substantially present. It is this which gave rise to the term Transubstantiation, just as natural to express a change of substance, as that of consubstantial was to express a unity of substance.

17.—*The Lutherans had the same reason as we to make use of the word Substance; Zuinglius never used it, nor Bucer at the commencement.*

For the same reason, the Lutherans, who acknowledge the reality without the change of substance, when they rejected the term Transubstantiation, retained that of "the true and substantial presence," as we have seen in the Apology of the Augsburg Confession; and these terms were chosen to fix the natural sense of these words, "This is my body," as the word consubstantial was chosen by the fathers of Nice to fix the literal sense on these words, "I and my Father are one," and these other, the "word was God."

Accordingly, we do not find that Zuinglius, who first reduced to form the opinion of the figurative sense, and explained it in the frankest manner, ever employed the word substance. On the contrary, he perpetually excluded "the manducation," as well as the substantial "presence," in order



that he might leave nothing but a figurative manducation, that is, "In spirit and by faith\*."

Bucer, although more inclined to ambiguous expressions, did not, at the beginning, make use of the word substance, or communion and substantial presence, but was content not to condemn these terms, and confined himself only to the general expressions which we have seen. Such was the first state of the Sacramentarian controversy, into which Bucer's subtleties introduced afterwards such a number of unseasonable variations as we shall be obliged to relate in the sequel. For the present it is sufficient to have pointed at the cause.

18.—*Of the doctrine of Justification ; that there is no difficulty in it after what has been said on it in the Confession of Augsburg and in the Apology.*

The question of justification, in which that of free will was contained, seemed to Protestants of a far different importance, for which reason they twice demand of the emperor, in the Apology, a particular attention to this subject, as being the most important of the whole gospel, and that also on which they have laboured most†. But I hope it will soon be discovered they have laboured in vain, to say nothing more, and that in this dispute there is much more of misunderstanding than real difficulty.

19.—*That the doctrine of Luther on Free Will is retracted in the Confession of Augsburg.*

And first, we must remove from this dispute the question of free will. Luther had returned from that excess, which induced him to say, that God's prescience wholly destroyed free will in all creatures ; and had consented to have this article placed in the Augsburg Confession:—"That free will is to be acknowledged in all men that have the use of reason, not for the things of God, which men cannot commence or at least finish without him, but only with regard to the works of this present life and the duties of civil society‡." Melancthon added to it in the Apology, "with respect to the exterior works of God's law§." These are two truths already which admit of no discussion ; one, that there is a free will ; and the other, that of itself it can do nothing in works that are truly Christian.

\* Ep. ad Cæs. et Princ. Prot. † Ad Art. iv. de Justif. p. 60. de pæn. p. 161.  
‡ Conf. Aug. Art. xviii. Apol. ad eund. Art. § Apol. ad eund. Art.

20.—*A word in the Augsburg Confession which tended to Semi-Pelagianism.*

There was, moreover, a word, in that passage we have just seen of the Augsburg Confession which, from men who would attribute all to grace, was not near so correct as we speak in the Catholic Church. It is in that place where it is said, that of itself “free will cannot commence, or at least finish the things of God,” a restriction which seems to insinuate it can at “least commence” them by its proper strength—a semi-Pelagian error, from which we shall hereafter see the Lutherans at present are not far removed.

The following article\* explained how “the will of the wicked was the cause of sin;” where, although it be not distinctly enough said that God is not the author of it, as much at least was insinuated, in opposition to the first maxims of Luther.

21.—*All the reproaches made to Catholics founded on calumnies; the first calumny on gratuitous Justification.*

But what is most remarkable, with respect to the other points of Christian grace in the Confession of Augsburg is this, that it everywhere supposes errors in the Catholic Church, which errors were always detested by her; so that they seemed rather to have sought a subject for quarrelling than reforming, and the thing will appear manifest upon expounding historically the belief of the one and the other.

In the Confession of Augsburg and in the Apology, they grounded themselves much on the remission of sins being purely the result of generosity, which ought not to be attributed to the merit and worth of precedent actions. Strange! the Lutherans everywhere ascribed to themselves the honour of this doctrine, as if they had brought it back again into the Church, and reproached Catholics, “that they believed they obtained the forgiveness of their sins by their own works; that they believed they could merit it by doing, on their side, what they were able, and even by their own strength; that all they attributed to Jesus Christ was the having merited for us a certain habitual grace, whereby we may more easily love God; and although the will had it in its power to love him, it did it more willingly from this habit; that they taught no other justice than that of reason; that we could draw near to God by our proper works, independently of the

\* Art. six. *ibid.*

propitiation of Jesus Christ, and that we had dreamt of a justification without speaking one word of him\* ; which they repeat incessantly, to conclude as often, "That we had buried Jesus Christ."

22.—*They attributed to Catholics two propositions that were contradictory: "ex opere operato," what it means.*

But whilst they reproached Catholics with so gross an error, they, on the other hand, imputed to them the opposite sentiment, accusing them of "believing themselves justified by the sole use of the sacrament, 'ex opere operato,' as they speak in schools, without any good disposition†." How could the Lutherans imagine, that amongst us so much was given to man, and at the same time so little? But both one and the other are very distant from our doctrine, inasmuch as the council of Trent is quite full, on the one side, of the good sentiments by which we ought to dispose ourselves for baptism, for penance, and for communion, declaring even in express terms, "that the reception of grace is voluntary:" and, on the other side, it teaches, that the forgiveness of sins is purely gratuitous; and that all which prepares us for it, either proximately or remotely, from the beginning of the vocation and the first horrors of a conscience shaken by fear, even to the most perfect act of charity, is the gift of God‡.

23.—*According to the Lutheran doctrine, the Sacraments operate "ex opere operato."*

True it is, we say with regard to infants, that by his infinite mercy baptism sanctifies them, though they co-operate not by any good motives to this great work; but besides, that in this the merit of Jesus Christ, together with the efficacy of his blood, displays itself, the Lutherans themselves say as much; they themselves confessing that "little children ought to be baptized; that baptism is necessary for their salvation; and that by this sacrament they are made the children of God §." Is not this an acknowledgment of the force of the sacrament, of itself and by its own action effectual, "ex opere operato," in children? For I do not find that the Lutherans consider themselves bound to maintain with Luther, that children brought to baptism, produce therein an act of faith. They must then necessarily say

\* Conf. Art. lx. Apol. Cap. de Justif. Conc. p. 61. Ibid. pp. 62, 74, 102, 103.

† Conf. Aug. Art. xiii, etc.

‡ Sess. 6. cap. v. vi. 14. Sess. xiii. 7. Sess. xiv. 4. Sess. vi. 7. Ibid. cap. viii. ibid. cap. v. vi. Can. 1, 2, 3. Sess. xiv. 4.

§ Art. ix.

with us, that the sacrament, by which they become regenerated, operates by its own proper virtue.

If it be objected, that amongst us the sacrament has the same efficacy in the adult, and operates in them “*ex opere operato*,” it is easy to comprehend that this is not admitted to exclude the necessary good dispositions in them, but only to shew that what God works in us, when he sanctifies us by the sacrament, is above all our merits, all our works, all our foregoing dispositions; in a word, the pure effect of his grace, and of the infinite merits of Jesus Christ.

24.—*That according to the Council of Trent, the remission of sins is purely gratuitous.*

There is no merit therefore of ours that obtains the remission of sins; and the Confession of Augsburg ought not to have assumed the glory of this doctrine, as if it were peculiar to itself; since the Council of Trent equally acknowledged, “*that we are said to be justified gratuitously, because all that precedes justification, whether faith or works, cannot merit this grace;*” conformably to what the Apostle says, “*if it be grace, it is not therefore works, otherwise grace is no longer grace\*.*”

Here then is the remission of sins, and justification gratuitously and without merit, established in as express terms in the Catholic Church as it could possibly have been done in the Confession of Augsburg.

25.—*The second calumny on the Merit of Works; that it is acknowledged in the Augsburg Confession, and by Luther, in the same sense as it is in the Church.*

If after the remission of sins, when the Holy Ghost dwells, and charity reigns in us, and the soul is rendered agreeable by a gratuitous bounty, we acknowledge merit in our good works,—the Confession of Augsburg agrees with us in this, seeing that in the Geneva edition printed after that of Wittenberg, which was made under the inspection of Luther and Melancthon, we read that “*the new obedience is reputed a justice, AND MERITS rewards.*” And yet more expressly, that “*although far distant from the perfection of the law, it is a justice, AND MERITS rewards.*” And a little after, that

\* Conc. Trid. Sess. vi. cap. 8.

“good works are worthy of great praises, that they are necessary, and that **THEY MERIT** recompenses \*.”

Afterwards, explaining these words of the Gospel, “Who-soever hath, to him shall be given,” it says, “that our action must be joined to God’s gifts, which it preserves in us; and that **IT MERITS** their increase †;” and praises this saying of St. Austin, “that charity, when it is exercised, **MERITS** the increase of charity.” Here then is our co-operation necessary in express terms, and its merit confirmed by the Confession of Augsburg. Therefore they thus conclude this article: “thereby good men may understand what true good works are, and how they please God, and how **THEY ARE MERITORIOUS** ‡.” Merit cannot be better established, nor more inculcated; nor does the Council of Trent insist further on this matter.

All this was taken from Luther, and from the grounds of his sentiments; for in his commentary on the epistle to the Galatians, he writes, that “where he speaks of justifying faith, he means that which works by charity; for,” says he, “faith **MERITS** that the Holy Ghost be given us§.” He had just said, that with this Holy Ghost all virtues are given us, and it was thus he explained justification in that famous commentary: it was printed at Wittenberg, in 1553; so that twenty years after Luther had commenced the Reformation, nothing as yet was found in merit that deserved correction.

26.—*The Apology asserts the Merit of Works.*

It must not then be a matter of surprise, if in the Apology of the Augsburg Confession this opinion be found so strongly grounded. There Melancthon makes new efforts to explain the subject of justification, as his letters testify, where he thus teaches, “that there are rewards proposed and promised to the good works of the faithful, and that they are **MERITORIOUS**, not of forgiveness of sins or of justification, (which we have not otherwise than by faith,) but of other corporal and spiritual rewards in this life, and that to come;” according to what St. Paul saith, “that each one shall receive his reward according to his works||.” And Melancthon is so full of this truth, that he confirms it anew in the answer to the objections by these words: “We confess, as we have often done already, that although justification and life eternal

\* Art. vi. Synt. Gen. p. 12. Ibid. p. 20. cap. de Bon. Oper. † Ibid. p. 21.

‡ Page 22.

§ Comment. in Ep. ad Gal. t. v. 243.

|| Apol. Conf. Aug. ad Art. iv. v. vi. Resp. ad Object. Concord. p. 96.

appertain to faith, good works, however, MERIT other corporal and spiritual rewards, and different degrees of rewards, according to what St. Paul says, ‘that each one shall be rewarded according to his labour:’ for gospel justice being occupied about the promise of grace, gratuitously receives justification and life; but the fulfilling of the law, which proceeds as the result of faith, is occupied about the law itself; and then the recompense, continues he, IS OFFERED, not GRATUITOUSLY, but according to works, AND IT IS DUE; and accordingly those WHO MERIT this reward are justified before they fulfil the law\*.”

Thus the merit of works is constantly recognised by those of the Augsburg Confession as a thing comprised in the notion of a reward, there being nothing indeed more naturally united than merit on one side, when reward is promised and proposed on the other.

And verily, what they reprehend in Catholics is not their admission of merit, which is also asserted by them, but is, says the Apology, “that, as often as merit is spoken of, they transfer it from other rewards to justification †.” If, then, we acknowledge no merit but what follows and not precedes justification, the difficulty will be removed; and it is the very thing was done at Trent by this decision, “that we are said to be gratuitously justified, because not any of those things, whether faith, or works, which precede justification, can merit it ‡.” And again, “that our sins are gratuitously forgiven us, by the divine mercy, for the sake of Jesus Christ §.” Whence it follows, also, that the Council admits no merit, “but in regard to the augmentation of grace, and life eternal ||.”

27.—*Melancthon is inconsistent with himself in the Apology, when he there denies that good works merit eternal life.*

As to the augmentation of grace, it was agreed to at Augsburg, as already seen; and for life eternal, true it is, Melancthon would not acknowledge it was merited by good works, since, according to him, they merited other recompenses only, which are promised to them in this life and the next. But when Melancthon spoke thus, he did not reflect what he had said in this same place, that it is “eternal glory which is due to those who are justified,” according to this saying of St. Paul, “Those whom he hath justified, he hath

\* Resp. ad Object. Con. p. 137. † Apol. Conf. Aug. p. 137. ‡ Sess. vi. cap. 8.

§ Ibid. cap. 9.

|| Ibid. cap. 16. et Cau. 32.

glorified also \*." Again, he reflected not that eternal life is the true recompense promised by Jesus Christ to good works, conformably to that text of the Gospel cited by him in another place in support of merit, that those who shall obey the Gospel "shall receive a hundred-fold, in this world, and life everlasting in the next †;" where is seen, besides the hundred-fold which shall be our recompense in this life, that life eternal is promised as our reward in the life to come: so that if merit is grounded on the promise of a recompense, as Melancthon asserts, and with truth, nothing is more merited than eternal life, though, in other respects, nothing more gratuitous, according to that excellent doctrine of St. Augustine, "Life eternal is due to the merits of good works; but the merits unto which it is due are gratuitously given us by our Lord Jesus Christ."

28.—*That there is something in eternal life which falls not under merit.*

It is also true, that what prevents Melancthon from absolutely holding eternal life as a recompense promised to good works, is, that eternal life being always, in a certain manner, annexed to grace, it is without works given to little children, and would be given to the adult in case they were even surprized by death the very moment they were justified, without their having had time to act afterwards; which prevents not, in another respect, the eternal kingdom, eternal glory, eternal life, from being promised as a reward to good works, and also from being merited, in the sense expressed by the Augsburg Confession.

29.—*Variations of the Lutherans in that which they curtailed in the Confession of Augsburg.*

What does it avail the Lutherans to have altered this Confession, and to have erased in their Book of Concord, and other editions, those passages which sanction merit? Can they, by this act, prevent this confession of faith from having been printed at Wittemberg, under the eyes of Luther and Melancthon, with no contradiction from any of the party, and with all the passages we have cited? What other effect does the erasure of them produce, but to make us remark the force and importance of them? But to what purpose is it to erase the merit of good works in the Confession of Augsburg,

\* Apol. Conf. Aug. 137.

† In Locis Comm. cap. de Justif. Mat. xix. 29.

‡ Aug. ep. 105, num. 194, N. 19. De Comp. et Grat. cap. 13. N. 41.

whilst they themselves leave it as entire in the Apology, as they have caused it to be printed in their Book of Concord? Is it not certain the Apology was presented to Charles V. by the same princes and in the same diet as the Confession of Augsburg\*? But what is still more remarkable, it was presented, as the Lutherans confess, "in order to preserve its true and proper sense †;" for so it is worded in an authentic writing, in which the Protestant princes and states declare their faith. Therefore, it is not to be doubted but the merit of works is agreeable to the spirit of Lutheranism, and of the Confession of Augsburg, and it is unjustly that the Lutherans disturb the Church of Rome on this head.

30.—*Three other calumnies against the Church—The fulfilling of the law acknowledged in the Apology in the same sense as in the Church.*

I foresee, however, it may be said they have not approved the merit of works in the same sense as we do, for three reasons:—first, because they do not acknowledge with us, that the just man can and ought to fulfil the law; secondly, because for this very reason they do not admit that merit which is called of condignity, whereof all our books are full; thirdly, because they teach that the good works of man justified stand in need of the gratuitous acceptation of God in order to obtain for us eternal life, which they will not allow that we admit. Here, will it be said, are three characters by which the doctrine of the Confession of Augsburg and Apology will stand separated eternally from ours. But these three characters subsist not, except by as many misrepresentations of our belief: for, in the first place, if we say we ought to satisfy the law, the whole world agrees in it, since all agree we ought to love, and the Scripture pronounces that "love or charity is the fulfilling of the law †." There is even an express chapter in the Apology which bears this title: "Of love and the fulfilling of the Law §." And we have just seen in it, that "the fulfilling of the law proceeds as the result of justification;" and this is there repeated in a hundred places, and cannot be called in question. But further, it is not true that we pretend, after one is justified, he satisfies the law of God in full rigour; since, on the contrary, we are taught by the Council of Trent that we are daily under the necessity of saying, "Forgive us our trespasses ||." So that, however

\* Præf. Apol. Conc. p. 48.

† Solid. repet. Conc. 633.

‡ Rom. xiii. 10.

§ Apol. 83. Ib. p. 137.

|| Sess. vi. c. 11.



perfect our justice may be, there is always something God amends in it by his grace, renews by his holy spirit, supplies by his bounty.

### 31.—*The merit of Condignity.*

As to the merit of condignity, besides that the Council of Trent has not made use of this term, the thing bears no difficulty, since, at the bottom, it is agreed upon, that after justification, that is, after the person has become agreeable, and the Holy Ghost dwells, and charity reigns in him, the Scripture attributes to him a kind of dignity: "They shall walk with me in white, because they are worthy\*." But the Council of Trent has clearly explained that all this worthiness proceeds from grace; and the Catholics have declared it to the Lutherans ever since the time of the Augsburg Confession, as appears from the history of David Chytræus, and from that of George Cælestin, both Lutheran authors †. Both these historians give an account of the confutation of the Augsburg Confession made by the Catholics at the Emperor's command, when they declare, "that man cannot merit eternal life by his own proper strength, and without the grace of God, and that all Catholics confess our works of themselves are not of any merit; but that the grace of God renders them worthy of life eternal."

### 32.—*The merit of Congruity.*

With regard to the good works we perform before we are justified—because the person then is neither agreeable nor just, on the contrary, is accounted still as in sin, and an enemy—in this state he is incapable of any true merit; and the merit of congruity or seemliness which divines allow in him, is not, in their opinion, any true merit, but a merit improperly so called, which has no further signification, than that it is suitable to the Divine Goodness to have a regard to the sighs and tears which he himself has inspired into the sinner who begins to be converted.

The same must be answered with regard to alms which a sinner bestows to "redeem his sins," according to the advice of Daniel ‡; and to that "charity which covereth the multitude of sins," according to St. Peter §; and forgiveness promised by Jesus Christ himself to "those who forgive their brethren ||."

\* Apoc. iii.

† Chyt. Hist. Conf. Aug. post Conf. Georg. Cæl. Hist. Conf. Aug. Aug. t. iii. :  
‡ Dan. iv.

§ 1 Peter iv. 8.

|| Luke vi. 37.

The Apology answers here, that Jesus Christ does not add "By doing alms, or by forgiving, one merits forgiveness, *ex opere operato*, in virtue of this action, but in virtue of faith\*." But who pretends otherwise? Who has ever said that good works, which please God, must not be done according to the spirit of faith, without which, as St. Paul says, "it is impossible to please God †?" Or who ever thought that these good works, and the faith which produces them, merited forgiveness of sins *ex opere operato*, and were capable of operating it of themselves? None so much as ever thought of employing this expression, *ex opere operato*, in the good works of the faithful: it was applied only to the Sacraments, which are nothing but instruments of God. It was employed to show that their action was divine, all-powerful, and effectual of itself; and nothing but a calumny, or gross ignorance, could suppose that in Catholic doctrine, good works wrought, after this manner, the forgiveness of sins, and justifying grace. God, who inspires them, has regard thereunto, of his bounty for the sake of Jesus Christ; not because we are worthy he should have a regard to them in order to justify us, but because it is worthy of him to look down with pity on humble hearts, and therein complete his own work. Such is the merit of congruity, which may be attributed to man even before he is justified. The thing, at bottom, is indisputable; and truly, if the term displeases, it is not used in the council of Trent, even by the Church herself.

### 33.—*The Mediation of Jesus Christ always necessary.*

But although God looks with another eye on sinners already justified, and the works which he then produces by his spirit dwelling in them tend more immediately to eternal life, it is not true, according to us, that a voluntary acceptance of them is not requisite on God's part, because all is here grounded, as says the council of Trent, on the promise which "God has made to us mercifully," that is, gratuitously, "for the sake of Jesus Christ ‡," of giving eternal life to our good works, without which we could not promise ourselves so high a recompense. Thus, when in the Confession of Augsburg, and the Apology §, it is everywhere objected against us, that after justification we believe we have no further need of Jesus Christ's mediation, we cannot be more visibly calum-

\* Resp. ad Arg.

‡ Conc. Trid. Sess. vi. c. 16.

† Heb. xi. 6.

§ Apol. Resp. ad Arg. p. 127.

niated; since, besides that it is through Jesus Christ alone we preserve the grace received, we stand in need of God's incessantly having a regard to that promise which he of his sole mercy, and by the blood of the Mediator, has made unto us in the new covenant.

34.—*How the merits of Jesus Christ appertain to us; and how they are imputed to us.*

In a word, whatever the Lutheran doctrine has that is good, had not only been entire in the Church, but also had been much better explained, inasmuch as all false ideas were clearly removed from it. The truth of this assertion appears principally in the doctrine of imputed justice. The Lutherans imagined they had discovered something wonderful and peculiar to themselves, when they said, "God imputed to us the justice of Jesus Christ, who had perfectly satisfied for us, and rendered his merits ours." Yet the Scholastics, so much censured by them, were full of this doctrine. Who amongst us has not ever believed and taught that Jesus Christ superabundantly satisfied for men, and that the Eternal Father, contented with this satisfaction of his Son, dealt with us as favourably as if we ourselves had satisfied his justice? If this be all that is understood, when the justice of Jesus Christ is said to be imputed to us, it is what no one doubted, nor should they have disturbed the whole world, nor taken on themselves the title of reformers, for so known and so avowed a doctrine. The council of Trent did acknowledge, with sufficient fulness, that "the merits of Jesus Christ, and of his passion" were rendered ours by justification, since it repeats so often, "that by it they are communicated to us," and without it none can be justified\*.

35.—*Justification, regeneration, sanctification, renovation, how in substance they are all the same grace.*

What Catholics, together with this council, understand, when, not satisfied with the simple imputation of the merits of Jesus Christ, they permit not that alone to be relied on, is, that God himself is not satisfied with that only; but in order to apply those merits to us, he at the same time regenerates us, visits us, renovates us, diffuses his holy spirit into us, which is the spirit of holiness, and by that means does sanctify us: and all this together in our doctrine makes up

\* Sess. vi. c. 3—7.

the justification of a sinner. This also was the doctrine of Luther and Melancthon \*. Those subtle distinctions between justification and regeneration or sanctification, in which at present the whole nicety of the Protestant doctrine is placed, were born after them, and since the confession of Augsburg. The Lutherans now acknowledge that these things were confounded by Luther and Melancthon, even in the Apology, so authentic a work of the whole party. Luther, indeed, thus defines justifying faith: "True faith is the work of God in us, by which we are renovated, and born again of God and the Holy Ghost. And this faith is that true justice which St. Paul calls the justice of God, and which God approveth." By this, therefore, we are both justified and regenerated at the same time; and since the Holy Ghost, that is, God himself acting in us, interposes in this work, it is no imputation out of us, as Protestants will now have it, but a work within us.

And as to the Apology, Melancthon repeats there in every page, "that faith justifies and regenerates us, and brings to us the Holy Spirit." And a little after, that "it regenerates hearts, and brings forth a new life †." And again, more clearly: "To be justified, is of unjust to be made just; and to be regenerated is to be declared and reputed just:" which shows that these two things concur together. Not the least appearance of the contrary is to be found in the confession of Augsburg; and there is nobody but perceives how well those ideas the Lutherans then had coincide with ours.

### 36.—*Satisfactory works acknowledged in the Apology, and Monks reckoned among the Saints.*

It seems as if they had separated farther on satisfactory works, and the austerities of a religious life; for they reject them frequently as contrary to the doctrine of gratuitous justification. But, in reality, they do not condemn them so severely as one might at first be induced to think; for not only St. Anthony, and the monks of the first ages, men of fruitful austerity, but also of these latter days, St. Bernard, St. Dominic, and St. Francis, are numbered amongst the holy fathers in the Apology. Their mode of life, far from being censured, is judged worthy of the saints, "because," say

\* Solid. Repet. Conc. p. 686. Epit. artic. Ibid. 185.

† Præf. in Epist. ad Rom. t. v. f. 97, 98.

‡ Cap. de Justif. Conc. pp. 68, 71, 72, 73, 74, 82. Cap. de Dilect. 83.

they, "it prevented them not from believing themselves justified by faith for the love of Jesus Christ §." A sentiment far removed from the excesses which we at this day witness in the new reformation, where they blush not to condemn St. Bernard, and rank St. Francis in the list of fools. True it is, after having placed these great men in the number of the holy fathers, the Apology condemns the monks who followed them, upon the pretence that "they believed they merited the forgiveness of sins, grace, and justice, by these works, and did not receive it gratuitously †." But the calumny is manifest, since the religious now-a-days still believe, as did those of old, together with the Catholic Church and the Council of Trent, that the forgiveness of sins is purely gratuitous, and given through the merits of Jesus Christ alone.

And that it may not be supposed the merit which we attribute to these works of penance was then disapproved of by the defenders of the Augsburg confession, they teach, in general, "of works and afflictions, that they do not MERIT justification, but other recompense; and of alms in particular, when they are done in the state of grace, "that they MERIT many benefits from God; THAT THEY MITIGATE PAINS; that they MERIT that we should be assisted against the perils of sin and death ‡." What prevents their saying as much of fasting and other mortifications? And all this, well understood, is nothing in substance, but what is taught by all Catholics.

37.—*The necessity of baptism, and the amissibility of justice taught in the Confession of Augsburg.*

Calvinists have departed from the true ideas of justification, by saying, as we shall see, that baptism is not necessary for little children; that justice once received is never lost, and, what is a consequence of this, that it is preserved even in crime. But the Lutherans, when they saw these errors spring up among the Anabaptist sects, condemned them by these three articles of the Confession of Augsburg:

"That baptism is necessary to salvation, and that they condemn the anabaptists who assert children may be saved without baptism, and out of the Church of Jesus Christ §."

"That they condemn the same anabaptists, who deny the Holy Ghost may be lost after a man is once justified ||."

"That those who fall into mortal sin are not just; that we ought to resist evil inclinations; that those who, contrary to

\* Apol. Resp. ad Arg. vi. 99. De Vot. Monast. 281.  
 † Ibid. p. 136. § Art. ix, p. 12.

† Apol. ibid.  
 || Art. xi. p. 13.

God's commandment, obey them, and act contrary to their conscience, are unjust, and have neither the Holy Ghost, nor faith, nor confidence in the divine mercy \*."

38.—*The inconsistencies of certainty, and of special faith, are not removed by the Augsburg Confession.*

One will be astonished to see so many articles of importance decided in the Augsburg Confession conformably to our sentiments; and truly, when I consider what it is which they have discovered, that is particular, I see nothing but that special faith of which we spoke at the commencement of this work, and the infallible certainty of the forgiveness of sins which they will have it to produce in consciences. And, indeed, it must be acknowledged this is what they give us as the capital point of Luther's doctrine, the masterpiece of his reformation, and the strongest foundation of piety and comfort to the faithful. However, no remedy was discovered against that terrible difficulty we at first observed,—in being assured of the forgiveness of sin, without ever being able to be certain of the sincerity of repentance. For after all, let imputation be what it may, it is certain that Jesus Christ imputes his justice to none but those who are penitent, and sincerely penitent, that is, sincerely contrite, sincerely afflicted for their sins, sincerely converted. Let this sincere repentance have in itself whatever of worth, perfection, merit, there may be, or let it not, I have sufficiently explained myself before on the subject, and shall add no more upon this occasion. Let it be either condition, or disposition and preparation, or in a word what you please, it concerns me not, since, whatever it may be, it must be had, or there is no forgiveness. But, according to the principles of Luther, I can never be assured whether I have or have it not; since, according to him, I can never know whether my repentance be not an illusion, the vain conceit of my own self-love; nor whether the sin I believe rooted out of my heart, reign not there more securely than ever, as it escapes my sight.

It is to no purpose to say with the Apology, "that faith is incompatible with mortal sin †;" now I have faith; therefore, I have not mortal sin. For it is from this springs all the difficulty, since it ought to be said on the contrary, "Faith is incompatible with mortal sin." It is what the Lutherans have now just taught. Now I am not assured that I have not mortal sin; it is what we have proved by

Art. vi. p. 12. Cap. de bon. Oper. p. 21.

† Apol. Cap. de Justif. 71—81.

the doctrine of Luther \*: I am not, therefore, certain that I have faith. In effect, they exclaim in the *Apology*, "Who loves God sufficiently? Who fears him sufficiently? Who suffers with sufficient patience?" Now, it may be said in the same manner, Who believes as he ought? Who believes sufficiently to be justified before God? And what follows in the *Apology* confirms this doubt; for it proceeds, "Who doubts not frequently whether it be God or chance that governs the world? Who doubts not frequently whether he shall be heard of God †?" Therefore, you doubt frequently of your own proper faith. How, then, are you assured of the forgiveness of your sins? You have not, therefore, this forgiveness; or else, contrary to the dogma of Luther, you have it without being assured you have it: or, which is the height of blindness, you are assured of it without being assured of the sincerity of your faith, or of that of your repentance; and so the forgiveness of sins becomes independent of both one and the other. See to what this certainty conducts us—this groundwork, on which is wholly built the Confession of Augsburg, this fundamental dogma of Lutheranism.

39.—*That, conformably to the principles of Lutherans themselves, the uncertainty acknowledged by the Catholics should give no trouble, nor disturb the repose of conscience.*

Now what they oppose to us, namely, that by the uncertainty, wherein we leave afflicted consciences, we cast them into trouble, or even into despair, is not true; and to this the Lutherans must agree, for this reason—because, however they may boast of the assurance they have of their justification, they dare not absolutely assure themselves of their perseverance, nor consequently of their eternal happiness. On the contrary, they condemn those who say, justice once received can never be lost ‡. But by this loss, one forfeits all right he had, as a justified person, to eternal inheritance. Therefore, one is never certain of not losing this right, since he is not certain that he shall never lose that justice to which it is annexed. Yet he hopes, however, for this blessed inheritance. In this sweet hope he lives happy, according to St. Paul, "rejoicing in hope §." Therefore, exclusive of this last assurance, which prohibits all kind of doubt, one may enjoy as much repose as the state of this life permits. †

\* Sup. Book I.

† Apol. Cap. de Justif. 91.

‡ Conf. Aug. Art. vi. 11. Cap. de Bon. Operib. pp. 12, 13, 21.

§ Rom. xii. 12.

40.—*What is the true repose of Conscience in Justification, and what certainty is received therein.*

Hence is seen what must be done in order to the acceptance of the promise, and the application of it; it is to believe, readily, that the grace of Christian justice, and, consequently, life eternal, belong to us in Jesus Christ: and not only to us in general, but also to us in particular. On the part of God, I acknowledge, there is no impediment to this ready and firm belief: heaven and earth shall pass away sooner than his promises fail us. But that we have no impediment, nothing to fear on our side, the terrible example of those who persevere not to the end, and who, according to the Lutherans, were not less justified than the elect themselves, evidently establishes the contrary. Here, then, in a few words, is the whole doctrine of justification. Although, to nourish humility in our hearts, we are always in fear as far as regards ourselves, with respect to God all things are made sure to us; so that our repose in this life consists in a firm confidence in his paternal goodness, and in a perfect resignation to his high and incomprehensible will, together with a profound adoration of this his impenetrable secret.

41.—*The Confession of Strasburg explains Justification like the Church of Rome.*

As to the Confession of Strasburg, if we consider its doctrine, we shall see how much reason there was, at the Conference of Marpurg, to accuse those of Strasburg, and the Sacramentarians in general, of understanding nothing of the justification as expounded by Luther and the Lutherans; for this confession of faith says not a word either of justice by imputation, or of the required certainty thereof. On the contrary, it defines justification to be that by which, “of unjust we become just, and of wicked good and upright\*,” without giving us any other idea of it. It adds, that it is gratuitous, and attributes it to faith; but to faith joined with charity, and fruitful in good works. Thus it says, with the Confession of Augsburg, “that charity is the fulfilling of the whole law, conformably to the doctrine of St. Paul†:” yet explains more strongly than Melancthon had done, how necessarily the law ought to be fulfilled, asserting “that no one can be completely saved, if he be not so guided by the spirit

\* See before, Book ii.

† Conf. Argent. cap. iii. et iv.



of Jesus Christ as not to fail in any of those good works, for the practising of which God has created us; and that it is so necessary the law should be fulfilled, that heaven and earth shall sooner pass away than an abatement be made in the least tittle of the law, or in one single iota." No Catholic ever spoke more strongly of the accomplishment of the law than this Confession. But, although this be the foundation of merit, Bucer spoke not a word of it there; though, elsewhere, he makes no difficulty of acknowledging it in the sense of St. Augustin, which is that of the Church.

42.—*Of Merit, according to Bucer.*

Whilst we are on this subject, it may not be unnecessary to consider what were the opinions of this Doctor, one of the chief leaders of the second party of the new Reformation, in a solemn conference, where he expressed his sentiments in these terms:—"Whereas, God will judge each one according to his works, we must not deny that good works performed by the grace of Jesus Christ, and which he himself operates in his servants, do *merit* eternal life; not, indeed, from their intrinsic worth, but from the acceptation and promise of God, and the covenant made with him: for it is to such works the Scripture promises the reward of eternal life, which in another respect, however, is a favour, because these good works, to which a recompense is given, are the gifts of God\*." This is what Bucer wrote in 1539, in the dispute of Leipsic, that it may not be supposed these things were written at the beginning of the Reformation, before they had time for reflection. Conformably to this same principle, the same Bucer decides, in another place, that it must not be denied but "one may be justified by works, as St. James teaches, since God will render to each man according to his works." And he proceeds,—“The question is not OF MERITS: we reject them not in any way, and even acknowledge that eternal life IS MERITED according to this saying of our Saviour, ‘He that shall leave off all for the love of me, shall have a hundred-fold in this life, and, hereafter, life everlasting†.’”

\* Disp. Lips. an. 1539.

† Resp. ad Abrinc.

43.—*Bucer undertakes to defend the Prayers of the Church, and shews in what sense the merits of the Saints profit us.*

The merits which every one may acquire for himself, and even with respect to eternal life, cannot be more clearly acknowledged. But Bucer advanced still farther; and, whereas the Church was accused of attributing merits to Saints, not only for themselves, but for others also, he justified it by these words:—"With regard to the public prayers of the Church, called Collects, where mention is made of the prayers and merits of the Saints; whereas, in these same prayers, whatever is intreated in that way, is intreated of God and not of the Saints, and, moreover, is intreated through Jesus Christ, by this all those who make this prayer acknowledge that all the merits of the Saints are gifts of God gratuitously granted." And, a little after, "For we, moreover, do confess and preach with joy, that God rewards the good works of his servants, not in themselves alone, but in those also for whom they pray, since he has promised he will do good to those who love him, to a thousand generations\*." Thus Bucer disputed for the Catholic Church in 1546, at the Conference of Ratisbon; and, indeed, these prayers were made by the greatest men of the Church, and in the most enlightened ages; and St. Augustin himself, however great an enemy he was to presumptuous merit, acknowledged, however, that the merits of the Saints were useful to us, when he said, "one of the reasons for celebrating in the Church the memory of martyrs, was in order that we might be associated to their merits, and assisted by their prayers†." Thus, let what may be said, the doctrine of Christian justice, of its works, and its merits, was acknowledged by both parties of the new Reformation; and what has since raised so much difficulty, at that time made none at all, or at most, if it did, it was from this cause alone,—that frequently, in the Reformation, men were swayed by the spirit of contradiction.

44.—*Strange doctrine of the Confession of Augsberg on the Love of God.*

I cannot here omit an odd doctrine of the Augsberg Confession on justification; namely, that not only the love of God was not necessary for it, but necessarily supposes it already

\* Disp. Ratisb.

† Lib. xx. contra Faust. Manich. 21.

accomplished. Luther had told us as much before; but Melancthon explains it at length in the Apology. "It is impossible to love God (says he), if, previously, one has not, by faith, the forgiveness of sins; for a heart that has a true feeling of an incensed Deity cannot love him—it must see him appeased: whilst he threatens, whilst he condemns, human nature cannot so far elevate itself as to love him in his wrath. It is an easy matter for idle contemplatives to imagine these dreams of the love of God, that a man guilty of mortal sin may love him above all things; because they are not sensible what the wrath and judgment of God are; but a troubled conscience perceives the vanity of these philosophical speculations." From this he concludes everywhere—"That it is impossible to love God, if, previously, one be not assured of forgiveness obtained\*."

That we are justified, therefore, before we have the least spark of divine love, is one of the niceties of Luther's justification: for the whole tenor of the Apology is not only to establish that one is justified before he loves, but, also, that it is impossible to love unless he be justified previously; insomuch that pardon offered with so great bounty can gain nothing on our hearts—we must have received it already to be capable of loving God. Not so speaks the Church in the Council of Trent:—"Man excited and assisted by grace (says this Council), believes all that God has revealed, and all he has promised; and this he believes before all things, that the impious man is justified by the grace, by the redemption which is in Christ Jesus. Conscious, then, to himself, that he is a sinner, from that justice by which he is alarmed, he turns himself towards the Divine mercy, which raises up his hope IN THE CONFIDENCE HE HAS THAT GOD WILL BE PROPITIOUS TO HIM THROUGH JESUS CHRIST, and he begins to love him as the author of all justice †," namely, as the gracious being who gratuitously justifies the impious. This love, so happily commenced, moves him to detest his crimes; he receives the sacrament—he is justified. Charity is gratuitously diffused into his heart by the Holy Ghost; and having commenced to love God when he offered to him his grace, he loves him still more when he has received it.

\* Art. v. 20. cap. de bon. Oper. Synt. Gen. ii. 2nd part. Apol. cap. de Justif. p. 81.

† Sess. vi. cap. 6.

45.—*Another error in the Lutheran Justification.*

But here is a new *finesse* of the Lutheran justification. St. Augustin, after St. Paul, establishes, that one of the differences of Christian justice from that of the law, is, that the justice of the law is built on the spirit of fear and terror; whereas, Christian justice is inspired by the spirit of affection and love. But the Apology expounds it in a different way; and that justice, to which the love of God is judged necessary, into which it enters, in which consist its purity and truth, is there throughout represented as the justice of works, the justice of reason, justice through its own proper merits; in a word, as the justice of the law, a Pharisaical justice. These were new ideas, with which Christianity was as yet unacquainted: a justice which the Holy Ghost infuses into our hearts, by infusing charity, is a Pharisaical justice, which cleanses but the exterior; a justice infused gratuitously into our hearts for the sake of Jesus Christ, is a justice of reason, a legal justice, a justice through works; and, finally, they accuse us of maintaining a justice by its own proper powers, whereas it appears clearly from the Council of Trent, that we maintain a justice which has faith for its foundation, grace for its principal cause, the Holy Ghost for its author from its very beginning, even to the last perfection to which it can arrive in this life.

I believe it now appears how necessary it was to give a clear idea of the Lutheran justification from the Confession of Augsburg and Apology, because, as this exposition has fully discovered that in an article which is considered by the Lutherans as the masterpiece of their Reformation, after all nothing has been done except to calumniate us in some points, to justify us in others, and even in those, when some dispute may still remain, evidently to leave us the advantage.

46.—*The Lutherans acknowledge the Sacrament of Penance, and Sacramental Absolution.*

Besides this principal article, there are others in the Augsburg Confession or Apology of the highest importance: for example, that “particular absolution ought to be retained in confession; that to reject it as an error of the Novatians, and a condemned error; that this absolution is a true sacrament, and properly so called; that the power of the keys remits sins, not only in the sight of the Church, but also in the

sight of God\*." As to their reproaching us with maintaining that "this sacrament conferred grace without any good motive on the part of him who receives it," I believe the reader is already tired with hearing a calumny already refuted so frequently.

47.—*Confession, with the necessity of enumerating Sins.*

As to what is taught in the same place, that confession being retained, "the enumeration of sins ought not to be exacted in it, because the thing is impossible, according to these words, 'Who is there that knoweth his sins †?'" For sins that are not known, this was indeed a good excuse, but no sufficient reason for not subjecting to the keys of the Church those that are known. And, truly, it must be candidly acknowledged, neither Luther nor the Lutherans differ in sentiments from us on this subject; since, in Luther's little Catechism, which is unanimously received by the whole party, we find these words:—"In the sight of God we must hold ourselves guilty of our hidden sins; but, with respect to the Minister, we must confess those only which are known to us, and which we feel within our hearts ‡." And, the better to discover the Lutheran conformity with us in the administration of this sacrament, it will not be irrelevant to consider the absolution, which, as the same Luther, in the same place, sets it down, the confessor gives the penitent, after confession, in these terms:—"Do you not believe that my forgiveness is that of God?" Yes! answers the penitent. "And I," replies the confessor, "by the orders of our Lord Jesus Christ, forgive you your sins, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost§."

48.—*The Seven Sacraments.*

For the number of sacraments, the Apology teaches us that Baptism, the Supper, and Absolution are three true sacraments. Here is a fourth, since "No difficulty ought to be made of admitting Orders into this rank, by taking it for the ministry of the word, because it is commanded of God, and has great promises ||." Confirmation and Extreme Unction are specified as "ceremonies received by the fathers," which, however, have not an express promise of grace. I know not,

\* Art. xi. xii. xxii. Gen. p. 21. Apol. de Pœnit. p. 167, 200, 201.

† Conf. Aug. art. xi. cap. de Conf.

‡ Cat. Min. Concord. p. 378.

§ Ibid. p. 380.

|| Apol. cap. de Num. Sac. ad art. 13. p. 200 et seq.

then, what can be the meaning of these words of St. James's epistle concerning the unction of the sick: "If he be in sin, it shall be forgiven him\*;" but the thing was, perhaps, that Luther had no opinion of this epistle, though the Church had never called it in question. This daring Reformer cut off from the canon of Scriptures whatever did not accord with his opinions; and it is on account of this Unction that he writes, in his Captivity of Babylon, without the least testimony of antiquity, "that this epistle seems not to be St. James's, nor worthy of the apostolic spirit †."

As for Marriage, those of the Augsburg Confession acknowledge its divine institution, its promises too, yet temporal; as if it were a temporal concern to bring up in the Church the children of God, and to save one's own soul in thus taking care of them ‡; or that one of the fruits of Christian matrimony were not to provide that the children born in it be named saints, as destined to sanctity §.

But the Apology, at bottom, seems not much to oppose our doctrine concerning the number of the sacraments, "provided," it says, "this sentiment, which predominates throughout the whole Pontifical kingdom, be rejected, that the sacraments operate grace without any good motion of him that receives them ||." For they are never tired with making us this unjust reproach. It is there they place the whole stress of the question; that is, were it not for the false ideas of our adversaries, scarce any difficulty would remain about it.

#### 49.—*Monastic Vows, and that of Contineny.*

Luther had expressed himself in a revolting manner against monastic vows, even to say on that of Contineny, (stop your ears, chaste souls!) that "it was as impossible for one to keep it as to divest himself of his sex ¶." Modesty would be offended should I repeat the words he, in many places, makes use of on this subject; and to see how he delivers himself on the impossibility of continence. For my own part, I know not what will become of that life he says he led without reproach, during the whole time of his celibacy, and to the forty-fifth year of his age. Be this as it may, all is softened in the Apology, since not only St. Antony and St. Bernard, but also St. Dominic and St. Francis, are there numbered among the saints; and all that is required from their

\* James v. 18.

§ 1 Cor. vii, 14.

† De C. Babyl. t. xi. 86.

|| Apol. p. 203.

‡ 1 Tim. ii. 15.

¶ Ep. ad Vol. t. vii. p. 505.

disciples is, that, after their example, they seek the forgiveness of their sins from the gratuitous bounty of God, which the Church has too well provided for to fear any reproach on that head\*.

50.—*St. Bernard, St. Francis, St. Bonaventure, placed by Luther amongst the Saints; his strange doubt regarding the Salvation of St. Thomas of Aquin.*

This place of the Apology merits attention, those of the latter ages being there placed on the list of saints, so that the Church which brought them forth and nourished them at her breast, is acknowledged for the True Church. Luther could not refuse this glorious title to these great men. He enumerates everywhere among the saints, not St. Bernard only, but also St. Francis, St. Bonaventure, and others of the thirteenth century. St. Francis, above all, seemed to him an admirable man, and animated with a wonderful fervour of spirit. He carries down his praises as far as Gerson, the same that, in the Council of Constance, had condemned Wickliff and John Huss, and calls him “a great man in every respect †.” Thus the Church of Rome was still the mother of saints in the fifteenth century. There is but St. Thomas of Aquin of whom Luther would doubt; for what reason I know not, unless it were that this saint was a Dominican, and Luther could not forget the sharp disputes he had held with that order. Whatever it might be, “he knows not (so he says) if Thomas be damned or saved ‡:” though, doubtless, he made no other kind of vows than the other religious, had said no other mass, and had taught no other faith.

51.—*The Lutheran Mass.*

To return to the Augsburg Confession and the Apology, even the article of the Mass is passed over there so lightly, that it can scarcely be perceived that Protestants designed any change in it. They commence by complaining of the “unjust reproach against them of abolishing the mass.”—“It is celebrated (say they) amongst us with extreme reverence, and in it are preserved almost all the ordinary ceremonies §.” In reality, when, in 1523, Luther reformed the

\* Apol. resp. ad Arg. p. 99. De Vot. Mon. p. 281.

† Thess. 1522. t. i. p. 377, adv. Paris Theologast. t. ii. p. 193, de abrog. Miss. priv. primo Tract. Ibid. 258, 259, de Vot. Mon. Ibid. 271, 278.

‡ Præf. adv. Latom. Ibid. 243.

§ Cap. de Miss.

mass, and drew up his formula\*, scarcely anything was altered by him that struck the eyes of the people. The Introit was there retained, the Kyrie, the Collect, the Epistle, the Gospel, with the wax candles and incense, if they pleased; the Credo, the Preaching, the Prayers, the Preface, the Sanctus, the Words of Consecration, the Elevation, the Lord's Prayer, the Agnus Dei, the Communion, the Thanksgiving. Such is the order of the Lutheran mass, which exteriorly appeared little different from ours; moreover, the singing was retained, and even in Latin: and this is what was said of it in the Confession of Augsburg,—“Together with the chanting in Latin, are mingled prayers in the German tongue, for the instruction of the people. In this mass we see the altar ornaments and sacerdotal garments, and great care was taken to retain them, as appeared from their practice, and the conferences then held†.” What is still more, nothing was said in the Augsburg Confession against the oblation; on the contrary, it is insinuated in this passage cited from the tripartite history:—“In the city of Alexandria they assemble together on Wednesday and Friday, and the whole service is then performed, except the solemn oblation‡.” The reason was, they were unwilling to discover to the people that they had made any alteration in the public service. To judge by the Augsburg Confession alone, it might seem that masses only, without communicants, were objected to, “which were abolished (said they) because they were scarcely ever celebrated but for lucre§;” so that, on considering merely the terms of the Confession, one would have said that nothing except the abuse was the object of attack.

53.—*The Oblation, how taken away.*

Meanwhile, those words, in which there is mention of the oblation made to God of the proposed gifts, were cut off from the canon of the mass. But the people, always struck exteriorly with the same objects, attended not to it at the commencement; and to render, however, this change supportable to them, it was insinuated that “the canon was not the same in all churches; that the canon of the Greeks differed from that of the Latins—and even among the Latins, that of Milan from that of Rome||.” This was done to amuse the ignorant; but they did not think proper to acquaint

\* Form. Miss. t. ii.

† Chyt. Hist. Conf. Aug.

‡ Conf. Aug. cap. de Miss. ibid.

§ Ibid.

|| Consult Lut. apud Chyt. Hist. Aug. Conf. tit. de Canone.



them that these canons or liturgies had none other than accidental differences; that all the liturgies agreed unanimously as to the oblation, which was made to God of the proposed gifts before they were distributed; and this is what they changed in practice, without daring to acknowledge as much in the public Confession.

53.—*What was invented in order to render the Oblation in the Mass odious.*

But, in order to render this oblation odious, they would pretend to make the Church believe she attributed to it “a merit of remitting sins, without the necessity of bringing to it either faith or any good motive;” which was repeated three times in the Confession of Augsburg, and they omitted not in the Apology to inculcate the same—insinuating that Catholics admitted the mass for no other reason than to extinguish piety.

In the Confession of Augsburg they even attribute to the Catholics this strange doctrine, “That Jesus Christ had satisfied for original sin in his passion, and had instituted the mass for mortal and venial sins, which were committed every day \*;” as if Jesus Christ had not equally satisfied for all sins; and, by way of a necessary elucidation, they added, that Jesus Christ had offered himself to bear the cross, “not for original sin only, but for all others too †,” a truth of which none ever doubted. It is not a matter of surprise that the Catholics, as Lutherans themselves relate, on hearing this reproach, all, as if with one common voice, cried out against it, saying, “That never had such a thing been heard among them ‡.” But the people were to be made believe that these wretched Catholics were even ignorant of the first elements of Christianity.

54.—*The Prayer and Oblation for the Dead.*

Now, whereas the faithful, at all times, had the oblation made for the dead deeply impressed upon their minds, the Protestants would not seem to be ignorant of, or conceal a thing so well known, and in the Apology spoke of it in these terms—“With regard to what is objected against us concerning oblation for the dead having been practised by the Fathers, we acknow-

\* Conf. Aug. edit. Gen. cap. de Miss. p. 25. Apol. cap. de Sacram. et Sacrif. et de Vocab. Miss. p. 269.

† Conf. Aug. in tit. Conc. cap. de Miss.

‡ Chyt. Hist. Conf.

ledge that they prayed for the dead, AND WE PREVENT NONE FROM NOW DOING IT; but we do not approve of the application of the Lord's Supper for the dead, in virtue of the action, *ex opere operato*\*." Here every thing abounds with artifice: for, in the first place, whilst they say they do not prevent this prayer, they had it cut off from the canon, and by so doing defaced a practice as ancient as the Church. Secondly, the objection spoke of the oblation, and their answer is concerning prayer, not daring to let the people see that antiquity had offered for the dead; because that was too convincing a proof that the Eucharist was profitable even to those who received not the communion.

55.—*The Lutherans reject the doctrine of Acrius, contrary to Prayer for the Dead.*

But the following words of the Apology are remarkable: "Unjustly do our adversaries reproach us with the condemnation of Acrius, whom they will have condemned for denying that the mass was to be offered for the living and the dead. This is their custom—to oppose the ancient heretics against us, and to compare our doctrine with theirs. St. Epiphanius declares, that Acrius taught that prayers for the dead were unprofitable. We support not Acrius, but dispute against you—who say, contrary to the doctrine of the Prophets, of the Apostles and Fathers, that the mass justifies men in virtue of the action, and merits the forgiveness of sinners, to whom it is applied, of the guilt and pain, provided they put no obstacle to it †." Thus is an imposition practised upon the ignorant. If it were not the intention of the Lutherans to maintain Acrius, why do they maintain this particular dogma, which this Arian heretic had added to the Arian heresy—"That we ought not to pray or offer up oblations for the dead ‡?" This is what St. Augustin relates of Acrius after St. Epiphanius, of whom he had given an epitome. If they reject Acrius, if they dare not support a heretic condemned by the holy Fathers, they ought to replace in the Liturgy, not only prayer, but also the oblation for the dead.

56.—*How the Oblation of the Eucharist is profitable to the whole world.*

But here is the great subject of complaint in the Apology: namely, say they, that St. Epiphanius, by condemning

\* Apol. c. de Voc. Miss. p. 274.

† Ibid.

‡ Aug. Lib. de Hær. 53, Ep. Hær. 75.

Aerius, did not assert as you do, "That the mass justifies men in virtue of the action, *ex opere operato*, and merits for the wicked to whom it is applied, the forgiveness of the guilt and the pain, provided they put no obstacle thereto." To hear them speak, one would say, that the mass of itself was to justify all kind of sinners for whom it is said, without their so much as thinking of it. But where is the advantage of thus deceiving men? The manner, say we, by which the mass is profitable, even to those who think not of it, even the most wicked, contains no difficulty at all. It is profitable to them like prayer, which certainly we should never offer for the most obdurate sinners, did we not suppose it could obtain of God that grace which would overcome their obduracy of heart, if they did not resist it, and which often obtains it so abundantly as to prevent their resistance. It is thus the oblation of the Eucharist is profitable to the absent, the dead, and even sinners themselves; because, in reality, the consecration of the Eucharist, placing before the eyes of God so agreeable an object as the Body and Blood of his Son, carries with it a most powerful manner of intercession, which, however, sinful men too often render useless by the impediment which they oppose to its efficacy.

What could be offensive in this manner of explaining the effect of the mass? As for those who converted so pure a doctrine to sordid gain, Protestants know very well the Church did not approve of them; and for masses without communicants, the Catholics told them ever since that time, what since has been confirmed at Trent, that if none communicate at it, it is not the fault of the Church; "since, on the contrary, she wished the assistants would communicate at the mass they hear\*:" so that the Church resembles a rich benefactor, who always keeps an open table, and ready served, although the guests come not to it.

The whole artifice of the Augsburg Confession, concerning the mass, is now seen: it consists in scarcely touching the exterior; in changing the interior, even what was most ancient, without apprising the people of the alteration; in accusing Catholics of the grossest errors—even so as to make them say, contrary to their own principles, that "the mass justified the sinner," (a thing always reserved to the sacraments of Baptism and Penance,) and that too without any good motive, in order to make the Church and her Liturgy more odious.

\* Cŕyt. Hist. Conf. Cath. c. de Miss. Conc. Trid. Sess. 22. c. 6.

57.—*A horrible calumny, grounded on Prayers made to Saints.*

They were not less industrious in disfiguring the other parts of our doctrine, and particularly that of prayer to the saints. "There are those," says the Apology, "who attribute downright divinity to the saints, by saying, they see in us the hidden thoughts\* of our hearts." Where are those divines, who attribute to saints the seeing of the hidden secrets of hearts like to God, or seeing them otherwise than by that light he imparts to them, as, when he pleased, he did to the Prophets? "They make the saints," said they, "not only intercessors, but also the MEDIATORS OF REDEMPTION. They devised that Jesus Christ was more difficult, and the saints more easy, to be appeased; they confide more in the mercy of the saints, than in that of Jesus Christ; and, FLYING FROM JESUS CHRIST, they seek the saints†." It is unnecessary to justify the Church from these abominable excesses. But to remove all doubt that this was literally Catholic doctrine, "We speak not now," added they, "of popular abuses; we speak of the opinion of doctors." And a little after, "They exhort to confide more in the mercy of the saints than in that of Jesus Christ. They enjoin to trust in the merits of the saints, as if we were reputed just by reason of their merits, as we are reputed just by reason of the merits of Jesus Christ." After imputing such excesses to us, they say gravely, "We invent nothing; they state in the indulgences that the merits of the saints are applied to us‡." A little equity would have enabled them to see in what manner the merits of the saints are useful to us; and Bucer himself, an unsuspected author, has sufficiently vindicated us from the reproach which they objected to us on that head.

58.—*Calumnies regarding Images, and a gross imposture with respect to Invocation of Saints.*

But their object was to exasperate and irritate the minds of men; and, therefore, they further add, "From the invocation of saints they proceeded to images. They honoured them, and believed there was a certain virtue in them, as the magicians make us believe there is in the images of the constellations when they are made at a certain time§."

\* Ad Art. xxi. c. de Invoc. SS. p. 225.

† Ibid.

‡ Ad Art. xxi. cap. de Invoc.

§ Ibid. 229.

Thus they excited the public hatred. It must be acknowledged, however, that the Confession of Augsburg proceeded not to this extremity; and that these images were not so much as mentioned in it. To satisfy the party, something more severe must be said in the Apology. Particular care however was taken not to let the people see that these prayers, addressed to the saints, that they might pray for us, were common in the ancient church. On the contrary, they spoke of it as "a new custom, introduced without the testimony of the Fathers, and of which nothing had been seen before St. Gregory, that is, before the seventh century\*." The people were not yet accustomed to despise the authority of the ancient church; and the Reformation, as yet timorous, revered the great names of the Fathers. But now it assumed boldness, and knew not how to blush; insomuch that they have conceded to us the fourth century, and are not ashamed to assure us that St. Basil, St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, in a word, all the Fathers of this so venerable an AGE, have, with the invocation of saints, set up, in the new idolatry, the reign of Antichrist †.

59.—*The Lutherans durst not reject the authority of the Church of Rome.*

Then, and during the time of the Augsburg Confession, the Protestants boasted, that they had on their side the holy Fathers, chiefly in the article of justification, which they esteemed most essential; and they not only pretended the ancient church was for them, but thus concluded the exposition of their doctrine. "Such is the abridgment of our faith, where nothing will be seen contrary to Scripture, nor to the Catholic Church, nor even to THE CHURCH OF ROME as far as she can be known from her writers ‡." The matter which is the subject of dispute regards some few abuses, which, without any certain authority, have been introduced into the churches; and though there should be some difference, it ought to be tolerated, since it is not necessary that church rites should be everywhere the same §."

In another edition are read these words: "WE DESPISE NOT THE CONSENT OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH, nor will we maintain the impious and seditious opinions she has condemned; for it is not irregular passions, but the authority of

\* Ad Art. xxi. cap. de Invoc.

† Dall. de Cult. Satin. Josep. Mida in Comment. ap. Jur. Acc. de Prop..

‡ Conf. Aug. Art. xxi. edit. Gen. p. 22. § Apol. Resp. ad Arg. p. 141. &c.

God's word, and OF THE ANCIENT CHURCH, that has moved us to embrace this doctrine, in order to increase the glory of God, and provide for the advantage of pious souls in the Universal Church \*."

Also in the Apology, after the exposition of the article of Justification, considered without comparison the most important, they said, "That it was the doctrine of the Prophets, the Apostles, and the Holy Fathers, of St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, and the greatest part of the other Fathers, and of the whole Church, who acknowledged Jesus Christ for propitiator, and author of justification; and that all which was approved by the Pope, some cardinals, bishops, divines, or monks, was not to be taken for the doctrine of the Church of Rome †:" whereby particular opinions were manifestly distinguished from the received and constant doctrine, with which they professed not to interfere.

60.—*Memorable words of Luther, acknowledging the true Church in the Communion of Rome.*

The people, therefore, still believed they followed in every thing the sentiments of the Fathers, the authority of the Catholic Church, and even that of the Church of Rome, a veneration for which was deeply imprinted upon all minds. Even Luther himself, however arrogant and rebellious, returned at times to his good sense, and manifested plainly, that the ancient veneration, which he had formerly entertained for the church, was not wholly extinguished. About the year 1534, so many years since his revolt, and four years after the Confession of Augsburg, was published his treatise for abolishing the Private Mass. It is the same in which he relates his famous conference with the prince of darkness ‡. There, though so much incensed against the Catholic Church, even so far as to hold it for the seat of Antichrist and abomination, so far from taking from it the title of Church, on that account, he concluded, on the contrary, "That she was the true church, the pillar and ground of truth, and the most holy place. In this church," continued he, "God miraculously preserves baptism, the text of the Gospel in all languages, the remission of sins, and absolution as well in Confession as in public; the Sacrament of the altar towards Easter, and three or four times a year, though one kind has been taken away from the people; the vocation and

\* Edit. Gen. Art. xxi. p. 22.

† Apol. Resp. ad Arg. p. 141.

‡ Tr. de Missa, t. vii. p. 236 et seq.

ordination of pastors, comfort in the agony of death; the image of the crucifix, and at the same time the remembrance of the death and passion of Jesus Christ: the Psalter, Lord's Prayer, the Symbol, the Decalogue, and many pious canticles in Latin and high Dutch." And a little after: "Where the true relics of saints are to be found, there, without doubt, has been, and still is, the Holy Church of Jesus Christ; there the saints have dwelt; for the institutions and sacraments of Jesus Christ are there, excepting one kind that has been forcibly taken away. For which reason it is certain, Jesus Christ has been there present, and his Holy Spirit there does preserve his true knowledge, and the true faith in his elect." Far from looking on the cross put into the hands of dying persons as an object of idolatry, he, on the contrary, holds it for a monument of piety, and a wholesome admonition, that recalled to our minds the death and passion of Jesus Christ. As yet, the revolt had not extinguished in his heart those good remnants of the piety and doctrine of the church; nor am I surprised that, in the frontispiece of all the volumes of his works, he is represented, with the Elector his master, kneeling before a crucifix.

#### 61.—*Both kinds.*

As to what he says of taking away one kind, the Reformation found itself very much embarrassed about this article, and this is what was said of it in the Apology: "We excuse the church, which, not being able to receive both kinds, has suffered this injury; but we excuse not the authors of this prohibition\*."

To comprehend the mystery of this part of the Apology, but few words are necessary. Its author, Melancthon, writes to Luther, consulting him on this subject, whilst the Catholics and Protestants were disputing it at Augsburg. "Eckius believed, said he, that communion under one or both kinds should be held for indifferent. Which I would not allow; and yet I excused those who hitherto, through error, had received but one; for they exclaimed, we condemned the whole church †."

They durst not then condemn the whole church: they abhorred the very thought; which led Melancthon to this pure expedient of excusing the Church in an error. What more could those who condemn her say, since the error here

\* Cap. de utriusque Specie, p. 235.

† Mel. lib. i. Ep. 15.

meant, is supposed to be an error in faith, and an error tending even to the entire subversion of so great a sacrament as that of the Eucharist? But no other method was to be found; Luther approved it; and the better to excuse the church, which communicated under one kind only, he joined the violence she suffered from her pastors in that point, to the error into which she was led: thus she was admirably excused, and by this method the promises of Jesus Christ never to abandon her were excellently well preserved.

The words of Luther in reply to Melancthon merit observation: "They cry out, that we condemn the whole church." The whole world was astonished at this. "But," answers Luther, "we say that the Church being oppressed and deprived by violence of one kind, ought to be excused; as we excuse the synagogue in not having observed all the ceremonies of the law during the captivity of Babylon, when she had it not in her power\*."

The example was unhappily cited; for certainly those who detained the synagogue captive were not of her body, as the pastors of the church, whom they here represented as her oppressors, were of the body of the church. Again, the synagogue, though externally under control as to its observances, was not on that account drawn *into error*, as Melancthon maintained the church had been, in being deprived of one kind: but, in short, the article passed. Lest they should condemn the church, it was agreed to excuse her, as to the error she had been in, and *the injury* which had been done her; and the whole party subscribed to this answer of the Apology.

All this but little coincided with the eighth article of the Augsburg Confession, where it is declared, "That there is one Holy Church, which shall remain for ever. Now the Church is the assembly of the Saints, where the Gospel is taught, and the sacraments rightly administered †." To salve this idea of the church, not only the people were to be excused, but the sacraments also were to be well administered by the pastors; and if that of the Eucharist did not subsist under one kind alone, no longer could the Church herself be made to subsist.

\* Resp. Luth. ad Mel. t. ii.; Sleid. lib. vii, p. 112.

† Conf. Aug. Art. vii.



62.—*The body of the Lutherans submit themselves in the Augsburg Confession to the judgment of the General Council.*

The difficulty in condemning the doctrine of the church was not less pressing, and this was the reason that the Protestants durst not acknowledge, that their confession of faith was opposite to the Church of Rome, or that they had withdrawn themselves from her. They endeavoured to have it believed, as we have just seen, that they were not distinguished but by certain rites and some slight observances. And, moreover, to show they always pretended to make one body with her, they openly submitted to her council.

This appears in the Preface of the Confession of Augsburg, addressed to Charles V. “Your imperial majesty has declared, that you could determine nothing in this affair, wherein religion was concerned, but would have recourse to the Pope, to procure the convention of an universal council. You repeated the same declaration in the last year in the last diet held at Spire, and manifested that you persisted in the resolution of procuring this assembly of a general council: adding that the affairs between you and the Pope being concluded, you believed he might easily be induced to call a general council.” By this it is seen what council it was, of which there was question. It was a general council, to be assembled by the Pope, and the Protestants submitted themselves to it in these terms: “If matters of religion cannot be amicably arranged with our parties, we offer in all obedience to your imperial majesty, to appear and plead our own cause before such a general, free, and Christian council.” And, finally, “It is to this general council, and to your imperial majesty conjointly, that we have and do appeal, and we adhere to this appeal\*.” When they spoke in this manner, it was not their intention to give the emperor authority to pronounce on the articles of faith: but upon appealing to the council, they also named the emperor in their appeal, as the person who was to procure the convocation of this holy assembly, and whom they solicited to retain in the meantime all things in suspense. So solemn a declaration will remain for ever upon record in the most authentic act the Lutherans have ever made, and in the very front of the Augsburg Confession, in testimony against them, and in

\* Præf. Conf. Aug. Concord. p. 8.

acknowledgment of the inviolable authority of the church. All then submitted to it, and whatever might be done before her decision arrived, was all provisional. With this specious appearance they retained the people, and perhaps even deceived themselves. They involved themselves still further, however, and the horror they had for schism diminished daily. After they had been accustomed to it, and the party had gained strength by treaties and leagues, the Church was forgotten; all they had said of her holy authority vanished like a dream, and the title "of a free and Christian Council," used by them, became a pretext to render their calling for a council illusory, as will be seen hereafter.

63.—*The conclusion of this matter : how useful it ought to be in reclaiming the Lutherans.*

This is the history of the Augsburg Confession and of its Apology. We see the Lutherans would relinquish many things, and almost all, I dare say, should they only take the trouble to lay aside the calumnies with which they there charge us, and comprehend fully the dogmas in which they are so visibly conformable to our doctrine. If they had been advised by Melancthon, they would have drawn still nearer to Catholics, for he spoke not all he wished; and whilst he was labouring at the Confession of Augsburg, he, himself, writing to Luther, concerning the Articles of Faith, which he entreated him to revise, "They must," says he, "be often changed, and fitted to the occasion\*." Thus did they patch up this famous Confession of Faith, which is the foundation of the Protestant religion; and thus were the dogmas therein treated. Melancthon was not permitted to soften matters as he wished:—"I changed something," says he, "every day, and changed again, and should have changed much more if our companions would have suffered me †." "But," proceeded he, "they are concerned at nothing;" the meaning was, as he explained it everywhere, that, without foreseeing what might happen, they thought of nothing but carrying all to extremities; for which reason Melancthon, as he acknowledges himself, "was always oppressed with cruel anxieties, endless cares, and insupportable regrets ‡." Luther held him under greater restraints than all the rest together. We see, in the letters which he wrote to him, that he knew not how to assuage this proud spirit; some-

\* Lib. i. Ep. 2.

† Lib. iv. Ep. 95.

‡ Ibid.

times he was carried against Melancthon "into such a passion, that he even refused to read his letter\*." Express messengers were sent to him in vain; they returned without an answer; and under these restraints the unfortunate Melancthon, who did all he could to check the impetuosity of his master, and of the party, always weeping and sighing, wrote the Confession of Augsburg.

\* Lib. i. Ep. 6.

## BOOK IV.

[From the year 1530 to 1537.]

A brief summary—The Protestant Leagues, and the resolution of taking up arms warranted by Luther.—Melancthon's embarrassment upon these new projects so contrary to the first plans.—Bucer displays his Equivocations, in order to unite the whole Protestant party and the Sacramentarians with the Lutherans.—They are equally rejected by Zuinglius and Luther.—Bucer at length deceives Luther, by acknowledging that the unworthy do receive the Truth of the Body.—The Agreement of Wittenburg concluded on that foundation.—Whilst they are returning to the opinion of Luther, Melancthon begins to doubt of it, however subscribes every thing required by Luther.—The Articles of Smalkald, and Luther's new explication of the Real Presence.—Melancthon's limitation of the Article which regards the Pope.

- 
- 1.—*The Leagues of the Protestants after the Decree of the Diet of Augsburg, and the resolution of taking up arms approved by Luther.*

RIGOROUS was the decree of the Diet of Augsburg against Protestants. As the Emperor then set up a kind of defensive league with all the Catholic states against the new religion, the Protestants, on their part, resolved more than ever to unite among themselves. But the division regarding the Lord's Supper, which had broken out so openly at the Diet, was a perpetual obstacle to the reunion of the whole party. The Landgrave, in no way scrupulous, made his treaty with those of Basil, Zurich, and Strasburg. But Luther would not hear it mentioned; and the Elector, John Frederick, persisted in the resolution of making no league with them: in order, therefore, to settle this matter, the Landgrave dispatched Bucer, the great negotiator of those times in matters of religion, who, by his orders, had an interview with Zuinglius and Luther\*.

\* Recess, Arg. Sleid, Lib. vii. 3.

At this time a little pamphlet of Luther's put all Germany in a ferment. We have seen the great success of his doctrine had made him believe that the Church of Rome was going to fall of itself; and he then maintained strongly that arms ought not to be employed in the cause of the Gospel, not even to defend themselves against oppression\*. The Lutherans agree, that nothing was more inculcated in his writings than this maxim. He was desirous of giving his new church this beautiful character of primitive Christianity; but he could not adhere to it long. Immediately after the Diet †, and while Protestants were labouring to form the league of Smalkald, Luther declared, that although he had constantly taught hitherto, "it was not allowable to resist lawful powers, at present he referred to the lawyers, to whose maxims he was a stranger when he wrote his first works: moreover, that the Gospel was not contrary to political laws; and in such bad times one might be brought to extremity, when not only the civil law, but conscience also, would oblige the Faithful to take up arms, and associate themselves against all those who should make war upon them, even against the Emperor †." The letter, which Luther had written against George Duke of Saxony §, had already given a full evidence that the evangelical patience, so boasted of in their first writings, was considered by them as at an end; but that was a letter written to a private individual only. Here, however, is a public writing, by which Luther authorised those who took up arms against their prince.

2.—*Melancthon's concern at these new resolutions of war.*

If we credit Melancthon, Luther had not been consulted particularly about the leagues; the affair was somewhat paliated to him, and this writing came forth without his knowledge. But either Melancthon spoke not all he knew, or all was not discovered to Melancthon. It is certain, from Sleidan, that Luther was expressly consulted; nor is it found that his writing was published by any but himself, and truly who would have dared to do it without his orders? This writing set all Germany in a flame. Melancthon complained of it, but in vain. "To what purpose," says he, "was the circulation of this writing throughout all Germany? Ought the alarm to have thus been sounded to excite all the towns to make confederacies ¶?" It was with difficulty he

\* Lib. i. n. 3. ii. 9.

† Sleid. Lib. vii. viii.

‡ Sleid. Lib. vii. 117.

§ Sleid. Lib. ii. n. 42.

¶ Lib. iv. Ep. 3. Lib. vii. 117.

¶ Lib. iv. Ep. 3.

was brought to renounce that beautiful idea of reformation Luther had instilled into him, and which he had so well maintained, when he wrote to the Landgrave, "That it was better to suffer every thing than to take up arms in the cause of the Gospel\*." He had said as much about the leagues the Protestants were treating about, and which he had endeavoured to prevent, as far as he was able, at the time of the Diet of Spire, to which he had been conducted by his Prince, the Elector of Saxony. "It is my opinion," said he, "that all good men ought to oppose these leagues †:" but in such a party these fine sentiments could not be supported. When it was seen that prophecies went on too slowly, and Luther's blast was too weak to cast down this so much detested Papacy, instead of entering into themselves, they permitted themselves to be carried away by the most violent measures. At length Melancthon hesitated, but not without extreme reluctance: nay, the agitation he showed while these confederacies were forming excited compassion: he writes to his friend Camerarius, "We are no longer consulted about the question—whether or not it be lawful to defend ourselves by making war: there may be just reasons for it. So great is the malice of some, that should they find us defenceless, they would be capable of any enterprise. Strange are the aberrations of men, and their ignorance extreme! None are touched with this saying—'Be not solicitous, for your heavenly Father knoweth what is needful for you.' Man believes not himself secure unless he has good and secure supports. In this weakness of minds our theological maxims could never make themselves be heard ‡." Then he ought to have opened his eyes, and seen that the new Reformation, incapable of maintaining the maxims of the Gospel, was not what he imagined it to be until then. But let us attend to the following part of the letter: "I will not," says he, "condemn any person; neither do I believe the precautions of our people ought to be blamed, provided that they do nothing that is criminal, which we shall well know how to provide against." No doubt these Doctors know perfectly well how to withhold armed soldiers, how to set bounds to the ambition of princes, after they have engaged them in a civil war. Alas! if this war itself was a crime, according to the maxims he had always maintained, could he hope to prevent crimes during the course of this war? But he durst not admit his party to be in the wrong; and after he was unable to frus-

\* Lib. iii. Ep. 16.

† Lib. iv. Ep. 85. 3. Ib. Ep. 85.

‡ Lib. iv. Ep. 110.

trate their resolutions to a war, he found himself under the obligation of supporting them by arguments. This caused him to sigh. "Oh!" says he, "how well did I foresee, at Augsburg, all these commotions!" It was then he so bitterly lamented the transports of his friends, who pushed all to extremities, and were, said he, "concerned at nothing." For this he wept incessantly; nor could Luther, with all the letters he wrote, give him relief. His grief increased when he saw so many projects of leagues warranted by Luther himself. But, "in conclusion, my dear Camerarius," thus he finishes his letter, "this thesis is wholly singular, and may be considered several ways, for which reason we must pray to God\*."

His friend Camerarius, in his heart, approved no more than he of these warlike preparations; and Melancthon did always what he could to support him. Above all, Luther was to be excused. A few days after the above letter, he acquaints the same Camerarius, "That Luther had written extremely moderately, and it was with great difficulty they had extorted his determination from him. I believe," says he, "you see completely we are not in error. In my opinion, we ought to give ourselves no more concern about these same leagues; and, truly, such is the present conjuncture, that, in my opinion, we ought not to condemn them. So let us again pray to God †."

Very right; but God holds in derision prayers made to him in deprecation of public calamities, when we do not oppose such proceedings as bring them on us. What do I say? When we approve, when we subscribe to them, though with reluctance. Melancthon was sensible of this; and troubled, as well for what he himself, as what others did, intreats his friend to comfort and support him. "Write to me often," thus he speaks; "I have no ease but from your letters."

### 3.—*Bucer's negotiations—The death of Zuinglius in battle.*

This, then, was a point determined in the new Reformation, that it was lawful to take up arms, and necessary to join in leagues. At this period Bucer entered upon his negotiations with Luther; and whether it was that he found him inclined to peace with the Zuinglians, from a desire to form a strong league, or that by some other means he was able to meet him in good humour, he obtained from him fair words. He sets

\* Lib. iv. Ep. iii.

† Ibid.

off immediately to obtain the adhesion of Zuinglius; but the negotiation was interrupted by the war that intervened between the Catholic and Protestant cantons. The latter, though stronger, were vanquished; Zuinglius was killed in battle, and manifested, that however warm a disputant, he was no less bold a combatant. The party found it difficult to defend, in a pastor of souls, this unbecoming bravery, and the excuse was, that he followed the Protestant army in the capacity of a minister, rather than that of a soldier\*; but, after all, it was certain that he had advanced far into the hottest of the engagement, and died sword in hand. His death was followed by that of Cœcolampadius. Luther says he was beaten to death by the Devil, whose assault he was unable to resist†; and others, that he died of grief, being unable to support the anguish which so many troubles brought upon him. In Germany, the peace of Nuremberg moderated the rigours of the decree of the Diet of Augsburg; but the Zuinglians were not included in this agreement, either by Catholics or Lutherans; and the Elector, John Frederick, obstinately refused to admit them into the league until they should have agreed with Luther in the article of the Real Presence. Bucer, not desponding, pursued his object, and, by all possible ways, laboured to surmount this only obstacle to the reunion of the party. To persuade either party was deemed impossible, and already fruitlessly attempted at Marpurg. A mutual toleration, each one retaining his own sentiments, had been rejected there by Luther with contempt, who persisted to say, with Melancthon, that this would be injurious to the truth, which he defended. No other method was left for Bucer, but to have recourse to equivocation, and to acknowledge the substantial presence so as to leave himself a way of escaping.

4.—*The grounds of Bucer's equivocations, in order to reconcile parties.*

The plan he adopted to effect so considerable a concession is surprising. It was an ordinary discourse with the Sacramentarians, that they ought to be cautious not to place simple signs in the sacraments. Zuinglius himself had made no difficulty of acknowledging something more in them; and, to verify his words, some promise of grace annexed to

\* Hosp. ad an. 1521.

† Tr. de abrog. Miss. t. vii. p. 230.



the sacraments was sufficient. The example of baptism sufficiently proved this. But, whereas the Eucharist was not only instituted as a sign of grace, but, moreover, was called the body and blood,—not to be a simple sign, it was necessary the body and blood should be received in it. It was said, therefore, they were received by faith: the true body was therefore received, for Jesus Christ had not two. When they had come so far as to say the true body of Jesus Christ was received by faith, they acknowledged the proper substance was received. To receive it, without it being present, was a thing incomprehensible. Behold, then, said Bucer, Jesus Christ substantially present. There was no further occasion for speaking of faith; it was sufficient to understand it. Thus did Bucer, absolutely and without restriction, acknowledge the real and substantial presence of our Lord's body and blood in the Eucharist, although they were only in heaven; which, however, was afterwards softened by him. In this manner, without admitting anything new, he changed his whole language; and, by habituating himself to speak like Luther, began at length to say, they never had understood each other, and that this long discussion, which had caused so much excitation, was nothing but a dispute on words.

5.—*The agreement Bucer proposes is only in words.*

He had spoken more justly, had he said their agreement was in words only; since, after all, this substance, which was said to be present, was as distant from the Eucharist as heaven is from earth, and was no more received by the faithful than the substance of the sun is received by the eye. It is what Luther and Melancthon said. The first called the Sacramentarians a double-tongued faction\*, on account of their equivocations; and said, "They made a devilish game with the words of our Lord †." "The presence, which Bucer admits," says the latter, "is but a presence in word, and a presence of virtue. But it is the presence of the body and blood, and not that of their virtue, which we require. If this body of Jesus Christ be nowhere else but in heaven, and is not with the bread, nor in the bread,—if, finally, it is not to be found in the Eucharist but by the contemplation of faith, it is nothing but an imaginary presence."

\* Luth. Ep. ad Sen. Francof. Hosp. ad 1533, 128.

† Ep. Mel. apud Hosp. 1530, 110.

6.—*Equivocation on spiritual presence and real presence.*

Bucer and his companions were displeased that what was done by faith was here called imaginary, as if faith were nothing but a simple imagination. "Is it not enough (said Bucer) that Jesus Christ is present to the pure spirit and to the soul elevated on high\*?" There was much equivocation in these words. The Lutherans agreed that the presence of the body and blood, in the Eucharist, was above the senses, and of a nature not to be perceived but by the mind and by faith; but required, however, that Jesus Christ should be present, in the sacrament, in his proper substance. Whereas Bucer would not have him present, indeed, elsewhere than in heaven, where the mind, by faith, sought him; which had nothing in it that was real, nothing that answered to the idea given by these sacred words,—“This is my body, this is my blood.”

7.—*The presence of the body, how spiritual.*

But that which is spiritual, is it not real also? and is there nothing real in baptism, because there is nothing in it that is corporeal? Another equivocation.—Spiritual things, such as Grace and the Holy Ghost, are as present as they can be, when they are spiritually present. But what is a body present in spirit only, if not a body absent in reality, and present only in thought? a presence which cannot, without fallacy, be called real and substantial. But would you, then, said Bucer, have Jesus Christ corporeally present, and do not yourselves acknowledge the presence of his body in the Eucharist to be spiritual? Neither Luther, with his companions, no more than the Catholics, denied that the presence of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist was spiritual as to the manner, provided it were granted to them, that it was corporeal as to the substance; that is, in more plain words, the body of Jesus Christ was present, but in a divine, supernatural, incomprehensible manner, which the senses could not reach; spiritual, inasmuch as the mind alone, subject to faith, could know it, and that its end was entirely celestial. St. Paul had justly called the human body, raised from the dead, “a spiritual body†,” on account of the qualities with which it was invested, divine, supernatural, and above the reach of the senses: with much more reason, the body of our Saviour, placed after so incomprehensible a manner in the Eucharist, might be so called.

\* Ep. Mel. p. 3.

† 1 Cor. xv. 44, 46.

8.—*If the presence of the body be only spiritual, the words of the institution are nugatory.*

Again, all they said of the mind being elevated on high, to seek Jesus Christ at the right hand of his Father, was no more than a metaphor, not at all capable of representing a substantial reception of the body and blood, since this body and blood remained only in heaven, as the soul, united to its body, remained only on earth; nor was there any more a true and substantial union between the faithful and the body of the Lord, than if there never had been an Eucharist, and Jesus Christ had never said, "This is my body." Let us suppose these words had never been uttered by him at all; the presence, by the mind and by faith, would still subsist in a manner entirely similar, and never mortal man have dreamt of calling it substantial. Now, if the words of Jesus Christ oblige us to more strong expressions, it is because they grant us what would not have been given without them, namely, the proper body and the proper blood, whose immolation and effusion have saved us on the cross.

9.—*Whether a local presence were to be admitted.*

Two fruitful sources of cavilling and equivocation remained for Bucer; one in the word local, and the other in the word sacrament or mystery. Luther and the defenders of the real presence never had pretended that the body of our Lord was contained in the Eucharist as in a place to which it was commensurate, and in which it was comprehended after the ordinary manner of bodies; on the contrary, they believed nothing to be in the flesh of our Lord which was distributed to them at the holy table, but the simple and pure substance, together with the grace and life with which it abounded; nay, more than this, divested of all sensible qualities and modes of existence with which we are acquainted. Accordingly, Luther easily granted to Bucer that the presence under debate was not local, provided it were granted to him it was substantial; and Bucer strongly insisted on the exclusion of local presence, believing he had weakened as much by this as he had been forced to allow of the substantial presence. He even made use of this artifice to exclude the oral manducation of our Lord's body. He conceived it to be not only useless, but even gross, carnal, and little worthy of the spirit of Christianity; as if this sacred pledge of the flesh and

blood, offered on the cross, which our Saviour still gave us in the Eucharist, to certify to us that the victim and immolation of it were wholly ours, had been a thing unworthy of a Christian; or that this presence ceased to be true, under pretext that, in a mystery of faith, God had not designed to make it sensible; or, lastly, that a Christian was not touched with this inestimable token of divine love, because it was not known to him otherwise than by the word alone of Jesus Christ: things so far distant from the spirit of Christianity, that the grossness of their minds is inconceivable who, not able to relish them, look on others, that do, as gross minded.

#### 10.—*Equivocation on the word Sacrament and Mystery.*

The other source of equivocation was in the words Sacrament and Mystery. Sacrament, in the ordinary acceptation, means a sacred sign: but in the Latin language, from which this word is taken, sacrament often signifies a high, secret, and impenetrable thing. This also is the signification of the word mystery. The Greeks have no other word to express sacrament than that of mystery; and the Latin fathers frequently call the mystery of the Incarnation the sacrament of the Incarnation, and so of the rest.

Bucer and his followers thought they had gained their point, when they said the Eucharist was a mystery, or a sacrament of the body and blood: or, that the presence acknowledged in it, and the union then effected with Jesus Christ, was a sacramental presence and union; and, on the contrary, the defenders of the Real Presence, both Catholics and Lutherans, understood it to be a presence and union, real, substantial, and properly so called; but hidden, secret, mysterious, supernatural in its manner, and spiritual in its end, proper, in a word, to this sacrament; and it was for all these reasons that they called it sacramental.

Far, therefore, were they from denying that the Eucharist was a mystery in the same sense as the Trinity and Incarnation; namely, a thing high as well as secret, and altogether incomprehensible to the mind of man.

#### 11.—*The Eucharist is a sign, and how?*

Nor did they even deny that it was a sacred sign of the body and blood of our Lord; for they knew that the sign does not always exclude the presence; on the contrary, there are signs of such a nature as denote the thing present. When it is said, a sick person has given signs of life, the

meaning is, from these signs it is seen that the soul is still present in its proper and true substance. The external acts of religion are intended to manifest, that truly we have religion in our hearts; and when the angels appeared in human shape, under this appearance, which represented them to us, they were in person present. Thus, the defenders of the literal sense spoke nothing incredible, when they taught that the sacred symbols of the Eucharist, accompanied with these words, "This is my body, this is my blood," denote to us Jesus Christ present, and that the sign is most closely and inseparably united to the thing.

12.—*All the Mysteries of Jesus Christ are signs in certain respects.*

It must be acknowledged still further, that what is most true in the Christian religion, if I may so speak, is both together a mystery, and a sacred sign. The incarnation of Jesus Christ figures to us that perfect union we ought to have with the Divinity in grace and glory. His birth and death are the figure of our spiritual birth and death. If, in the mystery of the Eucharist, he condescends to approach our bodies in his own proper flesh and blood, thereby he invites us to the union of minds, and figures it unto us. In a word, until we have arrived to the full and manifest truth, which will render us for ever happy, every truth will be to us the figure of a truth more intimate: we shall not taste Jesus Christ all pure and in his proper form, and entirely disengaged from figure, until we shall see him, in the fulness of his glory, at the right hand of his Father: for which reason, if in the Eucharist he is given to us in substance and in truth, it is under a foreign species. This is a great Sacrament and great Mystery, in which, under the form of bread, is hidden from us a true body; in which, in the body of a man, the majesty and power of a God are hidden from us; in which such great things are performed after a manner impenetrable to human senses.

13.—*Bucer plays with words.*

What latitude for the equivocations of Bucer, in these several significations of the words Sacrament and Mystery! And how many evasions might not be prepared from terms, which each one wrested to serve his own purpose! If he granted a real and substantial presence and union, though he did not always express that he understood it by faith, he believed he saved all, by adding to expressions the word Sacramental;

this done, he exclaimed, they disputed only on words, and how strange it was they should disturb the Church, and prevent the progress of the Reformation, for so frivolous a dispute.

14.—*Æcolampadius had warned Bucer of the fallacy there was in his equivocations.*

No person would credit him in this. Not only Luther and the Lutherans laughed at his pretence, that the whole Eucharistic dispute was only a dispute on words,—even those of his own party told him plainly he imposed on the world by his substantial presence, which, after all, was only a presence by faith. Æcolampadius had observed how much he had confused the subject by this his substantial presence of the body and blood, and a little before he died, had written to him, that, in the Eucharist, there was only for those “Who believed, an effectual promise of the remission of sins, by the body given, and the blood shed; that our souls were nourished therewith, and our bodies associated to the resurrection by the Holy Ghost: that we thus received the true body, and not bread only, nor a simple figure,” (he took good care not to say that we received it substantially); “that in truth the wicked received but a figure; but that Jesus Christ was present to those who were his, as God, who strengthens and who governs us\*.”

This was all the presence Æcolampadius would allow, who concluded in these words: “This is all, my dear Bucer, we can grant the Lutherans.—Obscurity is dangerous to our Churches. Act after such a manner, my dear brother, as not to deceive our hopes.”

15.—*The sentiments of those of Zurich.*

Those of Zurich declared to him with still greater freedom, that it was an illusion to say, as he did, that this dispute was only verbal, and warned him that his expressions led him to the doctrine of Luther, to which he arrived at length, but not so soon. Then they raised loud complaints of Luther, who would not treat them like brethren; yet, however, acknowledged him “for an excellent servant of God †;” but it was observed by the party, this suavity served only to make him “more inhuman and more insolent ‡.”

\* Epist. Æcol. ap. Hosp. an. 1520. 112.

† Ep. ad March. Brand. ib.

‡ Hosp. 127.

16.—*The Confession of Faith of those of Basil.*

Those of Basil showed themselves far removed both from the sentiments of Luther and the equivocations of Bucer. In the Confession of Faith, which is placed in the collection of Geneva in the year 1532, and in Hospinian's history in the year 1534, because, perhaps, it was published for the first time in the one of these two years, and renewed in the other, they say, that "as water remains in Baptism, where the forgiveness of sins is offered to us; so the bread and wine remain in the Supper, where, with the bread and wine, the true body and true blood of Jesus Christ are figured to us, and offered by the minister\*." To explain this more plainly they add, "Our souls are nourished with the body and blood of Jesus Christ, by a true faith," and by way of elucidation put in the margin, "That Jesus Christ is present in the Supper, but sacramentally, and by the remembrance of faith, which raises man up to heaven, and does not take Jesus Christ from thence."—Finally, they conclude by saying, "That they confine not the natural, true and substantial body of Jesus Christ in the bread and wine, nor adore Jesus Christ in the signs of bread and wine, commonly called the Sacrament of the body and blood of Jesus Christ; but in heaven at the right hand of God his Father, whence he shall come to judge the living and the dead." This is what Bucer would neither say, nor explain clearly; that Jesus Christ, as man, was nowhere than in heaven, although, as far as a judgment can be formed, he was then of that opinion. But he plunged still more deeply into notions so metaphysical, that neither Scotus, nor the most refined Scotists, came near to him; and all his equivocations turned on these abstracted ideas.

17.—*Luther's Conference with the Devil.*

At this time Luther published his book against private mass, where that famous conference is to be found, which he formerly had with the angel of darkness, and where, convinced by his reasons, he abolishes, like an impious wretch, that mass he had said for so many years with so much devotion, if we may believe him †. It is surprising to see how seriously and lively he describes his awakening, as in a surprise, in the dead of the night; the manifest apparition of

\* Conf. Bas. 1532. Art. ii. Synt. i. Part 72. † De abrog. Miss. priv. t. vii. p. 226.

the devil to dispute against him. "The terror with which he was seized,\* his sweat, his trembling, and the horrible palpitation of his heart in this dispute; the strong arguments of the demon, who leaves no repose to the mind; the sound of his thundering voice; his oppressive ways of arguing, when he makes both question and answer perceptible at once. I then was sensible," says he, "how it so often happens that men die suddenly towards the dawn of day: it is by means of the devil, who can kill and strangle them, and without all that, by his disputes reduce them to such difficulties, that it is enough to cause death, as I have many times experienced." He informs us in passing, that the devil frequently attacked him in this manner, and to judge of the other attacks by this, it is to be believed he had learned many things from him besides the condemnation of the mass. It is here he attributes to the evil spirit the sudden death of Cœcolampadius, as well as that of Emzer, formerly so great an enemy to Lutheranism in its birth. I mean not to enlarge on so trite a subject: I am satisfied with having observed, that God, for the confusion, or rather for the conversion of the enemies of the Church, has permitted Luther to fall into so great a blindness, as to acknowledge, I do not say, that he was frequently tormented by the devil, which might be common to him with many saints; but what is peculiar to him, that he was converted by his industry, and that the spirit of falsehood had been his tutor in one of the principal points of his reformation.

In vain do they pretend here, that the devil disputed against Luther, only to overwhelm him with despair, by convincing him of his crime; for the dispute had not that tendency. When Luther appears convinced, and unable to answer anything more, the devil presses no farther, and Luther rests satisfied he had learned a truth of which he was before ignorant. If this be true, how horrible to be tutored by such a master! If Luther fancied it, what illusions, what dismal thoughts occupied his mind! If he invented it, how sad a story had he to boast of!

18.—*The Swiss are incensed against Luther.*

The Swiss were scandalized at the conference of Luther, not so much because the devil appeared there in the capacity of a doctor: they were embarrassed enough to defend themselves against a similar vision, of which Zuinglius boasted\*,

\* Hosp. ad an. 1533. 131.



as we have already seen ; but they could not endure the manner in which he there treated *Ceolampadius*. Most severe libels came out on this subject : but *Bucer* went on negotiating ; and through his mediation a conference was held at *Constance*, for the reunion of both parties. There, those of *Zurich* declared they would compromise with *Luther*, provided, on his side, he would grant them three points : one, that the flesh of *Jesus Christ* was not eaten but by faith ; another, that *Jesus Christ*, as man, was only in a particular place of heaven ; the third, that he was present in the *Eucharist*, by faith, in a manner proper to the sacraments. These words were plain and void of equivocation. The other *Swiss*, and in particular those of *Basil*, gave their joint approbation to so clear a proposal. And, indeed, it was wholly conformable to the *Basil Confession of Faith* : but, although this confession gave a perfect idea of the doctrine of the figurative sense, those of *Basil*, who had drawn it up, failed not to draw up another, two years after, on the occasion we are going to relate.

19.—*Another Basil Confession of Faith, and the former modif*

In 1536, *Bucer* and *Capito* came from *Strasburg*. These two celebrated architects of the most refined equivocations, taking occasion from the *Confessions of faith*, which the churches separated from *Rome* prepared to send to the council which the *Pope* had just convened, solicited the *Swiss* to make one, “which might be so framed as to assist the agreement they had considerable hopes of effecting\* ;” that is, it was proper to select such terms as the *Lutherans*, ardent defenders of the *Real Presence*, might take in good part. With this view, a new *Confession of Faith* was drawn up, which is the second of *Basil* ; the expressions we have related in the first, which specified, too precisely, that *Jesus Christ* was not present, except in *Heaven*, and that nothing but a *Sacramental Presence*, and by remembrance only, was to be acknowledged in the *Sacrament*, are here retrenched. In reality, the *Swiss* appeared strongly intent on asserting, as they had done in the first *Basil Confession*, “that the body of *Jesus Christ* is not contained in the bread.” Had they used these terms without some modification, the *Lutherans* would easily have perceived their object was directly to oppose the *Real Presence* ; but *Bucer* had expedients for every thing. By his insinuations, those of *Basil* were determined to say, “That the Body and

\* *Synt. Conf. Gen. de Helv. Conf. Hosp. Part ii. 141.*

Blood are not naturally united to the Bread and Wine ; but that the Bread and Wine are symbols, by which Jesus Christ himself gave us a true communication of his Body and Blood, not to serve as a perishable nourishment to the stomach, but to be a food of life eternal \*." The remainder is nothing but a somewhat long application of the fruits of the Eucharist, which all the world receives.

20.—*Equivocation on this Confession of Faith.*

There was not here so much as one word to which the Lutherans might not agree ; for they do not pretend the body of Jesus Christ is a food for our stomachs, but teach that Jesus Christ is united to the bread and wine, in an incomprehensible, celestial, and supernatural manner ; so as, it may well be said, without offending them, that he is not " naturally united " to them. The Swiss proceeded no farther ; so that, by means of this expression, the article passed in terms a Lutheran might admit, and wherein nothing else, at most, could be desired, but more precise and less general expressions. Of the substantial Presence, a thing discussed at that time, they would say neither good nor evil ; this was all Bucer could gain of them. Afterwards, they neither adhered to the first nor the second Confession of Faith, which they had published by mutual agreement ; and in due time we shall see a third make its appearance, with quite new expressions.

21.—*Each one followed the Impressions of his Guide.*

Those of Zurich, taught by Zuinglius, and full of his spirit, made no compromise with Bucer ; and instead of drawing up, like those of Basil, a new Confession of Faith, to manifest how they persevered in the doctrine of their master, they published that which he had sent to Francis I., which has been mentioned already ; and in which he will admit of no other presence in the Eucharist, than that which is made " by the contemplation " of Faith, clearly excluding the substantial presence. Thus they continued to speak naturally. They alone did so among all the defenders of the figurative sense ; and it may be seen at this time, how, in the new Reformation, every Church acted according to the impression received from their respective masters. Luther and Zuin-

\* Conf. Bas. 1536. Art. xxii. Synt. p. 1, 70.

glius, ardent, and in extremes, inspired the Lutherans and those of Zurich with similar dispositions, and rejected all temperate measures: if Ocolampadius were more gentle, those of Basil were on that account more pliant; and the people of Strasburg entered into all the mitigations, or rather all the equivocations and fallacies of Bucer.

22.—*Bucer acknowledges that the unworthy really receive the Body.*

He carried the thing so far, that, after granting all that could be desired, on the real, essential, and substantial, even natural presence, that is, the presence of Jesus Christ according to his nature, he found out expedients to make the faithful, unworthily communicating, receive him really. He required only that the impious and infidels, for whom this holy mystery was not instituted, should be excepted: yet, however, said he was resolved, even in that point, to have no difference with any person\*.

1536. With all these explications, it is not surprising he appeased Luther, until then implacable. Luther believed the Sacramentarians truly came over to the doctrine of the Augsburg Confession and Apology. Melancthon, with whom Bucer was negotiating, acquainted him that he found Luther more tractable, and that he began to speak more amicably of him and his companions. At last the assembly of Wittemberg, in Saxony, was held, at which the deputies of the German churches, on both sides, were present †. Luther at first spoke in a lofty tone. He would have Bucer and his companions declare that they retracted, and entirely rejected all they said to him of the thing itself, as being not so much the subject of discussion as the manner. But at length, after much discussion, in which Bucer displayed all his pliancy, Luther took those articles, which this minister and his companions granted him, for a retractation.

23.—*The Agreement of Wittemberg, and its Six Articles.*

1. "That, according to the words of St. Irenæus, the Eucharist consists of two things—the one terrestrial, and the other celestial; and, by consequence, the body and blood of Jesus Christ are truly and substantially present, given, and received with the bread and wine."

\* Hosp. Part ii. fol. 135.

† Hosp. an. 1535, 1536.

2. "That, although they had rejected Transubstantiation, and did not believe that the body of Jesus Christ was contained locally in the bread, or had with the bread any union of long continuance out of the use of the sacrament, it ought, however, to be acknowledged that the bread was the body of Jesus Christ, by a sacramental union; that is, that the bread being present, the body of Jesus Christ was at the same time present, and truly given."

3. They add, however, "That out of the use of the sacrament, whilst it is kept in the ciborium, or shewn in processions, they believe it is not the body of Jesus Christ."

4. They concluded by saying "That this institution of the sacrament has its force in the church, and depends not on the worthiness or unworthiness of the minister, nor of him who receives."

5. "That as for the unworthy, who, according to St. Paul, truly eat the sacrament, the body and blood of Jesus Christ are truly presented to them, and **THEY TRULY RECEIVE THEM**, when the words of Christ's institution are observed\*."

6. "That, however, they take it to their judgment," as says the same St. Paul, "because they abuse the sacrament, by taking it without repentance, and **WITHOUT FAITH**."

24.—*Bucer deceives Luther, and evades the terms of agreement.*

Luther, it seems, had nothing more to desire. When they grant him that the Eucharist consists of two things—the one heavenly and the other terrestrial, and from this conclude, that the body of Jesus Christ is substantially present with the bread, they manifest sufficiently that he is not present only to the mind, and by faith. But Luther, who was not unacquainted with the subtleties of the Sacramentarians, urges them on still further, and induces them to say, that those even "who have not faith, do, however, truly receive the body of our Lord †."

One would not have suspected they believed the body of Jesus Christ was not present to us but by faith, since they acknowledged that it was present and truly received by those who were without repentance, and without faith. After this avowal of the Sacramentarians, Luther easily believed that he had nothing more to demand, and judged they said all that was necessary to confess the reality: but he had not as yet sufficiently understood that these Doctors had particular

\* Hosp. p. ii. an. 1535. f. 145. in Lib. Conc. 729.

† Art. i. Art. v. et vi.

secrets to explain every thing. However lucid the words of agreement appeared to him, Bucer had reserved a way of escaping. He has published several writings, where he acquaints his friends in what sense he understood each word of the agreement: he there declares, that "Those who, according to St. Paul, are guilty of the body and blood, receive not only the sacrament, but the thing itself indeed, and are not without faith; although," says he, "they have not that lively faith which saves us, nor a true devotion of heart\*."

Who would ever have believed that the defenders of the figurative sense could have acknowledged a true reception of the body and blood of our Lord in the Supper, without having the faith which saves us? What! is a faith, which is unable to justify us, sufficient, according to their principles, to communicate Jesus Christ truly to us? Their whole doctrine contradicts this sentiment of Bucer. Nor can this minister, however subtle, possibly reconcile what he says here with his other maxims. But it is not my object, in this place, to examine the subtleties by which Bucer extricates himself from the agreement of Wittemberg: I am content with remarking this undoubted fact—that all the churches of Germany, which defended the figurative sense, assembled in a body, by their deputies agreed, in an authentic act, "That the body and blood of Jesus Christ are truly and substantially present, given, and received in the Supper, with the bread and wine; and that the unworthy, who are WITHOUT FAITH, do, however, receive this body and this blood, provided they adhere to the words of the institution."

If these expressions can accord with the figurative presence, henceforth it is no longer known what is the meaning of words, and all things may be discovered in anything. Men, who have accustomed themselves to wrest in this manner human language, will make the Scripture and Fathers speak what they please; nor must we be surprised at so many violent interpretations they give to the most plain passages.

25.—*Calvin's Sentiments on Equivocations in matters of Faith.*

Whether Bucer had a settled design of amusing the world with these affected equivocations, or whether some confused idea of the reality induced him to believe he might safely subscribe these expressions, so evidently contrary to the figu-

\* Buc. Declar. Conc. Vit. Id. ap. Hosp. an. 1536. 148, et seq.

native sense, I leave the Protestants to determine. Certain it is, Calvin, his friend, and, in some manner, his disciple also, when he wished to express a reprehensible obscurity in a profession of faith, said, "There was nothing so embarrassed, so ambiguous, so intricate in Bucer himself\*."

These artificial ambiguities were so congenial to the spirit of the new reformation, that Melancthon himself, naturally the most sincere of men, who had most condemned equivocations in matters of faith, permitted himself to be drawn into them contrary to his inclinations. We find a letter of his in 1541, where he writes that nothing is more unworthy of the church, "than to use equivocations in Confessions of Faith, and to draw up articles which required other articles to explain them; that it was establishing peace in appearance, and in fact exciting war;" and, in short, that it was "similar to the false council of Sirmium and the Arians, mingling truth with error †." His judgment was certainly correct; and, at the same time, however, when the first assembly of Ratisbon was held, to reconcile the Catholic religion with the Protestant, "Melancthon and Bucer (it is not Catholics that write it, but Calvin, who was present, and the intimate friend of both) composed, on transubstantiation, equivocal and deceitful forms of faith, in order to satisfy, if possible, their adversaries in conceding nothing to them ‡." Calvin was the first to condemn these affected obscurities and shameful dissimulations: "With reason," says he, "you blame the obscurities of Bucer §." "It must be spoken freely," says he in another place, "it is not lawful to embarrass that with obscure and equivocal words which requires light; those who would hold a medium, forsake the defence of truth ||." And with regard to those snares just mentioned, which Bucer and Melancthon, by their ambiguous discourses, laid for the Catholics nominated to confer with them at Ratisbon, this is what the same Calvin says of them: "As to myself, I do not approve of their design, although they have their reasons; for they hope the points of discussion will emit light, and be elucidated of themselves. For this reason they pass over many things, and fear not these ambiguities: they do it with a good design, but yield too much to the times ¶." Thus did the authors of the new Reformation, with very bad reasons, either practise or excuse the most criminal of all dissimulations—that is, affected equivocations in points of faith. We shall learn from what follows, if Calvin, who seems as much op-

\* Ep. Cal. p. 50. † Lib. i. Ep. 25. 1541. Ib. Ep. 76. ‡ Ep. Cal. p. 38.  
§ Ep. p. 50. || Ibid. ¶ Ep. p. 38.

posed to the practice himself, as he is indulgent to it in others, will always continue of the same opinion; and we must return to the artifices of Bucer.

26.—*Whether the Presence be permanent in the Eucharist.*

In the midst of the advantages he conceded to the Lutherans in the Agreement of Wittemberg, he gained at least one thing which Luther let pass,—that the body and blood of Jesus Christ had no permanent union, out of the sacramental use, with the bread and wine; and that the body was not present, when shown, or carried in procession\*. This was not the sentiment of Luther; till then he had always taught that the body of Jesus Christ was present from the time the words were said, and remained present till the species was altered †; so that, according to him, “he was present even when carried in procession,” although he would not approve that custom. And truly, if the body was present in virtue of the words of institution, and these words be understood according to the letter, as Luther maintained it, it is clear the body of Jesus Christ ought to be present at the instant he says, “This is my body,” since he does not say, “This will be,” but “This is.” It was suitable to the power and majesty of Jesus Christ, that his words should have a present effect, and the effect subsist as long as things should remain in the same state. Nor was it ever doubted, from the earliest times of Christianity, that the portion of the Eucharist reserved for the communion of the sick, and for that which the faithful practised daily in their houses, was as much the true body of our Saviour as that distributed to them at church. Luther had always understood it thus; and yet he was induced, I know not how, to tolerate the contrary opinions which Bucer proposed at the time of the agreement.

27.—*Sequel—Conclusion of the Agreement.*

He would not, however, permit him to say that the body was not in the Eucharist, except precisely at the time of using it, that is, in the reception; but only “that, out of the sacramental use, there was no permanent union between the bread and the body ‡.” This union subsisted, therefore, out of the use, that is, out of communion; and Luther, who made the holy sacrament be elevated, and adored, even at the time the

\* Art. ii. 3. † Luth. Ser. cont. Lucr. et Ep. ad quend. Hosp. ii. p. 14, 44, 132  
‡ Form. Miss. b. ii. Hosp. an. 1536. p. 148

Agreement was framing, would not permit it should be denied him, that Jesus Christ was there present during these ceremonies; but in order to take away the presence of the body of our Lord in the tabernacles and procession of Catholics, which was the object of Bucer, it was sufficient to permit him to say, that the presence of the body and blood in the bread and wine was not of long duration.

Now, had it been asked of these doctors how long, therefore, this presence was to remain, and to what time they limited the effect of the words of our Lord, they would have been strangely embarrassed. It will appear from what follows, and we shall see, when they abandoned the natural sense of the words of our Saviour, as they had no longer any certain rule, so they no longer had precise terms, nor certain faith.

Such was the issue of the Concord of Wittenberg. The articles are reported in the same manner by both parties of the new reformation, and were signed at the end of May in 1536\*. It was agreed that it should not have force until it had received the approbation of the churches. Bucer and his companions so little doubted of the approbation of their party, that immediately after the Agreement was signed, they celebrated the Supper with Luther in token of perpetual concord. The Lutherans have always praised this agreement. The Sacramentarians refer to it as an authentic treaty, which had reunited all Protestants. Hospinian pretends that the Swiss—a part, at least, of that body—and Calvin himself, gave it their approbation†. An express approval of it, in fact, is found among the letters of Calvin‡: so that this Agreement ought to have place among the public acts of the new reformation, since it contains the sentiments of all Protestant Germany, and of almost all the reformation.

28.—*Those of Zurich laugh at the equivocations of Bucer.*

Bucer was solicitous to have it approved by those of Zurich. He went to their assembly, and harangued them in words lofty and indefinite; then presented them a long writing§. In such verbosity equivocations lie concealed, and a few words are sufficient to speak the faith plainly. In vain did he display his subtilties; he could not make the Swiss digest his substantial presence, nor his communion of the

\* Conc. p. 729. Hosp. part ii. fol. 145. Chytr. Hist. Confess. Aug.

† Ann. 1536, 1537, 1538.

‡ Calv. Ep. p. 324.

§ Hosp. p. ii. f. 150, et seq.



unworthy; they wished always to express their thoughts just as they were, in plain terms, and to say, as Zuinglius did, that there was no physical or natural presence here, nor a substantial one, but a presence *by faith*, a presence *by the Holy Ghost*, reserving to themselves the liberty of speaking of this mystery as they should find most suitable, and always in the most plain and intelligible manner that is possible. This is what they wrote to Luther; and Luther, scarcely recovered from a dangerous illness, and fatigued, perhaps, with so many disputes, sought repose, and referred the affair to Bucer, with whom he imagined that he perfectly agreed\*.

29.—*The Zuinglians will not hear Miracles mentioned, nor Omnipotence in the Eucharist.*

But having mentioned in his letter, that, agreeing about the Presence, they were to leave the manner to the Divine Omnipotence; those of Zurich, astonished that he should speak to them of Omnipotence in an action, where they conceived nothing that was miraculous, no more than their master Zuinglius, complained of it to Bucer, who took great pains to satisfy them; but the more he insisted with them that there was something incomprehensible in the manner Jesus Christ gave himself to us in the Supper, the more the Swiss, on their part, repeated to him that there was nothing more easy. A figure in these words, “This is my body;” the meditation on the death of our Lord, and the operation of the Holy Ghost in the hearts of the faithful, were attended with no difficulty, and they were determined to admit no other miracles in it. So, indeed, should the Sacramentarians speak, would they speak naturally. The Fathers, it is true, did not speak so; they found no example too elevated to raise up the minds of men to the belief of this mystery; but employed for the purpose the creation, the incarnation of our Lord, his miraculous birth, all the miracles of the Old and New Testament, the wonderful change of water into blood, and of water into wine; persuaded as they were, that the miracle, which they acknowledged in the Eucharist, was not less the work of Omnipotence, and yielded in nothing to the most incomprehensible miracles of the hand of God. Thus it was proper to speak in the doctrine of the Real Presence, and Luther had, with this faith, retained the same expressions. From a contrary

\* Hosp. p. ii. f. 157.

reason, the Swiss found all easy, and chose rather to turn the words of our Lord into a figure, than to call upon his Omnipotence to verify them; as if the most simple manner of explaining the Holy Scriptures were always that in which reason encounters the least difficulty; or miracles cost the Son of God anything, where he wished to give us a pledge of his love.

30.—*Doctrine of Bucer, and return of the Towns from his belief to that of the Real Presence.*

Although Bucer could not prevail on those of Zurich, during two years continually treating with them, after the Agreement of Witttemberg, and foresaw very well that Luther would not always be so peaceable as at that time, he used every expedient in order to retain him in this quiet disposition. As for his part, he adhered so closely to the Agreement, that, ever after, he was considered by those of the Augsburg Confession as a member of their churches, and in everything acted conjointly with them.

Whilst he treated with the Swiss, and endeavoured to make them comprehend something in the Supper more high and impenetrable than they imagined, among other things he told them, that although there was no doubt of Jesus Christ being in Heaven, they did not well understand where this Heaven was, nor what it was, and that "Heaven was even in the Supper;\*" which carried with it so clear an idea of the Real Presence, that the Swiss could not bear to hear him.

The comparisons he employed tended rather to enforce than weaken the reality. He often instanced that ordinary action of shaking one another by the hand †; a very plain example to show that the same hand used to execute treaties may be a pledge of the will to fulfil them; and that a transitory contract, yet real and substantial, may become, by the institution and usage of men, the most effectual sign they can give to each other of perpetual union.

Since he had commenced to treat about the Agreement, he was not fond of saying with Zuinglius, that the Eucharist was the Body, as the Rock was Christ, and as the Lamb was the Passover. He chose rather to say it was so, as the Dove is called the Holy Ghost, which shews a Real Presence; there being none that doubt that the Holy Ghost was present, in a particular manner, under the form of the dove. He adduced also the example of Jesus Christ breathing on the Apostles,

\* Hosp. 162.

† Ep. ad Ital. int. Calv. Ep. p. 44.

and at the same time giving them the Holy Ghost \* : which still proved that the body of Jesus Christ is not less communicated, nor less present, than the Holy Ghost was to the Apostles.

With all this, however, he approved of the doctrine of Calvin, replete with sacramentarian notions † ; and was not afraid to subscribe a confession of faith, where the same Calvin said, that the manner in which the body and blood of Jesus Christ were received in the Supper consisted in the Holy Ghost uniting therein what was separated in place. This, it seems, was clearly acknowledging Jesus Christ to be absent. But Bucer explained everything, and had surprising solutions for all kinds of difficulties. But what is here most remarkable, the disciples of Bucer, and as we have before observed, whole towns, that under his guidance had so far removed from the Real Presence, came now again insensibly into this belief. The words of Jesus Christ were so well deliberated on, and so often repeated, that at last they produced their effect, and men naturally returned to the literal sense.

31.—*Melancthon begins to doubt the doctrine of Luther.—  
The Weakness of his Theology.*

While Bucer and his disciples, the declared opponents of the doctrine of Luther on the real presence, drew near to him, Melancthon, the dear disciple of the same Luther, the author of the Augsburg Confession, and of the Apology, in which he had maintained the reality, to such a length as to appear inclined to transubstantiation, began to waver.

In 1535, or about that time, this doubt came into his mind ‡ ; before that time, it may be seen how very steady he had been. He had even composed a book of the sentiments of the holy Fathers on the Supper, in which he had collected many passages most express for the real presence.

As the criticism of those days was not very accurate, he perceived, at length, that some of them were spurious, and that the transcribers, through ignorance or carelessness, had attributed to the ancients some works of which they were not the authors. This troubled him, although he had cited a sufficient number of passages which were incontestable. But he was more embarrassed to find many places in the ancients where they called the Eucharist a figure § . He collected

\* Ep. ad Ital. int. Calv. Ep. p. 44.

‡ Hosp. an. 1535. 137, et seq.

† Int. Ep. Calv. p. 378.

§ Lib. iii. Epist. 114, ad Joan. Brent.

|| Ibid.

these passages, and was astonished, said he, "to see in them so great a diversity." Weak divine! not to understand that neither the condition of faith, nor of this present life, could permit us to enjoy Jesus Christ face to face, for which reason he gave himself unto us under a borrowed form, necessarily joining truth with the figure, and the Real Presence with an exterior sign that concealed it from us. From this proceeds that apparent diversity of the fathers which surprised Melancthon. The same difficulty would have appeared to him, had he closely investigated the mystery of the Incarnation, and the divinity of the Son of God, before the disputes of heretics had induced the fathers to speak of these matters with more precision. In general, where two truths that appear contrary are to be reconciled, as in the mystery of the Trinity, and that of the Incarnation, to be equal and to be inferior; and in the Eucharist, to be present and to be in figure; naturally, a sort of language is used that appears confused, unless we have the key of the church, as we may say, and the full comprehension of the entire mystery: besides the other reasons which obliged the fathers to conceal the mysteries in some places, affording in others the certain means by which to understand them. Melancthon did not know so much. Dazzled with the name of reformation, and the exterior of Luther then somewhat specious, he immediately enlisted in the party. As yet but young and a great humanist, and only a humanist, newly called by the Elector Frederick to teach the Greek language in the university of Wittemberg, he could have made but little progress in the investigation of ecclesiastical antiquity with his master Luther, and was strangely shocked at the contrarieties he supposed he found in the fathers.

32.—*A dispute in the time of Ratramnus, that confounds Melancthon.*

To embarrass himself completely, he must also read the book of Bertram or Ratramnus, which then began to appear; an ambiguous book; where certainly the author did not always understand himself\*: the Zuinglians support their cause much by it. The Lutherans cite it for themselves, and find nothing in it to condemn, but that it sowed the seeds of Transubstantiation. There is, indeed, sufficient to content, or rather to embarrass both sides. Jesus Christ, in the Eucharist, is so much a human body by his substance, and so

\* Lib. iii. Ep. 188, ad Vit. Theod.

unlike a human body by his qualities, that it may be said he is one, and is not one, in different respects; that in one sense, considering his substance only, it is the same body of Jesus Christ, which was born of Mary; but that in another sense, considering the manner alone, it is a different one, which he has made himself by his own word, which he conceals under shadows and figures, whose truth reaches not the senses, but discovers itself to faith alone.

This is what raised a dispute amongst the faithful in the time of Ratramnus. Some, with respect to the substance, said, the body of Jesus Christ was the same in the womb of the Virgin and the Eucharist: others, with respect to the qualities, or, rather, manner of existence, would have it another. Thus we see St. Paul, speaking of a body risen again, makes, as it were, another body of it, far different from what we have in this mortal life, though, in reality it be the same\*: but, on account of the different qualities with which this body is vested, St. Paul makes of it as it were two bodies, one of which he calls "the animal body," and the other "the spiritual body†." In this same sense, and with much more reason, one might say, that the body received in the Eucharist was not that which came from the blessed womb of the Virgin. But though this might be said in a certain sense, others feared, by saying it, they should destroy the truth of the body. Thus did Catholic Doctors, agreeing in substance, dispute about the manner; some following the expressions of Paschasius Rathbert, who would have the Eucharist to contain the same body which came from the Virgin; others adhering to those of Ratramnus, who maintained it was not the same. With this another difficulty was connected, inasmuch as a strong persuasion of the real presence, which obtained over the whole Church, both in the East and West, had induced many Doctors no longer to permit in the Eucharist the term "figure," which they believed was contrary to the truth of the body; and others, who considered that Jesus Christ does not give himself in the Eucharist in his proper form, but under a foreign one, and in a manner so full of mysterious significations, acknowledged, indeed, that the body of our Saviour was really in the Eucharist, but under figures, under veils, and in mysteries: which to them appeared the more necessary, as, in other respects, it was most certain that, to possess Jesus Christ in his manifest truth, under the cover of no figure, was a privilege reserved for the next life. All this was true

\* 1 Cor. xv. 37, et seq.

† Ibid. 42, 43, 44 46.

in the main ; but, before it could be well explained, there was room for long disputes. Ratramnus, who followed the last party, had not sufficiently investigated this matter, and, without differing in substance from other Catholics, sometimes fell into obscure expressions, which it was difficult to reconcile : the very cause that all his readers, Protestants as well as Catholics, have understood him in so many different senses. Melancthon found that this author left his reader to guess at his meaning, instead of explaining it with clearness, and, with him, lost himself in a subject which neither he nor his master Luther had ever well comprehended.

33.—*Melancthon wishes for a new decision—Luther's tyranny.*

By this reading, and these reflections, he fell into a deplorable uncertainty ; but whatever might be his opinion, of which we shall hereafter speak, he began to dissent from his master, and wished most ardently that an assembly might be held to treat anew on this subject, “without passion, without sophistry, and without tyranny\*.” This last word visibly regarded Luther, for in all the assemblies, till then, held in the party, as soon as Luther appeared, and declared his opinion, Melancthon himself assures us the others had no alternative but silence, and all was terminated. But whilst, disgusted with such proceedings, he demanded new deliberations, and receded from Luther, yet he rejoiced that Bucer, with his companions, drew near to him. We have but just seen him approve the agreement in which the real presence was fixed more than ever to the external symbols† ; because it was there established that it subsists in the communion of the unworthy, “although there be neither faith nor repentance.” It is necessary to cast our eyes only for a moment on the Agreement of Wittemberg, not only subscribed but also obtained by Melancthon, to be convinced how positively he there assents to a thing of which he had conceived so great a doubt.

34.—*Luther makes a new declaration of his Faith, in the Articles of Smalkald.*

The reason was, Luther always pushed forward, and was so resolute upon this point, that he knew not how to contradict him. The year after the Agreement, that is, in 1537, while Bucer

\* Lib. ii. Ep. 40. iii. Ep. 188, 189.

† Lib. iii. Ep. 114. ad Brent.

continued negotiating with the Swiss, the Lutherans met at Smalkald, the ordinary place of their assemblies, and where all their leagues were formed. The Council summoned by Paul the Third gave occasion to this assembly. Luther could not be well satisfied with the Confession of Augsburg, nor the Apology, nor the manner in which his doctrine was there explained, since he himself draws up new articles, "in order (says he) that it may be known what are the points from which he is resolved never to depart\*;" and for this reason he procured this assembly. There Bucer declared himself so explicitly on the Real Presence, "that he satisfied (says Melancthon, who mentions it with joy) even those of our people who were the most difficult to be pleased†." Consequently, he satisfied Luther; and here, again, Melancthon is delighted that the sentiments of Luther are followed, whilst he himself abandons them; that is, he was delighted to see all the Protestants of Germany re-united. Bucer had given his assent; the town of Strasburg, with their Doctor, declared for the Confession of Augsburg; human policy, their most important object, had attained its end; and, as for doctrine, they were afterwards to provide for that.

### 35.—*A new way of explaining the Words of the Institution.*

It must be acknowledged, however, that Luther proceeded in this with more sincerity. He was determined to speak plainly on the subject of the Eucharist, and thus explained the sixth article of the Sacrament of the Altar:—"As to the Sacrament of the Altar (says he), we believe that the bread and wine are the true body and true blood of our Lord; and are not only given and received by pious Christians, but also by the impious‡." These last words are the same we have seen in the Concord of Wittemberg, except that, instead of the word "unworthy," he uses the word "impious," which is stronger, and removes the idea of faith to a still greater distance. It is also to be observed that, in this article, Luther says nothing against the presence out of the use of the sacrament, nor against the permanent union; but only "that the bread was the true body;" not determining when it was, nor for how long a time.

### 36.—*Whether Bread can be the Body.*

Yet this expression, "that the bread was the true body," before that time had never been inserted by Luther in any

\* Art. Smal. Præf. in lib. Conc.

† Ap. Hosp. an. 1537, p. 155. Mel. iv. Ep. 196.

‡ Conc. p. 330.

public act. The terms which he generally used were, that the body and blood were given "under the bread" and "under the wine\*:" thus he explains himself in his little Catechism. He adds a word in the large one, and says, "that the body is given to us in the bread and under the bread†." I cannot discover exactly at what time these two Catechisms were written, but it is certain the Lutherans acknowledge them both for authentic acts of their religion. To the two particles, "in," and "under," the Confession of Augsburg adds "with"; and it is the ordinary phrase of the true Lutherans, "that the body and blood are received in, under, and with the bread and wine:" but, hitherto, it had never been said in any public act of the whole party, that the bread and wine were the true body and true blood of our Lord. Luther here decides the point, and necessary it was for Melancthon, how great soever his repugnance might be, to unite the bread with the body,—to subscribe even that the bread was the true body.

37.—*Luther cannot evade the equivocations of the Sacramentarians who elude all.*

The Lutherans in their Book of Concord assure us, that Luther was forced to this expression by the subtillies of the Sacramentarians‡, who invented evasions to accommodate to their moral presence Luther's strongest and most precise expressions, for the real and substantial presence: from this we may again, as we go on, observe, that it is not a matter of surprise, if the defenders of the figurative sense invent expedients to call in the support of the fathers; since Luther himself living and speaking, who knew their subtillies, and who undertook to oppose them, found it difficult to prevent them from wresting his words to their own sense by their interpretations: fatigued with their subtillies, he directed his mind to the discovery of such expressions as they might no longer wrest, and drew out the article of Smalkald in the above form.

And, indeed, as we have before observed §, if the true body of Jesus Christ, according to the opinion of the Sacramentarians, be not received except by means of a lively faith, it cannot be said with Luther, that "the impious receive it;" and as long as they shall maintain, that the bread is not the body of Jesus Christ, except in figure, without doubt they will never say with the Article of Smalkald, "That the bread is the true body of Jesus Christ;" thus Luther, by this ex-

\* Conc. p. 330.

† Ibid. p. 553.

‡ Ibid. p. 720.

§ Lib. ii. N. 3. p. 3



pression, excluded the figurative sense, and all the Sacramentarian interpretations. But he was not aware he no less excluded his own doctrine, since we have shewn that the bread cannot be the true body, unless it become so by a true and substantial change, which Luther would not admit.

Thus when Luther, and the Lutherans, after turning the Article of the Real Presence so many different ways, endeavour at last to explain it so precisely, as that the Sacramentarian equivocations might remain entirely excluded, we see them fall insensibly into expressions, which, according to their principles, have no sense, and cannot be maintained except in the Catholic doctrine.

38.—*The violence of Luther against the Pope in the Articles of Smalkald.*

At Smalkald Luther expresses himself with great asperity against the Pope, who, as we have seen, was not even named in the Articles of the Augsburg Confession, nor in the Apology; and lays down, among the articles from which he resolved never to depart, "That the Pope is not of divine right; that the power he has usurped is full of arrogance and blasphemy; that all he has done or now does, in virtue of this power, is diabolical; that the Church can and ought to subsist, without a head; that although the Pope should acknowledge he is not of divine right, but was made purely to maintain, more conveniently, the unity of Christians among sectaries, yet no good could ever come from such authority; and that the best way to govern and preserve the church, is for all the bishops, though unequal in their gifts, to remain equal in their ministry, under the one only head Christ Jesus: lastly, that the Pope is antichrist\*."

39.—*Melancthon wishes that the authority of the Pope should be acknowledged.*

expressly mention, at length, these decisions of Luther, because Melancthon gave them a limitation which cannot be sufficiently considered.

At the conclusion of the Articles are seen two lists of subscriptions, in which appear the names of all the Ministers and Doctors of the Confession of Augsburg †. Melancthon signed with all the others: but because he refused to agree

\* Art. iv. p. 312.

† Conc. p. 336.

to what Luther had said of the Pope, he made his subscription in these terms, "I, Philip Melancthon, approve the foregoing articles as pious and Christian. As for the Pope, my opinion is, if he would receive the Gospel, that for the peace and tranquillity of those who are already under him, or shall be hereafter, we may grant to him that superiority over the bishops, which he enjoys already by human right \*."

This superiority of the Pope, however established, was the object of Luther's aversion. Ever since the time the Popes condemned him, he became irreconcilable to this power, and induced even Melancthon to sign an act, by which the whole new reformation declared in a body, "We never will approve of the Pope's having power over the rest of the bishops †." At Smalkald Melancthon retracts it. It was the first and only time he ever, by a public act, opposed his master; and because his complaisance, or submission, or some similar motive, whatever it might be, induced him to pass over, in spite of all his doubts, the much more difficult point of the Eucharist, we must believe that powerful reasons influenced him to resist in this. These reasons merit investigation the more, as by this examination we shall discover the true state of the new reformation; the particular dispositions of Melancthon; the cause of all the troubles which constantly agitated him, even to his death; how a man engages on the side of error with general good intentions; and how he there remains in the midst of the most violent anxieties that can be felt in this life. The thing merits to be deeply understood, and Melancthon himself, by his own writings, will discover it to us.

\* Conc. p. 338.

† Mel. Lib. x. Ep. 76.

## BOOK V.

[General Reflections on the agitations of Melancthon, and the State of the Reformation.]

A brief summary.—Melancthon's agitations, regrets, vacillating condition.—The cause of all his errors, and of his disappointed hopes.—The unhappy success of the Reformation, and the wretched motives that attract men to it, acknowledged by the Authors of the party.—Melancthon in vain acknowledges the perpetuity of the Church, the authority of her judgments, and that of her Prelates.—Imputed Justice leads him away, though, by his Confession, he does not find it in the Fathers, not even in St. Augustine, on whom he had formerly rested.

### 1.—*How Melancthon was attracted to Luther.*

THE first proceedings of Luther, at which time Melancthon devoted himself entirely to him, were attended with a specious appearance. Exclaiming against abuses, which were but too true, with much force and liberty; mingling with his discourses pious sentiments, the remnants of a good education; and at the same time leading a life, if not perfect, at least blameless in the eyes of men, are things which have no small attractive influence. We are not to suppose that heresies always have for their authors libertines and wicked men, who designedly make religion subservient to their passions. St. Gregory Nazianzen does not represent to us Heresiarchs as men destitute of religion, but as men who mistake it. "They are," says he, "men of great minds, for weak minds are equally useless for good or evil. But these great wits," proceeds he, "are withal ardent and impetuous, who pursue the affair of religion with a boundless warmth\*:" that is, who have a false zeal, and mingling proud disgust, and invincible assurance, and their own conceits with religion, urge all to extremes: to this also must

\* Orat. p. 26.

be united an air of regularity, or where would be that seduction so often \*predicted in the Scripture? Luther had formerly a zest for devotion. In his early life, alarmed by a clap of thunder, which he thought would have struck him dead, he entered into religion with dispositions sufficiently sincere. What occurred with regard to indulgences has already been explained. If he advanced extraordinary tenets of doctrine, he submitted himself to the Pope. Condemned by the Pope, he appealed to the Council, which the whole Christian world, many ages before, had deemed necessary to redress the grievances of the church. To reform corrupt morals was an object desired by the universe; and although sound doctrine always subsisted equally well in the church, yet it was not explained equally well by all preachers. Many preached nothing but indulgences, pilgrimages, almsgiving to the religious, and made those practices, which were only the accessaries of piety, the foundation of religion. They spoke little of the grace of Jesus Christ; and Luther, who, by the dogma of imputed justice, took a new view of it, appeared to Melancthon, as yet but young, and more acquainted with polite literature than theology, to be the only preacher of the Gospel.

*2.—Melancthon captivated with novelty, and the deceitful appearance of imputed justice.*

It is but just to give all to Jesus Christ. The Church attributed all to him in the justification of the sinner, as well and better than Luther, but in a different manner. We have seen how Luther attributed all to him, by absolutely taking all from man; and, on the other hand, the Church attributed all to him, by maintaining, for an effect of his grace, all the good man has, and even the right use of his free will in all that regards a Christian life. The novelty of Luther's doctrine and opinions captivated men of wit. Melancthon was the chief of them in Germany. To erudition, to politeness, and to elegance of style, he united a singular moderation. He was considered to be the only person capable of succeeding, in learning, to the reputation of Erasmus; and Erasmus himself, by his own choice, would have elevated him to the first honours among the learned world, had he not seen him engaged in a party against the Church; but the tide of novelty bore him down with the crowd. From the beginning of his attachment to Luther, he wrote to one of his friends, "I have not yet treated the matter of justification as it

should be treated, and I am aware that none of the ancients treated it in this manner \*." These words demonstrate a man captivated with the charms of the new doctrine; and yet he has but touched so great a subject, and already knows more than all the ancients. We see him charmed at a sermon which Luther made on the subject of the Sabbath-day †. He there taught that repose, in which God did all, and man nothing. A young professor of the Greek language heard such novel ideas, promulgated by the most lively and vehement orator of his age, with all the ornaments of his native language, and immense applause: it is not a matter of surprise that he was captivated. To him Luther appears the greatest of all men—a man sent by God—a Prophet. The unexpected success of the new reformation confirmed this opinion. Melancthon was sincere and credulous; men of talent are often so: there he was taken. All the votaries of polite literature follow his example—Luther becomes their idol. He is attacked, and perhaps with too much acrimony. The ardour of Melancthon is enkindled; the confidence of Luther engages him still more; and with his master he permits himself to be captivated with the temptation of reforming Bishops, Popes, Princes, Kings, and Emperors, even at the expense of unity and peace.

### 3.—How Melancthon excused the violence of Luther.

Luther, it is true, was the slave of unheard of excesses: this was a subject of sorrow to his moderate disciple. He trembled whenever he thought of the implacable wrath of this Achilles; and feared "nothing less from the old age of a man, whose passions were so violent, than the transports of a Hercules, a Philoctetes, and a Marius ‡;" that is, he anticipated what, indeed, happened, something furious. This he writes confidentially, and in Greek, according to his custom, to his friend Camerarius: but, as with men of wit, a witty saying often has great influence, a bon mot of Erasmus supported him. Erasmus said that the world, stubborn and obdurate as it was, required a master as rude as Luther §: that is, as he explained it to him, Luther seemed necessary to the world, as tyrants are, whom God sends for its correction; as a Nebuchadnezzar, a Holofernes; in a word, as a scourge of God. In this there was no subject in which to glory; but Melancthon, who had understood it on the fair

\* Lib. iv. Ep. 126. Col. 574.

† Ibid. Col. 575.

‡ Lib. iv. Ep. 240, 315.

§ Lib. xviii. Ep. 25, 19, 3.

side, persuaded himself, at the commencement, that, in order to awaken the world, nothing less was necessary than the violence and thunder of Luther.

4.—*The commencement of the agitations of Melancthon.*

But at length the arrogance of this imperious master declared itself. The whole world rose up against him, even those who were equally intent upon the reformation of the Church. A thousand impious sects enrolled themselves under his banner, and, under the name of Reformation, arms, seditions, civil wars, devastated Christianity. To increase these sorrows, the Sacramentarian contest divided the new-born reformation into two almost equal parts. However, Luther urged every thing to extremes; and his discourses, instead of calming, embittered the minds of men. His conduct appeared so weak, and his excess so singular, that Melancthon neither could excuse nor support them. From that time his agitations were exceedingly great. Every moment he wished for death. For thirty years his tears ceased not to flow\*. “And the Elbe,” said he, “with all its streams, would not have furnished him with water sufficient to weep for the sorrows of the divided reformation †.”

5.—*Melancthon acknowledges at length that Luther's great success proceeded from a bad principle.*

The unexpected success of Luther, with which he had been at first dazzled, and which with all others he considered as a mark of the finger of God, was but a weak relief to him, when time had discovered to him the true causes of this great progress and its deplorable effects. He soon perceived that licentiousness and independence had been the great supporters of the reformation. If the cities of the empire were seen to run in crowds to this new gospel, it was not to adopt its doctrine. Our reformed will feel pain at these words, but it is Melancthon who writes them, and writes them to Luther:—“Our people blame me because I restore the jurisdiction to Bishops. The people accustomed to liberty, having once cast off the yoke, will not receive it again; and the imperial towns are most averse to this authority. They seek not doctrine and religion, but power and liberty †.” He repeats this complaint again to the same Luther:—“Our associates,” says he,

\* Lib. iv. Ep. 100—119, 842.

† Lib. ii. Ep. 202.

‡ Lib. i. Ep. 17.

“dispute not for the Gospel, but who shall govern\*.” These towns, therefore, sought not for doctrine but independence; and if they were averse to their Bishops, it was not because they were their pastors, but because they were their sovereigns.

6.—*He anticipates the disorders which were to arise from the contempt of Episcopal authority.*

To speak all, Melancthon was not anxious to re-establish the temporal power of the Bishops; but what he wished to have restored, was the ecclesiastical government, the spiritual jurisdiction, and, in a word, “the episcopal administration;” because he saw that without that every thing would fall into confusion. “Would to God I could confirm, not the sovereignty of Bishops, but restore their administration; for I see what kind of Church we are likely to have if we subvert the ecclesiastical government. I see that TYRANNY WILL BE MORE INSUPPORTABLE THAN EVER†.” It is what always happens when the yoke of lawful authority is thrown off. Those who excite the people to insurrection under the pretext of liberty become tyrants themselves; and if it be not yet sufficiently seen that Luther was of that number, what follows will establish it beyond all doubt. Melancthon proceeds; and after blaming those who loved not Luther, only because, through his means, they removed the Bishops, he concludes, “They had gained a liberty which would do posterity no good. For what will be,” proceeds he, “the state of the Church, if we charge all the ancient customs, and there be no more prelates nor certain guides?”

7.—*Ecclesiastical authority and discipline entirely despised in the New Churches.—The testimony of Capito and others.*

In this disorder he anticipates each one will become his own master. If the ecclesiastical powers, to whom the authority of the Apostles came by succession, be not acknowledged, how will the new ministers subsist who have taken their places? It is only necessary to hear Capito speak, the colleague of Bucer in the administration of the Church of Strasburg;—“The authority of the ministers,” says he, “is wholly abolished; all is lost—all falls to ruin. There is not

\* Lib. i. Ep. 20.

† Lib. iv. Ep. 104.

any Church amongst us, not so much as one, where there is any discipline.\* The people say boldly to us—you wish to tyrannize over the Church which is free—you wish to establish a new Papacy.” And a little after: “God has given me to understand what it is to be a pastor, and the injury we have done the Church by our precipitate judgment, and the inconsiderate vehemence which induced us to reject the Pope. For the people, accustomed to, and nourished, as it were, in licentiousness, have rejected the curb altogether, as if, by destroying the power of the Papists, we, at the same time, destroyed the force of the Sacraments and the Ministry. They loudly tell us, I know enough of the gospel; what need have I of your aid to find out Jesus Christ; go and preach to those that are disposed to hear you\*.” What Babylon more confused than this Church, which boasted she had come forth from the Church of Rome as from a Babylon? Such was the Church of Strasburg; that Church which the new reformed incessantly proposed to Erasmus, when he complained of their disorders, as the most orderly and modest of all the churches. Such was this church in 1537, that is, in her vigour and in her bloom.

Bucer, the colleague of Capito, entertained no better opinion of it in 1549; and acknowledges that nothing had been there more sought after, “than the pleasure of living after their own fancy †.”

Another minister complains to Calvin, that there was no order in their churches, and gives this reason, “That a great number of their people believed they had withdrawn themselves from the power of Antichrist, by revelling with the wealth of the church, as pleased them best, and by despising all discipline ‡.” These are not discourses which censure disorders with exaggeration: they are what the new Pastors write to each other in confidence; and by them are seen the sad effects of the new reformation.

8.—*Another fruit of the Reformation.—The servitude of the Church, in which the Magistrates make themselves Popes.*

One of the fruits it produced was the slavery into which the Church fell. It is not surprising if the new reformation pleased princes and magistrates, who then became masters of all, even of doctrine itself. The first effect of the new gospel, in a town adjoining Genoa, Montbeliart, was an as-

\* Ep. ad Far. Int. Ep. Calv. p. 5.

† Int. Ep. Calv. p. 509, 510.

‡ Int. Ep. Calv. p. 43.



sembly there held; by the principal inhabitants, in order to know "what the Prince could ordain concerning the Supper \*." In vain Calvin resists this abuse: he has little hopes of a remedy; and all he can do is to complain of it, as the greatest disorder that can be brought into the Church. Mycon, the successor of Cœcolampadius in the ministry of Basil, makes a similar complaint, to as little purpose: "The laymen," says he, "assume all to themselves, and the magistrate has made himself Pope †."

This was an evil unavoidable in the new Reformation; it established itself by rising up against the Bishops, by warrant from the magistrates. The magistrate suspended the mass at Strasburg, abolished it in other places, and modelled the divine service; the new pastors were instituted by his authority; after that it was but just that he should have all power in the church. Thus all that was gained in the new Reformation, by rejecting the Pope, the ecclesiastical successor of St. Peter, was to give themselves a lay-pope, and place the authority of the Apostles in the hands of the magistrates.

9.—*Luther receives the Mission of the Prince to make the Ecclesiastical Visitation.*

Luther, proud as he was of his new Apostleship, could not defend himself against so great an abuse. Sixteen years had elapsed since the establishment of his Reformation in Saxony, without ever thinking of visiting the Churches, even to see if the pastors whom they had appointed discharged their duty, or if the people knew, at least, their Catechism. "They were taught very well (says Luther) to eat flesh on Fridays and Saturdays, to lay aside confession, to believe they were justified by faith alone, and that good works merited nothing †:" but seriously to preach repentance, Luther well assures us, was a thing they never thought of.—The Reformers were otherwise employed. At last, to restrain this disorder, in 1538, they thought of the remedy of a Visitation, so recommended in the Canons. "But not a man amongst us (says Luther) was as yet called to this ministry; and St. Peter prohibits anything being done in the Church without being assured, by a certain deputation, that what one does is the work of God;" that is, in a word, "a mission, a vocation, a lawful authority is necessary for that end§." Observe, these

\* Calv. Ep. p. 50, 51, 52.

† Int. Ep. Calv. p. 52.

‡ Visit. Sax. c. de Doct. c. de Libert. Christ.

§ Ibid.

new evangelists were assured of their extraordinary mission from above, to cause the people to rise up against their bishops, to preach in opposition to them, to take upon themselves the administration of sacraments, contrary to their prohibition: but for the true episcopal function, which is to visit and correct, not one of them had received the vocation or appointment from God, so imperfect was this heavenly mission; so much those, who boasted of it, did distrust it in reality. The remedy discovered for this defect was to have recourse to "the Prince, as to a power undoubtedly ordained by God in this country\*." Thus Luther speaks. But was this power of God's appointment established for this function? Luther acknowledges it was not, and rests upon this foundation, that a visitation is an apostolic function. Why, then, have recourse to the prince? "Because (says Luther), although the secular power be not charged with this office, they will not fail, in charity, to name visitors;" and Luther exhorts the other princes to follow this example; that is, he would have the function of Bishops be exercised by the authority of princes: and this attempt, in the language of the Reformation, is called charity.

10.—*The Lutheran Churches have no better discipline, and Melancthon acknowledges it.*

This statement demonstrates that the Sacramentarians were not the only people who, destitute of lawful authority, had filled their churches with confusion: Capito, it is true, after complaining, as we have seen, that discipline was unknown in the churches of his sect, adds, "there was no discipline except in the Lutheran Churches†." But Melancthon, who was acquainted with them, speaking of these churches, in 1532, and much about the time that Capito wrote his letter, relates "that discipline was destroyed among them, and they doubted of the most important matters: however, that, like the others, they would take no care to explain their tenets, and these evils were incurable‡:" so that no advantage remains on the part of the Lutherans, unless that their discipline, such as it was, so much excelled that of the Sacramentarians as to excite their envy.

\* Visit. Sax. cap. de Doct. cap. de Libert. Christ.

† Int. Epist. Calv. p. 5, n. 7.

‡ Lib. iv. Ep. 135.

11.—*Melancthon laments the Licentiousness of the party, in which people at table decided points of Religion.*

It is expedient we should also learn, from Melancthon, in what manner the great men of the party treated theology and ecclesiastical discipline. Confession of sins was but feebly spoken of among the Lutherans; and though little was said of it, and though the remains of Christian discipline which they wished to retain were small, yet they had such an influence on a man of importance, as Melancthon relates, that he openly declared at a “great banquet (for there only, says he, they treat theology) that they ought to oppose  $\kappa$ ; that they ought to be on their guard, lest that liberty they had recovered should be taken from them, otherwise they would be enchained by a new slavery, and that already, by little and little, the ancient traditions were renewing\*.” This is the consequence of exciting the spirit of rebellion among the people, and indiscreetly inspiring them with a hatred of traditions. We have in one single banquet a representation of what was done in the others. This spirit prevailed among all the people; and Melancthon himself says to his friend Camerarius, speaking of these new churches, “You see the excesses of the multitude, and their blind desires †:” no order could be established among them.

12.—*Imputed justice diminished the necessity of good works.*

Thus the true reformation, namely, of morals, retrograded instead of advancing, and this for two reasons—one, because authority was destroyed, and because the new doctrine inclined to favour human passions. I undertake not to prove that the new Justification had this bad effect. It is a subject often treated of before, and foreign to my purpose. I shall speak only of those notorious facts that, after the establishment of imputed justice, the doctrine of good works fell into such disrepute, that some of the chief disciples of Luther said it was a blasphemy to teach they were necessary. Others went so far as to say they were contrary to salvation; all concurred in deciding they were not necessary. It is permitted, in the new Reformation, to say, that good works are necessary, as things which God requires from man, but it cannot be said that they are necessary to salvation. And why, then, does God require them? Is it not in order to save us? Has not Jesus Christ himself said, “If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments ‡”? It is, therefore, precisely for obtaining life and eternal salvation that good

\* Lib. iv. Ep. 71.

† Ibid. p. 769.

‡ Matt. xix. 17.

works are necessary according to the Gospel, and it is what the whole Scripture preaches to us. But the new Reformation has discovered this subtilty, that one may without difficulty allow them to be necessary, provided it be not for salvation. The question regarded the adult, for as to little children, all were agreed. Who would have believed the Reformation was to bring forth such a prodigy? and that this proposition, "Good works are necessary to salvation," should ever have been condemned? It was done by Melancthon and all the Lutherans in many of their conventions\*, and particularly that of Worms, in 1557, the acts of which we shall see in their proper place.

13.—*No Reformation of Morals in the Protestant Churches; the testimony of Erasmus.*

I intend not here to impeach Protestants with their bad morals; our own, with relation to most men, did not appear better. I wish only to disabuse them of the idea that their Reformation was attended with the fruits that might be anticipated from so beautiful a name, or that their new justification had produced one good effect. Erasmus frequently said, that of the many whom he had seen embrace the new Reformation, (and he maintained a familiarity with most of their chiefs,) he had not seen so much as one whom it had not made worse instead of making better. "What an evangelical generation is this! (said he.)† Nothing was ever seen more licentious, and, withal, more seditious; nothing, in a word, less evangelical than these pretended evangelists: they abrogate vigils, and the divine service of the night and day. They were, said they, Pharisical superstitions; but then they should have substituted something better in their place, and not become Epicureans to escape Judaism. All is carried to extremes in this new reformation. They root up only what ought to be pruned; they set fire to the house in order to cleanse it. Morals are neglected; luxury, debauchery, adulteries, increase more than ever: there is no order, no discipline among them. The people indocile, after having shaken off the yoke of their superiors, will believe no person; and in so disordered a licentiousness Luther will soon have reason to regret what he calls the tyranny of bishops." When he wrote in this way to his Protestant friends regarding

\* Mel. Ep. Lib. i. p. 70. col. 84.

† Ep. p. 818, 822. Lib. xix. Ep. 3, 31, 47. p. 2063

the unhappy fruits of their reformation\*, they candidly agreed with him. "I had much rather," said he to them, "have to do with those Papists you decry so much †." He reproaches them with the malice of Capito, the malignant falsehoods of Farel, whom Œcolampadius, at whose table he lived, could neither suffer nor restrain; the arrogance and violence of Zuinglius, and in a word, with those of Luther, who sometimes seemed to speak like the Apostles, and at other times abandoned himself to such strange excesses, and such vile scurrility, that it was plainly seen the apostolic air he affected at times proceeded not from his heart. The others with whom he was acquainted were no better. "I find," said he, "more piety in one good Catholic bishop than in all these new evangelists ‡." What he said was not to flatter the Catholics, whose disorders he impeached with sufficient freedom. But, besides that he disapproved their boasting of the reformation, without any superior merit of their own, he judged there was an essential difference between those who neglected good works through weakness, and those who lessened their dignity and necessity by maxim.

#### 14.—*The testimony of Bucer.*

But here is a testimony which will press the Protestants more closely: it is that of Bucer. For in 1542, and more than twenty years after the reformation, this minister writes to Calvin, "that among them the most evangelical did not so much as know what true repentance was §"—so much had they abused the name of reformation and gospel. We have just heard as much from the lips of Luther ||. Five years after this letter of Bucer, and in the midst of the victories of Charles V., Bucer writes again to the same Calvin: "God has punished the injury we have done to his name by our long and pernicious hypocrisy ¶." This was confining a sufficiently proper name to licentiousness covered with the title of reformation. In 1549, he describes in stronger terms the little fruit of the pretended reformation, when he writes again to Calvin, "Our people have passed from the hypocrisy so deeply rooted in the Papacy, to a profession, such as it is, of Jesus Christ; and there is but a small number who have departed from this hypocrisy \*\*." Now he certainly seeks for a subject of dispute, and endeavours to render the

Lib. xix. 2, 30, 62.

† Lib. xix. 3.

‡ Lib. xxxi. Epist. 59. col. 2118.

§ Int. Ep. Calv. p. 54.

|| Visit. Sax. Cap. de Doct. c. de lib. chr.

¶ Int. Ep. Calv. p. 100.

\*\* Ibid. p. 509, 510.

Church of Rome guilty of that hypocrisy he acknowledges in his own party. For if by the Roman hypocrisy, according to the style of the reformation, he understands the watchings, the abstinence, and devotions performed in honour of the saints, and similar practices, it was impossible for the new reformed to be more detached from these things than they were, having all of them passed to the opposite extreme; but as the foundation of piety consisted not in these external things, it consisted still less in abolishing them. If it were the opinion of merits that Bucer here calls our hypocrisy, this was an evil, which the reformation had too well corrected, which had taken away even that merit which is the gift of grace, though the truth sometimes forced its acknowledgment. However that may be, the reformation had prevailed so little against hypocrisy, that very few, according to Bucer, had abandoned so great an evil. "For which reason," proceeds he, "our people laboured more to appear disciples of Jesus Christ than to be so in reality; and when this appearance injured their interests, they relinquished it. What pleased them was the separation from the tyranny and superstitions of the Pope, and LIVING AFTER THEIR OWN FANCY." And a little after, "Our people would never receive sincerely the laws of Jesus Christ; neither have they courage to enforce the laws against others, with a Christian constancy. As long as they believed they had the arm of flesh to support them, they generally returned answers of some vigour; but when this arm of flesh was broken, and they no longer had any human aid, they forgot them."

Doubtless, the true reformation hitherto—I mean that of morals—had but weak foundations in the pretended reformation; and the work of God, so much boasted of, and so much desired, was neglected by them.

15.—*The insupportable tyranny of Luther; what Calvin writes to Melancthon.*

What Melancthon most expected in Luther's reformation, was Christian liberty, and freedom from human authority; but he found himself much disappointed in his hopes. For almost fifty years together, he beheld the Lutheran Church always under tyranny or in confusion. She long had to sustain the punishment of despising lawful authority. Never was there a master more severe than Luther, nor a tyranny more insupportable than what he exercised in points of doctrine. This arrogance was so well known, as to induce Muncer to say

there were two popes—that of Rome, and Luther; and this latter was the more rigorous. Had it been only Muncer, a fanatic and the leader of fanatics, Melancthon might have consoled himself; but Zuinglius, Calvin, all the Swiss and all the Sacramentarians—men not at all despised by Melancthon—said, loudly, without his being able to contradict them, that Luther was another Pope. None are unacquainted with what Calvin wrote to his friend Bullinger, “that the excesses of Luther could be no longer borne, whose self-love would not permit him to see his own defects, nor bear contradiction\*.” Here doctrine was in question, and it was principally in doctrine that Luther would make himself absolute. The thing was carried to such excess, that Calvin complained of it to Melancthon himself. “With what excess does your Pericles deal out his thunder †!” It was thus Luther was called, when they wished to give a fine name to his intemperate eloquence. “We owe much to him, I acknowledge, and I will readily allow him a very great authority, provided he knows how to govern himself; though it is time for him now to reflect how much deference ought, in the Church, to be given to men. All is lost where one alone has more power than all the others, particularly if he fears not to use the extent of his power. And certainly, we leave a singular example to posterity, whilst we rather relinquish our liberty than by the least offence provoke one single man. His temper, you may say, is violent, and all his motives impetuous; as if his violence were not augmented by the obsequiousness of the whole world. Let us once have courage to sigh freely.” How great must be the captivity of man when he may not sigh with freedom! A man, I acknowledge, may be chagrined; though one of the first and least effects of virtue is to overcome himself in this inequality of temper: but what is to be hoped of a man who has no more authority, nor perhaps more learning than the others, who will hear nothing, and must rule all things by his word?

16.—*Melancthon, tyrannized over by Luther, thinks of retiring.*

Melancthon could make no reply to those just complaints, nor was he of a different opinion from the others. Those, who lived with Luther, never knew how this rigorous master would take their sentiments in point of doctrine. He

\* Ep. p. 526.

† Calv. Ep. ad Mel. p. 72.

menaced them with new formularies of faith, chiefly with regard to the Sacramentarians, whose pride Melancthon was accused of fomenting by "his meekness." This pretext was made use of to incense Luther against him, as his friend Camerarius writes in his life \*. Melancthon knew no remedy for those evils, except that of flight; and his son-in-law Bucer acquaints us, that he was resolved upon it †. He writes himself, that Luther was so incensed against him, on account of a letter received from Bucer, that he thought of nothing but of withdrawing for ever from his presence ‡. He was under such restraint with Luther, and the heads of the party, and they had so overwhelmed him with labour and uneasiness, that, quite exhausted, he wrote to his friend Camerarius, "I am," says he, "in slavery, as one in the den of the Cyclops; for I cannot conceal my thoughts from you, and I often think of flight §." Luther was not the only one that so enchained him: amongst those who have withdrawn themselves from lawful authority, every one is master at certain times, and the most moderate man is always the greatest slave.

17.—*He passes his whole life, without ever daring to explain his doctrine entirely.*

When a man has entered into a party to speak his sentiments with freedom, and this illusion has induced him to renounce the established government, if he subsequently find the yoke to enslave him, and not only the master he has chosen, but even his companions, retain him in more subjection than before, what has he not to suffer, and how can we feel surprise at the continual lamentations of Melancthon? No, Melancthon never spoke his full sentiments, with regard to doctrine, not even at Augsburg, when he wrote his Confession of Faith, and that of all the party. We have seen how "he accommodated his dogmas to the occasion ||:" he was ready to say many milder things, that is, approximating more closely to the tenets received by Catholics, "if his companions would have permitted him." Constrained on all sides, but more by Luther than any other, he never dares to speak, and reserves himself for "better times, if such should happen," says he, "for the designs I entertain ¶." This is what he writes in 1537, in the assembly of Smalkald, where

\* Cam. in Vit. Phil. Mel.

† Mel. lib. iv. ep. 315.

‡ Peuc. ep. ad Vit. Heod. Hosp. p. 2.

§ Ibid. p. 255.

|| Lib. iii. N. 59.

¶ Lib. iv. ep. 204.



the articles above-mentioned were drawn up. Five years after that time, and in 1542, we find him again sighing for a free convention of the whole party, "where doctrine may be explained in a firm and precise manner\*." Again, after this, and towards the latter end of his life, he writes to Calvin and Bullinger, that some were about to write against him, on the subject of the Eucharist, and the adoration of the bread. The Lutherans were to be the authors of this book. "If they publish it," said he, "I will speak freely †." But these better times, these times of speaking freely, and declaring without fear what he called truth, never came for him; nor was he deceived when he said, that, "Let matters turn out as they may, never should they have the liberty of speaking freely on points of doctrine ‡." When Calvin and the others encourage him to speak his sentiments, he always speaks like one under the obligation of great caution, and awaits an opportunity of explaining himself on certain matters §, which, however, he never performed.—Thus one of the chief teachers of the new reformation, and he who may be said to have given Lutheranism its form, died without fully explaining himself on the most important controversies of his time.

18.—*New Tyranny in the Lutheran Churches after that of Luther.*

The reason was, while Luther lived, he was forced to silence; after his death, they were not more free. Other tyrants took his place. These were Illyricus, and the other leaders of the people. The unhappy Melancthon considers himself, among the Lutherans his colleagues, as in the midst of enemies, or, to use his own words, in the midst of furious wasps, "and has no hopes of finding sincerity, except in heaven ||." I wish it were allowed me to employ the word "Demagogue," which he uses. • Those were certain orators in Athens, and the popular states of Greece, who became all powerful with the people, by flattering them. The Lutheran churches were led by similar speakers: "Ignorant men," so speaks Melancthon, "who are strangers to both piety and discipline. Such are they who domineer; and I am like Daniel among the lions ¶." This is the picture which he draws of the Lutheran churches. They had already fallen into anarchy, that is, as he says himself, "into a state that

\* Lib. i. ep. 110. col. 147.

† Ep. Mel. int. Calv. ep. p. 218, 236.

‡ Lib. iv. ep. 136

§ Ep. Mel. int. Calv. ep. p. 199. Calv. Resp. p. 211.

|| Mel. epist. ad Calv. int. Calv. epist. p. 144.

¶ Lib. iv. ep. 836, 842, 845.

at once involves all evils\* :” he wishes for death, and sees no hopes but in Him who has promised to support his church, “even in her old age, and to the end of the world.” Happy, could he have perceived that consequently he never ceases to support her!

19.—*Melancthon knows not where he is, and all his life searches after Religion.*

Here it is that men should have stopped; and since it was necessary ultimately to return to the promises made to the church, Melancthon had only to reflect, that they ought to have been as immutable in ages past, as he wished to believe they were to be in ages subsequent to the Reformation. The Lutheran church had no particular assurance of her eternal duration, nor ought the reformation made by Luther to remain more immoveable than the first institution established by Jesus Christ and his Apostles. How was it possible for Melancthon not to see that the reformation, whose faith he would change daily, was not the work of man? We have seen how he changed, and changed again, many important articles of the Augsburg Confession, even after it had been presented to the Emperor †. At different times, he even took many important things from the Apology, although it had been subscribed by the whole party with as much submission as the Confession of Augsburg. In 1532, after the Confession of Augsburg and Apology, he writes again, “That most important points remain undecided, and that they ought, without noise, to seek means to explain their dogmas ‡.” “How much,” says he, “do I wish this to be done, and done well!” like a man that knew in his conscience nothing hitherto had been done as it ought. In 1533, “Who is there,” says he, “that so much as thinks of healing the conscience agitated with doubts, and of discovering truth §!” In 1535, “How much,” says he, “do we deserve to be blamed, we that take no care to heal the conscience agitated with doubts, nor to explain the dogmas, purely and simply, without sophistry! These things torment me terribly ||.” He wishes in the same year, “that a pious assembly would determine the Eucharistic contest, without sophistry, and without tyranny ¶.” He judges then the thing as undecided; and five or six ways of explaining this article, which we find in the Augsburg Confession, and Apology, have not satisfied

\* Lib. iv. et lib. i. ep. 107, 4, 76, 876. † V. S. lib. iii. N. 5. et seq. 23, 24, 27.

‡ Lib. iv. ep. 135.

§ Ibid. ep. 140.

|| Ibid. ep. 170.

¶ Lib. iii. ep. 114.

him. In 1536, accused of still raising many doubts of the doctrine he professed, he replies at once, that it was immoveable, for so it was necessary he should speak, or abandon the cause\*. But immediately after, he gives to understand, that, indeed, many defects remained in it; and it must not be forgotten that he speaks of doctrine. Melancthon imputes these defects to the vices and obstinacy of ecclesiastics, "by whose means it happened (says he) that amongst us things have been left to take their own course, to say nothing worse; that we have fallen into many faults, and, at the commencement, have done many things without reason." He acknowledges the disorder; and the vain excuse he seeks, by imputing the defects of his own religion to the Catholic Church, will not conceal it. He had advanced no further in 1537; and whilst all the Doctors of the party assembled with Luther at Smalkald, there explained anew the points of doctrine, or, rather, there subscribed to the decisions of Luther; "I was of opinion (says he), that, rejecting some paradoxes, they should explain doctrine more simply †;" and, although he subscribed, as we have seen, these decisions, he was so little satisfied with them that, in 1542, we have heard him still wish for another assembly, "where the dogmas might be explained in a firm and precise manner †." Three years after, and in 1545, he acknowledges that truth had been but very imperfectly discovered to the preachers of the new gospel. "I beseech God (says he) to prosper this glimmering of doctrine, such as he has discovered to us §." He declares that, as to himself, he has done all in his power: "the will (says he) was not wanting to me, but time, guides, and doctors." How! was his master, Luther, then wanting to him—the man he had believed to be raised by God to dispel the darkness with which the world was covered? Without doubt he confided but little in the doctrine of such a master, when he so bitterly laments the want of a doctor. And, indeed, after the death of Luther, Melancthon, who in so many places so highly extols him, writing in confidence to his friend Camerarius, contents himself with saying, coldly enough, that "he had at least well explained some part of the heavenly doctrine ||." A little after, he confesses "that he and the others fell into many errors, which they could not avoid, upon coming forth from so much darkness ¶:" and is satisfied with saying that "many things have been well explained;" which agreed perfectly with the desire he had, that the rest

\* Lib. iv. ep. 194.

§ Lib. iv. ep. 662.

† Ibid. ep. 98.

|| Lib. iv. ep. 662.

‡ Lib. i. ep. 110.

¶ Ibid. ep. 699.

should be better explained. We see, in all the above passages, that the dogmas of faith were the things in question ; since decisions, and new decrees on doctrine, are there spoken of in every place. Men, if they please, may now be surprised at those they call Seekers in England. Here is Melancthon himself, who still seeks for many articles of his religion forty years after the preaching of Luther and the establishment of the Reformation.

20.—*What were the dogmas which Melancthon found badly explained.*

If it be asked what were the dogmas Melancthon pretended were badly explained, it is certain that they were most important ones—that of the Eucharist was in the number. In 1553, after all the changes of the Augsburg Confession, after the explanations of the Apology, after the articles of Smalkald, which he had signed, he still demands “a new formulary for the Supper\*.” It is not well known what he wished to insert in this new formulary ; it appears only, that neither those of his own nor those of the opposite party pleased him, since he says, that both one and the other did nothing but obscure the subject. Another article which he wished might be decided was that of free will, the consequences of which so very much affected the subjects of justification and grace. In 1548 he writes to Thomas Cranmer, that Archbishop of Canterbury who completely destroyed the King, his master, by his obsequiousness: “Ever since the commencement (says he), the doctrines which have been advanced amongst us on free will, according to the opinions of the stoics, were too harsh, and we must think of making some new formulary on this head†.” That of the Augsburg Confession, though he himself had drawn it up, no longer pleased him ; he began to think that free will did not only act in the duties of civil life, but moreover in the operations of grace, and by its assistance. These were not the notions he had received from Luther, nor what Melancthon himself had explained at Augsburg. This doctrine raised him opponents among the Protestants. He prepared himself for a vigorous defence, when he wrote to a friend, “If they shall publish their stoical disputes (regarding fatal necessity and free will), I shall answer very gravely and very learnedly.‡” • Thus, in

\* Lib. ii. Ep. 447.

† Lib. iii. Ep. 42.

‡ Lib. ii. Ep. 200.

the midst of his misfortunes, he is pleased with the thoughts of writing a fine work, and persists in his belief, as the following will more fully discover to us.

21.—*Melancthon declares that he adheres to the Confession of Augsburg, at the time he thinks of reforming it.*

We might point out other things which Melancthon wished to see decided, long after the Confession of Augsburg. But what appears more singular is, that whilst he, who had made it, found in his conscience, and acknowledged to his friends, the necessity of reforming it in so many important articles, he himself, in the public assemblies then held, never ceased to declare, with all the others, that he adhered precisely to this Confession, such as it was presented at the Diet of Augsburg, and to the Apology, as the pure exposition of the word of God. Policy required this; and it would have too much dishonoured the Reformation to admit that it had erred in its foundation.

What repose could Melancthon have during these uncertainties? The evil was, they arose from the very grounds, and, as I may say, from the constitution of his church, in which there was no regular power, no legitimate authority. Usurped authority has no uniformity; it bends or relaxes without moderation. Thus tyranny and anarchy are felt in it alternately; nor is it known to whom application should be made to arrange matters in a steady frame.

22.—*These uncertainties proceeded from the constitution of the Protestant Churches.*

So essential, and, at the same time, so inevitable a defect in the constitution of the new Reformation, gave extreme trouble to the miserable Melancthon. If any questions arose, there were no means of terminating them; the most certain traditions were despised; the Scripture was wrested and forced by the caprice of every man; all parties believed they understood it—they all proclaimed it was clear; not a man would yield to his companion. Melancthon called out in vain for an assembly, to terminate the Eucharistic dispute, which tore in pieces the new-born Reformation. Conferences which they called amicable had nothing but the name, and served only to exasperate the minds of men, and embarrass the cause: a juridical assembly was necessary, a Council which

should have the power of deciding, and to which all the people should submit. But where was this to be had in the new Reformation? The remembrance of the despised bishops was still too recent; the individuals, who had possessed themselves of their places, could not assume to themselves a more inviolable character; and, indeed, both sides, Lutherans and Zuinglians, wished to have their mission judged of by the merits of the cause. He who spoke the truth had, according to them, the true mission. The difficulty was to know who spoke the truth, which every person claimed; and all those who rested their mission on this examination made it doubtful. The Catholic bishops had a certain title, and their vocation alone was indisputable. It was said they abused it, nor was it denied that they had. Thus Melancthon always wished to acknowledge them, and always maintained that it was wrong "to yield nothing to the sacred order\*." If their authority was not re-established, he anticipated, with a lively and inconsolable sorrow, that "discord would have no end, and would be attended with ignorance, barbarity, and all kind of evils."

23.—*The authority of the Church absolutely necessary in matters of Faith.*

It is very easy to say, as our reformed do, that they have an extraordinary vocation; that the church, like kingdoms, is not attached to an established succession; and matters of religion ought not to be judged in the same form that causes are at tribunals. Conscience, say they, is the true tribunal, where each one is to judge matters as they are in themselves, and hear truth from himself: these things, I repeat, are very easily said. Melancthon said them, like the others; but, in his conscience, was very sensible some other foundation was necessary on which to build the church. For, in reality, why should she have less order than empires? Why should she not have a legitimate succession in her magistrates? Ought a way to be left open to every man who would say he was sent from God, or the faithful be obliged to investigate the cause to the bottom, though the greatest part of men are incapable of such inquiry? Such language may serve for disputation; but when a matter is to be terminated,—the peace of the church to be established,—and true repose, without impediment, given to the consciences of men, we must have recourse to other means. Do what we may, we must return to autho-

\* Lib. iv. Ep. 196.

city, which is neither certain nor lawful, when, proceeding from nothing higher, it rests on itself for a foundation. It is for this reason Melancthon wished to acknowledge the bishops, whom succession had established, and saw no other remedy for the evils of the church.

24.—*The sentiments of Melancthon on the necessity of acknowledging the Pope and Bishops.*

The manner in which he explains himself, in one of his letters, on this subject, is admirable. “Our people are agreed that ecclesiastical polity, by which bishops are acknowledged the superiors of many churches, and the Bishop of Rome superior to all bishops, is allowable. It was also lawful for kings to endow churches with revenues: so there is no dispute about the superiority of the Pope, and the authority of Bishops; and the Bishops, as well as the Pope, may easily retain this authority: for guides are necessary to retain the church in order, to watch over those who are called to the Ecclesiastical ministry and the doctrine of priests, and to exercise ecclesiastical judgments. If there were not such bishops, IT WOULD BE NECESSARY TO CREATE THEM. THE POPE’S MONARCHY would also be of great use to the agreement of doctrine between different nations. Thus the SUPERIORITY OF THE POPE might easily be admitted, were we but agreed in all the rest; and Kings themselves might easily moderate the attempts of Popes on the temporalities of their kingdoms\*.” This was what Melancthon thought of the authority of the Pope and Bishops. The whole party entertained the same sentiments when he wrote this letter. “Our people (says he) are agreed:” far from looking upon the authority of Bishops with the superiority and *monarchy* of the Pope, as a mark of the anti-Christian empire, he held it for a thing desirable, and which ought to be created, if not established. It is true that he added this condition, that ecclesiastical powers “should not oppress sound doctrine:” but, if it may be permitted to say they do oppress it! and, under this pretext, refuse the obedience due to them, they fall again into the difficulty they seek to avoid, and the ecclesiastical authority becomes a mock authority for all that wish to contradict.

\* Resp. ad Bell.

25.—*Melancthon, in the Assembly of Smalkald, is of opinion that they should acknowledge the Council convened by the Pope—and why?*

It was for this reason also that Melancthon always sought for a remedy to so great an evil. It was not certainly his design that the disunion should remain for ever. Luther submitted to the Council at the time Melancthon embraced his doctrine. The whole party pressed its convocation, and Melancthon hoped from it the termination of the schism, without which, I presume, he never would have engaged in it. But, after the first step, men venture farther than they had intended. To the demand of the Council the Protestants added, that they demanded it “free, pious, and Christian.” The demand is just—Melancthon agrees to it; but such fair words concealed a profound artifice. By the name of a free Council, they explained their meaning to be such a Council as the Pope, and all those who professed submission to him, should be excluded from. These, they said, were interested persons—the Pope was the guilty party, the Bishops were his slaves—they could not be judges. Who, then, should hold the Council? The Lutherans, mere private individuals? or priests in rebellion against their bishops? What an example to posterity! And, again, were they not also interested? Were they not considered guilty by Catholics, who, without doubt, formed the greatest, not to say the best part of the Christian world? What! to have indifferent judges, should then the appeal be made to Turks or Heathens, or ought God to send us angels? And was anything more necessary than to accuse all the magistrates of the church, in order to deprive them of their power, and render judgment impossible? Melancthon had too much sense not to see this was but an illusion. What can he do? He informs us himself. In 1537, when the Lutherans were assembled at Smalkald, in order to discover what was best to be done with regard to the council Paul the Third had summoned at Mantua, it was said the Pope ought not to be allowed the authority of forming a convention in which himself was to be accused, nor should a council so convoked be acknowledged by them. But Melancthon could not agree to this. “My opinion was (says he) not to refuse the Council absolutely, because, although the Pope cannot be judge therein, however HE HAS THE RIGHT OF CALLING IT TOGETHER, and the Council must order the proceeding on to judgment\*.” Here he immediately acknow-

\* Lib. iv. Ep. 196.



ledges the Council; and, what is still more remarkable, the whole world allowed he had, on the whole, reason on his side. "Men more acute than myself (proceeds he) said that my reasons were subtle and TRUE, but useless; that the tyranny of the Pope was such, that if we once consented to be present at the Council, it would be understood that we thereby granted to the Pope the power of judging. I saw very well there was some difficulty in my opinion; but, after all, it was the most honest. The other carried it, after great disputes, and I believe there is in this somewhat of fatality."

26.—*When certain principles are overturned, all we do is unwarrantable and contradictory.*

This is generally said when one knows not what to say.—Melancthon seeks for an end to the schism, and, for want of comprehending truth whole and entire, what he says is not consistent. On one side he was sensible what service an acknowledged authority does the church. He saw clearly, among so many dissensions then arising, that a principal authority was then necessary to maintain unity, nor could he recognise this authority any where but in the Pope. On the other hand, he would not have him to be judge in the impeachment the Lutherans brought against him. Thus he grants him the authority of calling the Assembly, and, after that, will have him excluded from it—an odd opinion, I acknowledge. But, for all this, Melancthon ought not to be deemed a person unskilled in these matters: he was not so reputed by his own party,—the only person, I may say, in whom they could boast, and excelled by none among them in sense or erudition. If he proposes things contradictory, it was because the new Reformation allowed nothing that was right or consistent. He was correct in saying that it belonged to the Pope to call the Council, for who else should call it, particularly in the present state of Christianity? Was there any other power, except that of the Pope, which the whole world acknowledged? and to deprive him of it at once, before the Assembly, in which they said they had intended to accuse him, was not this too unjust a prejudice? Above all, when the matter in debate was no personal crime of the Pope, but the doctrine which he had received from his predecessors so many ages ago, and which was common to him with all the bishops of the church? These reasons were so solid, that the rest of the Lutherans, opposed to Melancthon, acknow-

ledged them, as he himself has just told us, "to be true." But those who acknowledged this truth, however, maintained at the same time, and with good reason, that if they granted the Pope the power of forming the Assembly, they could no longer exclude him from it. The bishops, who ever acknowledged him the Chief of their order, and saw themselves in a synodical body convened by his authority, would they suffer their assembly to commence with dispossessing a natural President for a cause common to them all? Would they give an example unheard of in all past ages? These things were inconsistent; and in this conflict of the Lutherans it appeared manifestly that, after certain principles are overthrown, everything that follows is untenable and contradictory.

97.—*Reasons for the restriction which Melancthon placed to his Subscription in the articles of Smalkald.*

If they persisted in refusing the Council which the Pope had convened, Melancthon had no further hopes of a remedy for the schism; and it was on this occasion he spoke the words above cited, "that discord would be everlasting\*," in consequence of not recognizing the authority of the sacred order. Afflicted at so great an evil, he pursues his point; and although the opinion he had proposed for the Pope, or, rather, for the unity of the church, in the Assembly of Smalkald, was there rejected, he made his own subscription to the above form, as we have seen, reserving the authority of the Pope. The important causes and reasons which obliged him to concede the superiority of the Pope over the Bishops are now seen.—Peace,—which reason and experience of the dispositions of his own sect made him consider impossible without these means,—forced him, in opposition to Luther, upon so necessary an expedient. His conscience, at this time, triumphed over his complaisance; and he added only, that he gave the Pope a superiority of "human right:" unhappy in not seeing that a Primacy which experience showed him to be so necessary for the church, well deserved to have been instituted by Jesus Christ; nay more, what is found established in all ages, could proceed from none but him!

\* Lib. iv. Ep. 196.

28.—*The words of Melancthon on the authority of the Church.*

Surprising were the sentiments he had with regard to the authority of the Church. For, although, like other Protestants, he would not allow the infallibility of the Church in disputes, lest, said he, too great a prerogative should be given to men, the dictates of his mind carried him still farther. He frequently repeated, that Jesus Christ had promised his Church to support her for ever; that he had promised his "work," that is, his church, "should never be dissipated nor abolished;" and, therefore, to ground himself upon the faith of the Church, was to ground himself not on man, but on the promise of Jesus Christ himself\*. This induced him to say even, "Sooner may the earth open under my feet, than it happen to me to depart from the sentiment of the church in which Christ Jesus does reign." And, in other numberless places, "Let the church judge—I submit myself to the judgment of the church†." The truth is, that faith, which he had in the promise, vacillated frequently; and, once, after having said, according to the sentiments of his heart, "I submit myself to the Catholic Church," he adds, "that is to say, to good men, and learned men‡." This, his limitation, I acknowledge destroyed the whole; and it is easily seen what that submission was, which, under the name of good and learned men, acknowledges none, at the bottom, but such as he pleases: for this reason he wished always to come to a fixed character, and avowed authority, which was that of the Bishops.

29.—*Melancthon cannot depart from the opinion of imputed justice, whatever grace God bestows on him for his return.—Two truths acknowledged by him.*

If it be now asked, How it happened that a man so desirous of peace did not seek it in the church, but remained separated from that sacred order he was so intent on establishing? it is easily answered—it was chiefly because he could never abandon his imputed justice. God, however, had given him great graces, since he had the knowledge of two truths capable of reclaiming him: one, that a doctrine not found in antiquity ought not to be followed. "Consult (said he, to

\* Lib. i. Ep. 107. iv. 76, 733, 845, 876, etc.

† Lib. iii. Ep. 44. Lib. i. Ep. 67, 105. Lib. ii. Ep. 159, etc.

‡ Lib. i. Ep. 109.

Brentius) with the ancient church\* :” and, again, “ Opinions unknown to the ancient church are not to be received †.” The other truth, that is, his doctrine of imputed justice, was not to be met with in the Fathers. As soon as he began to set about explaining it, we have heard him say, “ He found nothing like it in their writings ‡.” Nevertheless, they thought fit to say, in the Augsburg Confession and Apology, that nothing was advanced therein but was conformable to their doctrine. Above all, St. Augustine was cited ; and it had been too shameful to the Reformers to own that so great a Doctor, the defender of Christian grace, had been ignorant of the foundation of it. But what Melancthon writes to a friend in confidence, shows us plainly that it was only for form sake, and to save appearances, they named St. Augustine in the party. For he repeats three or four times, with a kind of concern, that what hinders his friend from well understanding this matter is, because “ he is still too much wedded to St. Augustine’s imagination,” and that “ he must turn away his eyes entirely from the imagination of this Father §.” But, then, what is this imagination he must turn his eyes from ? Why, it is (says he) the imagination of being held for just by the fulfilling of the law, which the Holy Ghost works within us. This fulfilling, according to Melancthon, avails nothing towards rendering man agreeable to God, and it was a false imagination in St. Augustine to have thought the contrary : thus does he treat so great a man. And, nevertheless, he cites him, on account, says he, of the public opinion men have of him. But, in the main, continues he, “ he does not sufficiently explain the justice of faith.” As if he said, on such a subject, we ought at least to cite a Father the whole world considers the best interpreter of this article, although, to speak the truth, he makes not for us. He found nothing more favourable in the rest of the Fathers. “ What dense darkness (said he) do we find on this subject in the common doctrine of the Fathers and our adversaries ||.” What became of those fine words, Consult with the ancient church ? Why did he not practise what he advised others ? And seeing he knew no piety (as, indeed, none there is but what is grounded on the true doctrine of justification), how could he believe so many saints were ignorant of it ? How could he imagine he saw so clearly in Scripture what he did not see in the Fathers, not even in St.

\* Lib. iii. Ep. 114.

† Mel. de Eccles. Cath. ap. Lut. t. i. p. 444.

‡ Lib. iii. Ep. 126, col. 574, S. n. 2,

§ Lib. i. Ep. 94.

|| Lib. iv. Ep. 228.

Augustine, the doctor and defender of justifying grace against the Pelagians, whose doctrine also, in this point, the whole church had constantly followed ?

30.—*Melancthon can neither satisfy himself in imputed justice, nor resolve to abandon it.*

But what most deserves our observation in this place is, that he himself, smitten as he was with the specious idea of his imputed justice, never could succeed in explaining it to his own liking. Not content with laying down the dogma regarding it in the most ample manner in the Confession of Augsburg, he applies himself wholly to the expounding of it in the Apology ; and, whilst he composed it, he wrote to his friend Camerarius, “ I truly suffer a very great and painful labour in the Apology, in the points of justification, which I desire to explain profitably\*.” But, however, after all this pains-taking, has he fully explained it ? Let us hear what he writes to another friend ; it is the same we have seen him reprove as too much wedded to St. Augustine’s imaginations. “ I have endeavoured (says he) to explain this doctrine in the Apology, but, in such discourses as these, the calumnies of our adversaries permit not the explaining of myself so as I do to you at present, though, in reality, I say the same thing †.” And, a little after, “ I hope you will find some kind of help from my Apology, although I there speak with caution of so great matters.” This whole letter scarcely contains one single page, the Apology has more than a hundred on this subject ; and, notwithstanding, this letter, according to him, explains it better than the Apology. The thing was, he durst not say in the Apology as clearly as he did in this letter, “ that we must entirely take off our eyes from the accomplishment of the law, even from that which the Holy Ghost works in us.” This is what he called rejecting St. Augustine’s imagination. He saw himself always pressed with this question of the Catholics : If we are agreeable to God independently of all good works, and all fulfilling of the law, even of that which the Holy Ghost works in us, how and whereto are good works necessary ? Melancthon perplexed himself in vain to ward off this blow, and to elude this dreadful consequence : “ Therefore good works, according to you, are not necessary.” This is what he called calumnies of adversaries, which hindered

\* Lib. iv. Ep. 110. Omnino valde multum laboris sustineo, &c.

† Lib. i. Ep. 94.

him from owning frankly, in the Apology, all he had a mind to say—this was the cause of that great labour he had to undergo, and of those precautions of which he spoke.

To a friend the whole mystery of the doctrine was disclosed, but in public he was to be on his guard; he yet further added to his friend, that, after all, this doctrine is not well understood, except in “the conflicts of conscience:” which was as much as to say, that when a man could do no more, and knew not how to assure himself of having a will sufficient for fulfilling the law, the remedy for preserving all this, notwithstanding the undoubted assurance of pleasing God preached up in the new Gospel, was to take off their eyes from the law and the fulfilling of it, in order to believe that, independently of all this, God reputed us for just. This was the repose Melancthon flattered himself with, and which he never would relinquish. This difficulty, indeed, always occurred, that of holding oneself assured of the forgiveness of sins without a like assurance of conversion; as if these two things were separable, and independent one of the other. This occasioned, in Melancthon, that great labour; and therein he could never satisfy himself; so that after the Confession of Augsburg, and so many painful inquiries of the Apology, he comes besides, in the Confession called Saxonie, to another exposition of justifying grace, where he advances other novelties, which we shall see in time.

Thus is man agitated when smitten with an idea that has but a delusive appearance—fain would he explain his thoughts, but knows not how—fain would he find in the Fathers what he searches after; no such principle is to be found in them, yet cannot he renounce the flattering idea that so agreeably prepossesses him. Let us tremble and humble ourselves—let us acknowledge that, in man, there is a profound source of pride and error; and that the weaknesses of the human mind, like to the judgments of God, are unfathomable.

31.—*Melancthon's grievous agonies—he foresees the dreadful consequences of the overthrow of Church authority.*

Melancthon was persuaded he saw truth on one side, and lawful authority on the other. His heart was divided, and the struggle to reunite these two gave him continual torment. He was not able to renounce the charms of his imputed justice, nor to make the body of the bishops receive a doctrine

unknown to those who had governed the church till then. Hereupon, the authority which he loved for being lawful, became odious to him, because it opposed that which he mistook for truth. At the same time that you hear him say "he never called the authority of bishops in question," he arraigns their "tyranny," chiefly because they opposed his doctrine, and believes "he weakens his own cause by labouring to re-establish them\*."

Mistrusting his own conduct, he racks himself, nor foresees anything but disasters. "What will this Council be (says he), if held, but a tyranny, either of Papists or of others: a battle of divines more cruel and stubborn than that of centaurs †?" Well was he acquainted with his master, Luther, and feared no less the tyranny of his own than that he attributed to the adverse party! The fury of divines makes him tremble. He sees, authority once shaken, that all the dogmata, even the most important, will be called in question, one after another, without knowing where to stop. The disputes and differences about the Lord's Supper discovered to him what was to happen on other articles. "Good God!" says he, "what tragedies will posterity behold, if these questions ever come to be moved, whether or no the Word, whether the Holy Ghost be a person ‡!" These matters began to be moved in his time, but he judged this beginning to be but weak as yet; for he perceived the minds of men to become insensibly bolder and bolder against the established doctrines, and the authority of ecclesiastical decisions. What would have been the case had he seen the other pernicious consequences of the doubts which the Reformation started? the whole order of discipline publicly overthrown by some, and independence set up, that is, anarchy, with its whole train of evils, under the specious and flattering name of liberty; the spiritual power, placed by others in the hands of princes; Christian doctrine impugned in every point; Christians denying the work of the creation, and that of man's redemption; destroying hell; abolishing the soul's immortality; stripping Christianity of all its mysteries, and changing it into a sect of philosophy wholly adapted to the senses: thence indifference of religions arising, and, what naturally ensues, the very foundation of religion sapped; the Scripture directly combated; the way opened to Deism, that is, to Atheism in disguise; and the books that broach these prodigious doctrines issuing

\* Lib. iv. Ep. 228.

† Ibid. Ep. 140.

‡ Ibid.

from the bosom of the Reformation, and from those quarters where she predominates. What would Melancthon have said had he foreseen all these evils? and what would have been his lamentations? He had seen enough to trouble him his whole life long. The contests of his own times and party were sufficient to make him say that, without a visible miracle, all religion would be soon extinct.

32.—*The causes of Melancthon's errors—he alleges the promises made to the Church, but trusts not enough in them.*

What benefit did he then find in those divine promises, whereby, as he himself attests, Jesus Christ had bound himself to maintain his Church, even in her extreme old age, and never to suffer her to perish\*? Had he thoroughly considered this blessed promise, he would not have been satisfied with owning, as he has done, that the Gospel doctrine would subsist eternally, in spite of errors and disputes: but would have owned, moreover, that it ought to subsist by the means established in the Gospel, that is, by an inviolable succession of the ecclesiastical ministry. He would have seen that it was to the apostles and to the successors of the apostles this promise was addressed—"Go, teach, baptize; and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world †." Had he comprehended well these words, he would never have imagined that truth could be separated from that body, wherein succession and lawful authority were found; and God himself would have taught him, that as the profession of truth can never be overruled by error, the force of the apostolic ministry can receive no interruption by any relaxation of discipline. This is the faith of Christians: thus, with Abraham, they must believe the promise, "In hope against hope ‡;" and further believe that the Church will preserve her succession, and bring forth children even then when she shall appear the most barren, and her strength, through length of days, the most exhausted. Melancthon's faith could not stand this trial. He believed, indeed, in the promise in general, whereby the profession of truth was to subsist, but had not sufficient faith in the means God had appointed for its maintenance. What did the retaining so many good sentiments avail him? The enemy of our salvation, says St. Gregory Pope §, does

\* Lib. i. Ep. 107, 476, etc. v. n. 28.

† Matt. xxviii, 20.

‡ Rom. iv. 18.

§ Pastor. part iii. Adm. 31.



not always wholly extinguish them; and as God leaves in his children some remains of concupiscence, which keeps them in humility, Satan, his imitator, in a contrary sense, leaves also in his slaves, however strange it may seem, some remains of piety, (false, to be sure, and deceitful,) but yet apparent, whereby he accomplishes their seduction. To complete the mischief, they believe themselves saints, without reflecting that piety, unattended with all its requisites, is nothing but hypocrisy.

Melancthon, from some interior impulse, was moved to think that peace and unity, without which there is neither faith nor church, had no other support on earth but the authority of the ancient pastors. He did not follow this divine light to its whole extent; his foundations were all subverted; everything fell out contrary to his hopes. He aspired to unity; he lost it for ever, without being able to meet with so much as the shadow of it in the party wherein he had sought it. The Reformation, brought about or supported by arms, filled him with horror; he saw himself under the necessity of finding out excuses for an extravagance which he detested. Let us reflect on what he wrote to the Landgrave of Hesse, whom he saw ready to take up arms:—“May your Highness be persuaded that it is better to endure all extremities than to take up arms for the Gospel cause.\*” But he was forced to retract this fine maxim, when the party had entered into a confederacy to make war, and Luther himself had declared for them.

The unfortunate Melancthon could not even retain his natural sincerity; but was obliged to join with Bucer in laying snares for the Catholics, in affected equivocations; to load them with calumnies in the Confession of Augsburg†; to approve publicly this Confession, which he wished from the bottom of his heart to see reformed in so many points; to speak always as best pleased others; to pass his whole life in perpetual dissimulation; and that even with respect to religion, the first act whereof is to believe, as the second is to confess. What constraint! what a corruption! But party zeal carries all before it: one hardens and animates another; they must not only defend themselves, but multiply; the fine name of Reformation makes all lawful, and the first engagement makes all necessary.

\* Lib. iii. Ep. 16. Lib. iv. Ep. 110, 111.

† V. S. lib. iv. n. 2. et seq. lb. n. 24.

33.—*The Princes and Doctors of the party are alike insupportable to him.*

Meanwhile the heart is stung with secret reproaches, and such a state becomes irksome. Melancthon often declares that strange things pass in his mind, and knows not how to express his internal anguish. In the account he gives his intimate friend Camerarius, concerning the decrees of the Assembly of Spire, and the resolutions taken by the Protestants, all the terms he employs to represent his grief are extreme. "They are incredible agitations and the torments of hell: he is almost brought to death's door. What he feels is horrible: his consternation is astonishing. During his oppressions he is sensibly convinced how much certain people are to blame\*." When he dares not to speak out, it is some head of the party that is to be understood, and principally Luther: it was not certainly out of any fear of Rome that he wrote with so much precaution, and kept within such bounds; and, on the other hand, it is most certain nothing troubled him so much as what passed in the party itself, where all things were carried on by political interests, underhand contrivances, and violent counsels; in a word, nothing was there treated on but leagues, "which all good men (said he) ought to prevent†." All the affairs of the Reformation turned on these leagues of princes with the confederate towns, which the Emperor had a mind to break, and the Protestant princes were resolved to maintain; and this is what Melancthon wrote to Camerarius on the subject:—"You see, my dear friend, that in all these conventions nothing is less thought on than religion; fear makes them propose agreements, such as they are, for a time and with dissimulation; and no wonder if such treaties succeed ill; for is it possible that God should bless such counsels‡?" Far from exaggerating when he speaks thus, it is perceived, even from his letters, that he saw something in the party still worse than what he wrote. "I see (says he) that there is something secretly contriving, and I wish I were able to stifle all my thoughts§." He had such a disgust against the princes of his own party and their assemblies, into which they always brought him, in order to draw from his eloquence and facility excuses for counsels he approved not of, that at length he cried out—"Happy are they who meddle not with public affairs||." Nor did he ever find the

\* Lib. iv. Ep. 85.

† Steid. lib. viii.

‡ Lib. iv. Ep. 137.

§ Ibid. Ep. 70.

|| Ibid. Ep. 85.

least repose, till, after a too clear conviction of the evil intentions of those princes, "he had quite left off giving himself any concern about their projects\*." But they entangled him again in their intrigues in spite of him; and we shall soon see how he was obliged to authorise, by writing, their most scandalous proceedings. The opinion he had of the Doctors of the party, and how little he was satisfied with them, has been already shown: but here is something still stronger. "Their manners are such (says he), that, to speak very moderately, many people, moved at the confusion they behold amongst them, think any other state a golden age comparatively to that they put us in†." He judged "these wounds incurable‡;" and the Reformation, from the very beginning, stood in need of another reformation.

34.—*The prodigies, the prophecies, the horoscopes, where-with Melancthon was disturbed.*

Besides these agitations, in his correspondence with Camerarius, Osiander, and the rest of the heads of the party, and with Luther himself, he was continually upon the subject of the prodigies that happened, and the dreadful threats of the angry heavens. Sometimes you know not what he would be at: but it is always something terrible—something, I know not what, which he promises to disclose in private to his friend Camerarius, raises a kind of horror when you read him§. Other prodigies, almost coincident with the sitting of the Diet of Augsburg, appeared to him favourable to the new Gospel. At Rome, "the extraordinary overflowing of the Tiber, and a mule's bringing forth whose foal had a crane's foot;" in the territory of Augsburg, the birth of a "calf with two heads," were to him a sign of an unquestionable change in the state of the universe, and, in particular of "Rome's approaching ruin by schism||:" it is what he writes most seriously to Luther himself, informing him withal, that this happened on that same day the Confession of Augsburg was presented to the Emperor. Here we see with what notions the authors of this Confession, and the heads of the Reformation, fed themselves at so great a conjuncture: Melancthon's letters are quite full of dreams and visions, and one is apt to think he is reading Titus Livius, upon viewing all the prodigies there related. Is this all?

\* Lib. iv. Ep. 228.

+ Ibid. Ep. 742.

‡ Ibid. Ep. 759.

§ Lib. ii. Ep. 89. 269.

|| Lib. i. Ep. 120. iii. 69.

Oh, the extreme weakness of a mind in other respects admirable, and, but for his prepossession, so penetrating! The threats of astrologers terrify him. He is continually under frights from the ominous conjunctions of the stars—"a dreadful aspect of Mars" makes him tremble for his daughter, whose horoscope he himself had cast. He is not less "dismayed at the horrible flame of a comet extremely northern\*."

While the conferences were held at Augsburg upon matters of religion, he comforts himself for their proceeding so slowly on, because "the astrologers foretell that the stars will be more propitious to ecclesiastical disputes towards autumn†." God was above all these presages, it is true; and Melancthon repeats it frequently, as well as the almanac-makers; but, after all, the stars rule even church affairs. We find his friends, that is, the heads of the party, entered with him into these reflections: as for himself, his unlucky nativity promised him nothing but endless contests on doctrine, great labours, and little fruit. He is astonished, born as he was on the hills adjacent to the Rhine, that it should have been foretold him he was to suffer shipwreck on the Baltic sea‡; and being sent for into England and Denmark, he is determined not to venture himself on that sea. To so many prodigies and so many threats of unfriendly constellations, to complete the illusion, he joined also prophecies. It was one of the party's weaknesses to believe that their whole success had been foretold; and here is one of the most remarkable predictions they boast of. In 1516, as they say, and a year before the commotions of Luther, some cordelier or other, commenting on Daniel, had taken it into his head to say, that the "Pope's power was going to decline, and would never rise again§." This prediction was equally true with that other which this new prophet tacked to it, namely, that in 1600 "the Turk would be master of all Italy and Germany." Notwithstanding, Melancthon seriously relates the vision of this fanatic, and boasts of having the original by him, just as it was written by the brother cordelier. Who would not have trembled at this news? The Pope, it seems, already staggered at Luther's blow, and now they will have it that he is quite laid flat. Melancthon takes all this for prophecy; so weak is man when prepossessed. After the Pope's downfall he believes he sees the victorious Turk pressing forward; nay,

\* Lib. ii. Ep. 37. 445. Lib. iv. Ep. 119, 135, 137, 195, 198, 759, 844, etc. 119, 146.

† Ib. Ep. 93.

‡ Lib. ii. Ep. 448. 37.

§ Mel. Lib. i. Ep. 65.

the earthquakes that happened then confirm him in this thought.

Who would believe him capable of all these impressions, if all his letters were not full of them? We must do him this honour—they were not his own dangers which caused him so much trouble and anxiety. In the midst of his most violent agitations we hear him say confidently, “our dangers disturb me less than our faults\*.” He assigns a fine motive for his grief—the public grievances, and particularly the grievances of the church: but the truth is, he was sensible in his conscience, as he frequently acknowledges, how great a share those persons had in these grievances who had boasted of being the reformers of them. But enough of the troubles which afflicted Melancthon in particular: the reasons of his behaviour at the Assembly of Smalcald, and the motives for the restriction he put to that furious article which Luther proposed against the Pope, have been sufficiently explained.

\* Lib. iv. Ep. 70.

## BOOK VI.

[From the year 1537 to the year 1546.]

A brief Summary.—The Landgrave endeavours to maintain union between the Lutherans and Zuinglians.—A new remedy discovered for the incontinence of this Prince, by allowing him to marry a second wife, the first being alive.—The remarkable instruction he gives to Bucer, in order to induce Luther and Melancthon to adopt this sentiment. The dogmatical judgment of Luther, Bucer, and Melancthon, in favour of Polygamy.—The new marriage ensues in consequence of this consultation.—The Party is ashamed, and has not courage to deny or acknowledge it.—The Landgrave prevails on Luther to suppress the elevation of the Holy Sacrament in favour of the Swiss, whom this ceremony had alienated from the League of Smalcald.—On this occasion Luther is provoked anew against the Sacramentarians.—Melancthon's design to destroy the foundation of the Altar Sacrifice.—It is acknowledged in the Party that this Sacrifice is inseparable from the Real Presence and Luther's doctrine.—As much confessed concerning Adoration.—A Momentaneous Presence, and in the sole reception, how allowed.—Luther's sentiment despised by Melancthon and the Divines of Leipsic and Wittemberg.—Luther's furious Theses against the Divines of Iouvain.—He acknowledges the Sacrament to be adorable, detests the Zuinglians, and dies.

1.—*The scandalous Incontinency of the Landgrave, and what remedy was found for it in the Reformation.*

THE agreement of Wittemberg continued not long; it was foolish to imagine that a peace so patched up would be of long duration, and that so great an opposition in doctrine, with so great an emotion in the minds of men, could be surmounted by equivocations. Luther could not forbear

uttering angry words and venting his spleen against Bucer. Those of Zurich were not backward in defending their Doctor; but Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, who had always warlike projects in contemplation, kept the whole Protestant party united, as far as he was able, and for some years withheld them from coming to an open rupture. This Prince was the support of the League of Smalcald, and, considering the great need they had of him in the party, they allowed to him what no example before had warranted among Christians—it was to have two wives at once; nor could the Reformation find out any other remedy for his incontinence.

The historians who have written that this Prince was, in other respects, very temperate\*, were not let into the whole secret of the party; they did all they could to conceal the intemperance of a Prince whom the Reformation cried up above all others. We find from Melancthon's letters, in 1539†, at the time when the League of Smalcald became so formidable, that this Prince had a distemper which was carefully concealed; it was one of those that are not to be named. He recovered; and, for his intemperance, the heads of the Reformation prescribed the new remedy above-mentioned. They concealed, as much as they were able, this shame of the new doctrine. M. de Thou, with all his penetration into foreign affairs, could, it seems, discover no more than that this Prince, "by the advice of his pastors," had a concubine together with his wife. This is enough to cover these false pastors with confusion who thus authorised concubinage: but it was not then known that these pastors were Luther himself and all the heads of the party, and that they permitted the Landgrave to have a concubine under the title of a lawful wife, although he had then another whose marriage subsisted in full force. At present this whole mystery of iniquity is discovered by the authentic papers which the late Elector Palatine, Charles Lewis, caused to be printed, and part of which, Ernest, Prince of Hesse, descended from Philip, has made public since his becoming Catholic.

2.—*Important acts relating to this matter, taken from a book printed by order of the Elector Charles Lewis, Count Palatine.*

The book which the Prince Palatine caused to be printed bears this title,—“Conscientious Considerations on Mar-

\* Thuan. lib. iv. ad an. 1557.

† Mel. lib. iv. Ep. 214.

riage, with a Dilucidation of the Questions till this present time debated, touching Adultery, Divorce, and Polygamy." The book came out in high Dutch in 1679, under the borrowed name of Daphneus Arcuarius, under which was concealed that of Laurentius Bøger, that is, Laurence Archer, one of this Prince's counsellors. The design of the book is, apparently, to justify Luther against Bellarmine, who accused him of authorising polygamy, but, in reality, he shews that Luther favoured it; and lest it might be said he, perchance, advanced this doctrine at the beginning only of the Reformation, he produces what was done long after, in this new marriage of the Landgrave. He instances in three pieces, the first of which is an instruction of the Landgrave himself delivered to Bucer, for he was the person commissioned to negotiate with Luther the whole business, whence it is plain that the Landgrave at times employed him in adjusting matters of a quite different nature than were the Sacramentarian contests. You have here a faithful copy of this instruction; and, as the piece is remarkable, it may be here seen entire, translated word for word, from high Dutch into Latin, and by a good hand\*.

3.—*Bucer sent to Luther and other heads of the Party to obtain leave for marrying a second wife—this Prince's instructions to his Envoy.*

The Landgrave begins by setting forth how that, "since his last illness, he had reflected much on his state, and chiefly upon this, that a few weeks after his marriage he had begun to wallow in adultery; that his pastors had frequently exhorted him to approach the holy table, but he did believe he should there meet with his judgment, because he will not abandon such a course of life†." He imputes to his wife the cause of all his disorders, and gives the reasons for his never loving her; but, having a difficulty in explaining himself on these matters, he refers them to Bucer, whom he had made privy to the whole affair. Next he speaks of his complexion, and the effects of high living at the assemblies of the empire, at which he was obliged to be present. 'To carry thither a wife of such a quality as his own would be too great an incumbrance. When his preachers remonstrated to him that he ought to punish adulteries and such like crimes, "How (said he) can I punish crimes of which I myself am guilty? When I expose myself in war for the

\* See the end of this (6th) Book,

† Inst. N. 1, 2. Ib. u. 3.



Gospel cause, I think I should go to the Devil should I be killed there by the sword or a musket-ball\*. I am sensible that, with the wife I have, NEITHER CAN I, NEITHER WILL I, change my life, whereof I take God to witness; so that I find no means of amendment but by the remedies God afforded the people of old, that is to say, polygamy†.

4.—*Sequel to the Instruction—the Landgrave promises the revenues of Monasteries to Luther if he will favour his design.*

He there states the reasons which persuade him that it is not forbidden under the Gospel; and what deserves most notice, is his saying, “that, to his knowledge, Luther and Melancthon advised the King of England not to break off his marriage with the Queen, his wife; but, besides her, also to wed another‡.” This, again, is a secret we were ignorant of: but a Prince, so well informed, says he knows it; and adds, that they ought to allow him this remedy so much the readier, because he demands it only “for the salvation of his soul.” “I am resolved (proceeds he) to remain no longer in the snares of the Devil; NEITHER CAN I, NEITHER WILL I, withdraw myself but by this way; wherefore I beg of Luther, of Melancthon, of Bucer himself, to give me a certificate, that I may embrace it. But, if they apprehend that such a certificate may turn to scandal at this time, and prejudice the Gospel cause, should it be printed, I desire at least they will give me a declaration in writing, that God would not be offended should I marry in private; and that they will seek for means to make this marriage public in due time, to the end that the woman I shall wed may not pass for a dishonest person, otherwise, in process of time, the church would be scandalized§.” Then he assures them that “they need not fear lest this second marriage should make him injure his first wife, or even separate himself from her; since, on the contrary, he is determined on this occasion to carry his cross, and leave his dominions to their common children. Let them, therefore, grant me (continues this Prince), in the name of God, what I request of them, to the end that I may both live and die more cheerfully for the Gospel cause, and more willingly undertake the defence of it; and, on my part, I will do whatsoever they shall in reason

\* Inst. N. 5. † Ibid. N. 6. ‡ Ibid. N. 6. et seq. Ibid. N. 10. Ibid. N. 11, 12.  
§ Ibid. N. 12.

ask of me, whether they demand the revenues of monasteries, or other things, of a similar nature\*.”

5.—*Continuation of it—the Landgrave proposes to have recourse to the Emperor, and even to the Pope, in case of refusal.*

We see how artfully he insinuates the reasons which he, who knew them so thoroughly; was sensible would have most influence on them; and, as he foresaw that scandal was the thing they would most dread, he adds, “That already the ecclesiastics hated the Protestants to such a degree, that they would not hate them more or less for this new article allowing polygamy: but if, contrary to his expectation, Melancthon and Luther should prove inexorable, many designs ran in his head—amongst others, that of applying to the Emperor for this dispensation, whatever money it might cost him†.” This was a ticklish point—“For (continues he) there is no likelihood of the Emperor’s granting this permission without a dispensation from the Pope, for which I care but little (says he); ‡ but for that of the Emperor I ought not to despise it, though I should make but little account of that too, did I not otherwise believe that God had rather allowed than forbidden what I wish for; and if the attempt I make on this side (that is upon Luther) succeed not, a human fear urges me to demand the Emperor’s consent, certain as I am to obtain all I please, upon giving a round sum of money to some one of his ministers. But although I would not for anything in the world withdraw myself from the Gospel, or be engaged in any affair that might be contrary to its interest, I am, nevertheless, afraid lest the Imperialists should draw me into something not conducive to the interests of this cause and party. I, therefore, call on them (concludes he) to afford me the redress I expect, lest I should go seek it in some other place less agreeable; desirous a thousand times rather to owe my repose to their permission than to all other human permissions. Finally, I desire to have, in writing, the opinion of Luther, Melancthon, and Bucer, in order that I may amend myself, and with a good conscience approach the Sacrament.”—Given at Melsinguen, the Sunday after St. Catherine’s Day, 1539.

PHILIP, LANDGRAVE OF HESSE.

\* Inst. N. 13.

† Ibid. N. 14.

‡ Ibid. N. 15. et seq.

6.—*The dogmatical advice of Luther—Polygamy allowed by him and the other heads of the Protestants.*

The instruction was equally pressing and ticklish. We see the secret springs which the Landgrave sets in motion: he forgets nothing; and whatever contempt he shewed for the Pope, the very naming him on this occasion was too much for these new Doctors. So dexterous a Prince let not that word slip without design; and, besides, the very hint of entering into conjunction with the Emperor, was enough to make the whole party tremble. These reasons carried with them much more weight than those the Landgrave had striven to draw from Scripture. To cogent reasons there was joined an artful agent. Accordingly, Bucer obtained of Luther a consultation in form, the original of which was in high Dutch, in Melancthon's hand and style\*. It is permitted to the Landgrave, according to the Gospel† (for everything is done in the Reformation under that name), to marry another wife besides that he has already. They deplore, indeed, the condition he is in, "that he cannot refrain from his adulteries as long as he shall have but one wife‡;" and represent to him this state as very bad in the sight of God, and contrary "to the security of his conscience§." But at the same time, and in the next period, they grant him their leave, and declare to him that "he may marry a second wife, if he be fully bent upon it, provided only he keep it secret." Thus the same mouth pronounces good and evil||; thus the crime becomes lawful by concealing it. I blush to write these things, and the Doctors who wrote them were themselves ashamed of them. This may be seen through the whole tenor of their perplexed and winding sentences: but they, in the end, were obliged to speak the word, and allow the Landgrave, in express terms, this bigamy he so much coveted. This was the first time it was ever said, since the birth of Christianity, by men styling themselves Doctors in the Church, that Jesus Christ had not forbidden such marriages: that text of Genesis, "They shall be two in one flesh¶," was eluded, although Jesus Christ had reduced it to its first sense and primitive institution, which suffers but two persons in the nuptial band\*\*. The resolution, in the German language,

<sup>c</sup> See the end of this (6th) Book.

† Consul. de Luther, N. 21, 22.

‡ Ibid. N. 20.

§ Ibid. N. 21.

|| Jam. iii. 10.

¶ Gen. ii. 24.

\*\* Matt. xix. 4, 5, 6.

was signed by Luther, Bucer, and Melancthon. Two other Doctors, one of them Melander, the Landgrave's minister, signed it also, in Latin, at Wittenberg, in the month of December, 1539\*. This permission was granted in form of dispensation, and reduced to a case of necessity†, for they were ashamed of passing this practice into a general law. They found out necessities against the Gospel, and, after having so much blamed the dispensations of Rome, they ventured to give one of that high importance. All the most renowned persons of the Reformation in Germany consented to this iniquity: God visibly gave them over to a reprobate sense; and those who exclaimed against abuses in order to render the church odious, themselves commit much stranger and more numerous ones at the very beginning of their Reformation; than they could either rake up or invent during the course of so many ages that they upbraided the church with her corruption.

7.—*What was answered in this Consultation with relation to the Emperor.*

The Landgrave had very well foreseen he should make his Doctors tremble with the bare mentioning his thoughts of treating with the Emperor on this affair. They answer him, that this Prince has neither faith nor religion—"that he is a cheat, who has nothing of German manners in him, with whom it is dangerous to enter into any engagements‡." Writing thus to a Prince of the empire, what is it else but putting all Germany in a flame? Then, what can be more abject than what appears at the beginning of this advice? "Our poor, little, miserable, and abandoned church (say they) stands in need of virtuous governing princes§." Here is the reason, if taken right, these new Doctors go upon. But these virtuous princes the Reformation stood in need of, were princes who would make the Gospel subservient to their passions. The church, indeed, may want the support of princes for her temporal repose; but to broach pernicious and unheard of points of doctrine, purely to please them, and, by this means, to sacrifice to them the Gospel they boast of re-establishing, is the true mystery of iniquity, and the abomination of desolation in the sanctuary.

\* Book of Conscience. Confid. S. N. 2.

† Ibid. N. 23, 24.

‡ Consult. N. 4, 20, 21.

§ Ibid. N. 2.

8.—*The secret of the second Marriage, which was to pass for Concubinage—this scandal despised by those who were of the Consultation.*

So infamous a Consultation was enough to discredit the whole party; nor could the Doctors who subscribed it have silenced the clamours, nor shunned the odium of the people, who, as themselves do own, would have “ranked them with Mahometans, or Anabaptists, that make a jest of marriage\*.” Accordingly they took their measures, and, in their advice, forbade the Landgrave, above all things, ever to discover this new marriage. There were but a very small number of witnesses to be present, who were also to be bound to secrecy “under the seal of confession †,”—thus spoke the Consultation. The new bride was to pass for a concubine. They preferred this scandal in the house of this Prince to that which would be caused throughout all Christendom by the sanctioning of a marriage so contrary to the Gospel, and to the common doctrine of all Christians ‡.

9.—*The second Marriage is made in private—the contract agreed upon.—1540.*

The consult was followed by a marriage, in form, betwixt Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, and Margaret of Saal, by the consent of Christina of Saxony, his wife. The Prince had no more to do but declare, at his marriage, that he did not take this second wife “through any levity or curiosity, but from inevitable necessities of body and conscience, which his Highness had laid before many learned, prudent, Christian, and devout preachers, who had advised him to put his conscience in repose by this means §.” The instrument of this marriage, dated the 4th of March, 1540, may be found, together with the consultation, in the book which was published by order of the Elector Palatine. Prince Ernest has also furnished the same pieces, so that they are become public in two ways. It is ten or twelve years since copies of them have been produced in a book dispersed through all France ||, and never contradicted; and now we have them in such authentic form that there is no room left for doubt. That nothing further might be required, I have added thereto the Landgrave’s instruction, and the history is now complete.

\* Consult. N. 10, 18.

† Ibid. N. 21.

‡ Ibid.

§ Inst. Copalat.—See the end of this (6th) Book.

|| Lettres de Gastineau.—Varill. Hist. de l’Heres. liv. xii.

10.—*The Landgrave's and Luther's Answer to those who reproach them with this Marriage.*

Evil deeds generally come out one way or other. Whatever caution was used to conceal this scandalous marriage, it began, nevertheless, to be suspected; and certain it is, both the Landgrave and Luther were upbraided with it in public writings, but they shifted off the matter by equivocating. A German author has published a letter of the Landgrave's to Henry, the young Duke of Brunswick, where he speaks to him in these words;—"You reproach me with a report, that prevails of my having taken a second wife, whilst the first is still living: but I declare to you, that if you or any other person say that I have contracted an unchristian marriage, or that I have done anything unworthy of a Christian Prince, it is all downright calumny: for although, towards God, I look upon myself as a miserable sinner, I live, however, before him, in my faith and in my conscience, after such a manner that my confessors do not hold me for an unchristian person. I give scandal to no one, and live with the Princess, my wife, in a perfect good understanding\*." All this was true, in his way of thinking, for he did not allow that the marriage he was reproached with was unchristian. His first lady was satisfied with it, and the Consultation had stopped the mouths of the Confessors of this Prince. Luther answers with no less artifice. "They reproach the Landgrave (says he) with being a polygamist. I have not much to say on that subject. The Landgrave is able, and has men learned enough to defend him. As for myself, I know one only Princess and Landgrave of Hesse, who is and ought to be named wife and mother in Hesse; and there is no other that can give young Landgraves to this Prince, but the Princess who is the daughter of George, Duke of Saxony †." And, indeed, they had ordered matters so that neither the new bride nor her children could bear the title of Landgraves. To defend themselves thus, is aiding their own conviction, and acknowledging the shameful corruption introduced in doctrine by those who, in all their works, spoke of nothing but re-establishing the pure Gospel.

\* Hortlederus de Caus. Bell. Germ. An. 1540.

† Jen. T. vii. fol. 425.

### 11.—*Luther's scandalous Sermon on Marriage.*

After all, Luther did but follow those principles he had laid down in other places. I have always dreaded speaking of these "inevitable necessities" which he recognized in the union of the two sexes, and of that scandalous sermon he delivered at Wittemberg on marriage; but, since the scree of this history has made me at once break through that barrier which modesty had laid in my way, I can no longer dissemble what is found printed in Luther's works\*. It is true, then, that in a sermon which he delivered at Wittemberg, for the reformation of marriage, he blushed not to pronounce these infamous and scandalous words:—"If they are stubborn (he speaks of wives) it is fitting their husbands should tell them, if you will not another will: if the mistress refuse to come, let the maid be called." A man would blush to hear such words in a farce, and on the stage. The chief of the reformers preaches this seriously in the church; and, as he turned all his excesses into dogmata, he adds—"However, it is necessary for the husband to bring his wife first before the church, and to admonish her two or three times; after that put her away, and take Esther instead of Vasthi." This was a new cause for divorce superadded to that of adultery. Thus did Luther handle the subject of the reformation of marriage. We must not ask him in what Gospel he found this article; it is sufficient that it is included "in those necessities," which he fain would believe were above all laws and precautions. After this, will any one wonder at what he allowed the Landgrave? In this sermon, it is true, he orders to repudiate the first wife before the other be taken; and, in the consultation, he permits the Landgrave to have two at once. But, then, the sermon was pronounced in 1522, and the Consultation was penned in 1539. It was but fair that Luther should have learned something after seventeen or eighteen years spent in reforming.

12.—*The Landgrave obliges Luther to suppress the elevation of the blessed Sacrament in the Mass.—How this occasion was made use of to inflame him anew against the Sacramentarians.—1542, 1543.*

From that time forward the Landgrave had almost an absolute sway over this patriarch of the Reformation; and after having found out his weak side in so essential a

\* Serm. de Matrim, t. v, fol, 123.

point, he no longer thought him capable of resisting him. This Prince was little versed in controversies; but, to make amends, like an expert politician, he knew how to conciliate the minds of men, to manage different interests, and keep up confederacies. His chief aim was to prevail upon the Swiss to enter into that of Smalcald; but he perceived they were offended at many things in practice among the Lutherans, and particularly at the elevation of the Holy Sacrament, which was still in use, with the ringing of the bell, and the people striking their breasts, with sighs and groans. Five-and-twenty years had Luther preserved these motions of a piety which he knew had Jesus Christ for its object: but nothing was permanent in the Reformation. The Landgrave never ceased attacking Luther on this head, and importuned him in such a manner, that after suffering this custom to be abolished in some churches of his party, he at length set it aside in the church of Wittemberg, which was under his immediate direction. These changes happened in 1542 and 1543\*. The Sacramentarians triumphed at it; they believed that Luther was now relenting; and, even among the Lutherans, it was said he was at length falling off from that admirable resolution, wherewith he had, up to that period, maintained the ancient doctrine of the Real Presence, and that he was about coming to an understanding with the Sacramentarians. He was nettled at these reports; for he was impatient of the most trifling circumstance that infringed on his authority†. Peucer, Melancthon's son-in-law, from whom we have taken this account, observes, he took no notice of it for awhile; for, says he, "his great heart was not easily wrought upon‡." We shall now, however, see by what means they roused him. A physician, named Wildus, of great repute in his profession, and much esteemed by the nobility of Misnia, where these reports were most spread against Luther, came to visit him at Wittemberg, and met with a kind reception at his house. It fell out (proceeds Peucer) that, at a feast, where Melancthon was also present, this physician being heated with wine (for at the Reformers' tables men drank as in other places, and such abuses as these were not what they had undertaken to correct); this physician, I say, began to talk unguardedly of the elevation lately suppressed, and told Luther very frankly, that the common opinion was, he had made this

\* Gas. Peuc. Nar. Hist. de Phil. Mel. soceri sui, sent. de Cœn. Dom. Ambergæ, 1596, p. 24.

† Peuc. *ibid.* Sultzeri. *id.* Ep. ad Cal. inter. Calv. Ep. p. 52.

‡ Peuc. *ibid.*



alteration only to please the Swiss, and that he had at length adopted their opinions. This great heart was not proof against these words uttered in liquor; his emotion was perceptible, and Melancthon foresaw what ensued.

13.—*Luther's old jealousy awakened against Zuinglius and his disciples.—1545.*

In this manner was Luther animated against the Swiss, and his wrath became implacable on account of two books, which those of Zurich caused to be printed the same year. One was a translation of the Bible made by Leo of Juda, that famous Jew who embraced the Zuinglian doctrine: the other was the works of Zuinglius, carefully collected, with great eulogiums of this author. Although there was nothing in these books against Luther's person, immediately upon their publication he flew out into the greatest extravagance, nor had his transports ever appeared so violent. The Zuinglians published, and the Lutherans have almost owned the same, that Luther could not endure that any one, besides himself, should meddle with translating the Bible\*. He had made a very elegant version of it in his own language, and thought it was not consistent with his honour that the Reformation should have any other, at least where high Dutch was understood. The works of Zuinglius awakened his jealousy†, and he believed they were always resolved to set up this man against him, to dispute with him the glory of being the first reformer.‡ Be that as it will, Melancthon and the Lutherans all owned that, after a truce of five or six years' standing, Luther first renewed the war with greater fury than ever. Whatever power the Landgrave had upon Luther, he could never restrain his transports for any considerable time. The Swiss produce letters in Luther's own hand, where he forbids the bookseller, who had made him a present of Leo's translation, ever to send him any thing from those of Zurich, "for they were damned men, who dragged away others into hell; and the churches no longer could communicate with them, nor consent to their blasphemies, and he had resolved to oppose them, by his writings and his prayers, to his very last breath§."

\* Hosp. Part ii. p. 183. Calix. Judicium, N. 72, p. 121, 122.

† Hosp. *ibid.* f. 184.

‡ *Ibid.*

§ *Ibid.* f. 183.

- 14.—*Luther will not suffer the Sacramentarians to be any longer prayed for, and believes them inevitably damned.*  
—1544.

He kept his word. The year following he published a comment upon Genesis, where he placed Zuinglius and Ecolampadius with Arius, with Muncer; and the Anabaptists among the Idolaters, who made for themselves “an idol of their own thoughts, and adored them in contempt of God’s word.” But what he afterwards published was much more terrible—it was his little “Confession of Faith,” where he calls them “madmen, blasphemers, miserable wretches, damned souls, for whom it was no longer lawful to pray\* :” for he carried matters to this extremity, and protested he never would have any further communication with them, “neither by letters, nor by words, nor by works,” if they did not confess “that the bread of the Eucharist was the true natural body of our Lord, which the impious, and even the traitor Judas, received not less by the mouth than St. Peter and the rest of the faithful.”

15.—*Luther’s Anathemas.*

By that means he believed he had put an end to the scandalous interpretations of the Sacramentarians, who turned all to their own sense; and declared he held all for fanatics who should refuse subscribing this last “confession of faith †.” For he now assumed so high a tone, and so threatened the world with his anathemas, that the Zuinglians no longer called him any thing but the “new Pope, and new Anti-Christ.”

- 16.—*The Zuinglians reprove Luther for always having the Devil in his mouth, and call him a madman.*

Thus not less vigorous was the defence than the attack. Those of Zurich, scandalised at this strange expression, “the bread is the true natural body of our Lord,” were much more so at Luther’s outrageous contumelies; insomuch that they wrote a book, entitled, “Against the vain and scandalous Calumnies of Luther,” in which they maintain “that a man must be as mad as himself to bear with his furious sallies; that he dishonoured his old age; and, by his violence, rendered himself contemptible; and he ought to

\* Hosp. *ibid.* p. 186, 187. Calix. Jud. N. 73. p. 123, et seq. Lut. parv. Cons.

† Conc. p. 734. Luth. t. ii. f. 325. Hosp: 193.

be ashamed of filling his books with so much abusive language and so many devils." The truth is, Luther had taken care to place the devils within and without, at top and at bottom, at the right hand and the left, before and behind the Zuinglians; inventing, withal, new phrases to pierce them through and through with devils, and repeating this odious name even so as to excite horror.

17.—*Luther's scandalous Prayer, who says he never offended the Devil.*

Such was his custom: in 1542 the Turk threatened Germany more than ever; he had published a prayer against him, where he brought in the Devil after a strange manner. "Thou knowest (said he), O Lord, that the Devil, the Pope, and the Turk, have neither right nor reason to torment us, for we have never offended them: but because we confess that thou, O Father, and thy Son, Jesus Christ, and the Holy Ghost, are but one only God eternal—there is our sin, there is our whole crime: for that it is they hate and persecute us; and we should no longer have to fear any thing from them, did we but renounce this faith\*." What a blindness, to jumble together the Devil, the Pope, and Turk, as the three enemies of the faith in the Trinity! what a calumny to aver that the Pope persecutes them for this faith! and what folly to exculpate himself to the enemy of mankind as one that never had given him any displeasure!

18.—*Bucer's own Confession of Faith—He confirms that the unworthy do really receive the body of our Lord—Invention of solid Faith.*

Some time after Luther had renewed his indignation against the Sacramentarians, in the manner already mentioned, Bucer framed a new confession of faith. These men were never tired of that; it seemed as if he had a mind to oppose it to the little confession which Luther had but just published. That of Bucer came up pretty near to the expressions of the Wittemberg agreement, whereof he was the mediator; but he would not have made a new confession of faith, had he not intended to change something. The thing was (he would no longer say as distinctly and generally as he had done) that the body of our Saviour might be taken without faith, and taken very really in virtue of our Lord's institution, which our evil disposition could not deprive of its efficacy†. Bucer

\* Sleid. lib. xiv.

† Ibid. lib. iv. N. xxiii.

here corrects that doctrine, and seems to lay it down as a condition for the presence of Jesus Christ in the Supper, not only that it be celebrated according to Christ's institution, but also "that men have a solid faith in those words by which he gives himself\*." This Doctor, who durst not give a lively faith to those who communicated unworthily, in favour of them invented "this solid faith," which I leave to the examination of Protestants; and he would have it, that, by such a faith, the unworthy received "not only the sacrament, but the Lord himself †."

19.—*The same Author's perplexities with relation to the Communion of the Impious.*

He seems puzzled what to say of the communion of the impious: for Luther, whom he would not openly contradict, decided, in his little confession, that they as truly received Jesus Christ as the saints. But Bucer, who feared nothing so much as speaking plainly, says, that those amongst the impious "who have faith for a while, receive Jesus Christ in an enigma, as they receive the Gospel." What prodigies of expression! and, for those who have no faith at all, it seems he ought to say, they do not at all receive Jesus Christ. But that would have been too clear; he is content with saying, "they do not see, nor touch, in the Sacrament, anything but what is sensible." But what else would he have men see and touch therein, besides what is sensible of striking the senses? The rest, that is, the body of our Saviour, may be believed, but no one boasts of either seeing him, or touching him in himself; nor have the faithful any advantage in that respect above the impious. Thus Bucer, according to his custom, does nothing but perplex; and, by his subtillies, prepares the way, as we shall see, to those of Calvin and the Calvinists.

20.—*Melancthon labours to make the Real Presence momentaneous, and places it only in the act of using it.*

Meanwhile, Melancthon made it his particular endeavour to diminish, as I may say, the Real Presence, by striving to reduce it to the precise time of its reception. This is a principal dogma of Lutheranism, and it is of great moment clearly to understand how it was established in the sect.

\* Conf. Bucer, *ibid.* art. 22.

† *Ibid.* art. 23.

21.—*The aversion for the Mass is the true foundation of this dogma—Two things the Protestants cannot bear with therein.*

The mass was the great aversion of the new Reformation, though, in point of fact, it was nothing else but the public prayers of the church, consecrated by the celebration of the Eucharist, wherein, Jesus Christ present, honours his Father, and sanctifies the faithful. But two things offended the new Doctors, because they never thoroughly had understood them: one was the oblation, the other the adoration given to Jesus Christ present in these mysteries.

22.—*Luther's blind hatred to the Oblation and the Canon of the Mass.*

The oblation was nothing but the consecration of the bread and wine, in order to make them the body and blood of Jesus Christ, and render him, by this means, truly present. It was impossible this action should not, of itself, be agreeable to God; nor that the sole presence of Jesus Christ, shewed to his Father, by honouring his supreme majesty, should not be capable of drawing down his graces on us. The new Doctors were bent to believe that a virtue of saving men, independently of faith, was attributed to this presence, and to the action of the mass: we have seen their error, and on so false a pre-supposition did the mass become the object of their aversion. The most holy words of the canon were decried. Luther discovered poison in every part thereof, even in that prayer we there make a little before Communion—"O Lord Jesus Christ, Son of the living God, who by thy death hast given life to the world, by thy body and blood free me from all my sins." Luther, who could believe it! condemned these last words, and would imagine that we attributed our deliverance to the body and blood, independently of faith, without reflecting that this prayer, addressed to Jesus Christ, Son of the living God, who by his death has given life to the world, was itself, in every part, an act of the most lively faith. No matter: Luther said, that the monks attributed "their salvation to the body and blood of Jesus Christ, without mentioning one word of faith\*." If the priest, at communion, said with the Psalmist, "I will take the heavenly bread,

\* De abomin. Mis. priv. seu Canonis, t. ii. pp. 393, 394.

and call upon the name of the Lord\*," Luther found fault with it, and said, "that we improperly, and unseasonably, turned off the mind from faith to works." How blind is hatred! how envenomed must that heart be which poisons such holy things!

23.—*In what sense we offer in the Mass for the redemption of mankind—The Ministers forced to approve this sense.*

No wonder if, after this, they shewed the same virulence against the words of the canon, where it is said that "the faithful offer this sacrifice of praise for the redemption of their souls." The most passionate of their ministers are now obliged to own, that the intention of the church here is to offer for the redemption, not to merit it anew, as if the cross had not merited it, but "in thanksgiving for so great a benefit," and with the design of applying it to us †. But never would Luther or the Lutherans enter into so natural a sense; nothing would they see in the Mass but horror and abomination: thus, all that was most holy in it was wrested to an evil sense; and thence concluded Luther "that the Canon ought to be as much abominated as the Devil himself."

24.—*The whole Mass is comprehended in the Real Presence alone—This Presence cannot be admitted without owning it permanent, and existing out of the Reception.*

In the hatred which the Reformation had conceived against the Mass, nothing was so much desired as to sap the foundation of it, which, after all, was nothing else but the Real Presence. For upon this presence did the Catholics ground the whole worth and virtue of the Mass: this was the only basis of the oblation, and all the other worship; and Jesus Christ there present constituted its very essence. Calixtus †, a Lutheran, has owned, that one of the reasons, not to say the principal one, which made so great a part of the Reformation to deny the Real Presence, was, because they knew no better way to destroy the Mass and the entire worship of Popery. Luther, could he have done it, would himself have come into this sentiment; and we have seen what he said of the inclination he had to shake off Popery in this particular as well as others. And yet, whilst he re-

\* Ps. cxv.

† Blond. Præf. in lib. Albert de Euchar.

‡ Judic. Calix. N. 47, p. 70. N. 51, p. 76. S. lib. ii. N. 1.

tained, as he saw himself forced to do, the literal sense, and the Real Presence, it was evident that the Mass subsisted entire; for, upon his retaining this literal sense, the Catholics concluded, not only that the Eucharist was the true body, since Jesus Christ had said "this is my body," but also that it was the body from the time Christ had pronounced it so; consequently, before the manducation, and from the very instant of consecration, since it was not then said, "this shall be," but "this is;" a doctrine wherein we shall now perceive the whole Mass to be contained.

25.—*The Real Presence permanent and independent of the Reception retained by Luther, even after he had suppressed the Elevation.*

This consequence, which the Catholics drew from the Real Presence to the Permanent Presence, and subsisting independent of its use, was so clear that Luther had acknowledged it\*; it was on this foundation that he had always retained the Elevation of the Host, even to the year 1543, and, even after he had abolished it, he still writes, in his "Little Confession," in 1544, that "it might be retained with piety, as a testimonial of the real and corporeal presence in the bread, since, by this action, the priest did say, 'Behold, Christians, this is the body of Jesus Christ, which was given for you.'" Whence, it appears, that, although he had changed the ceremony of Elevation, he did not change the foundation of his sentiment on the Real Presence, but continued to own it immediately after the Consecration.

26.—*Melancthon finds no other means of destroying the Mass, but by denying the Permanent Presence.*

With this faith it is impossible to deny the sacrifice of the altar; for what will they have Jesus Christ do before his body and blood are eaten, but to render himself present for us before his Father? It was, then, in order to hinder so natural a consequence, that Melancthon sought always to reduce this presence to the sole manducation; and it was chiefly at the conference of Ratisbon that he displayed this part of his doctrine. Charles the Fifth had ordered this conference in 1541, betwixt the Catholics and Protestants, that means might be found out for reconciling both religions. It was there that Melancthon, acknowledging, according to his custom, the real and substantial presence together with

\* Luth. parv. Conf. 1544. Hosp. p. 13.

the Catholics, took great pains to show that the Eucharist, like other sacraments, was not a sacrament, except in the lawful use thereof, that is, as he understood it, except in the actual reception\*.

27.—*Melancthon's frivolous reasons.*

The comparison he drew from the other Sacraments was very weak; for, in signs of this nature, where all depends on the will of the institutor, it appertains not to us to prescribe him general laws, nor to tell him he can make but one kind of sacraments; in the institution of his sacraments he might have proposed to himself divers designs, which must be understood from the words he employed at each particular institution. Now, Jesus Christ having said, precisely, "this is," the effect ought to be as speedy as the words are powerful and true; nor was there room for further reasoning.

28.—*Other, as frivolous, reasons.*

But Melancthon replied; and this was his main argument, which he ceased not to repeat, that God's promise not being made to the bread, but to man, the body of our Lord ought not to be in the bread but when man received it†. By a similar method of reasoning it might as well be concluded, that the bitterness of the waters of Mara was not corrected‡, nor the waters of Cana made wine§, but at the time they were drank, since these miracles were wrought only for the men who drank of it. As, then, these changes were made in the water, but not for the water, there is no reason we should no. likewise acknowledge a change in the bread which is not for the bread; there is no reason, why this heavenly bread, as well as the terrestrial, should not be made and prepared before it be eaten, nor can I conceive how Melancthon should lay such stress on so pitiful an argument.

29.—*These reasons of Melancthon destroyed all Luther's doctrine.*

But the most considerable thing here is, that by this reasoning, he attacked his master Luther, no less than he did the Catholics; for, by proving that nothing at all was done in the bread, he proved that nothing was done in it in any

\* Hosp. pp. 154, 179, 180.

† Hosp. pp. 154, 179, 180. Mel. lib. ii. ep. 25, 40. lib. iii. 188, 189, &c.

‡ Exod. xv. 23.

§ Joan. ii.



instant, and that the body of our Lord is not there, either in the reception, or out of the reception; but that man, to whom this promise is addressed, receives it at the presence of the bread, as at the presence of water he receives, in baptism, the Holy Ghost and sanctifying grace. Melancthon saw well this consequence, as it will appear hereafter; but whether he had the cunning to conceal it then, or Luther looked not so narrowly into it, the hatred he had conceived against the Mass, made him pass over all that was advanced in order to destroy it.

30.—*Melancthon's last reason more weak than all the rest.*

Melancthon made use of another argument still weaker than the foregoing ones. He said that Jesus Christ would not be tied; and that to bind him to the bread, further than the time of using it, was to take away his free will\*. How can one think such a thing, and say, that the free-will of Jesus Christ is destroyed by a tie that proceeds from his own choice? His word binds him, without doubt, because he is faithful and true; but this bond is not less voluntary than inviolable.

31.—*Melancthon's true reason was, because he could not separate the Mass from the Real Presence, were that owned permanent.—Luther's saying.*

This was what human reason opposed to the mystery of Jesus Christ; vain subtilties, mere quirks: but a weightier motive lay at the bottom of all this. Melancthon's true reason was, because he could not deny but that Jesus Christ, placed on the holy table before the manducation and by the sole consecration of the bread and wine, was an object of itself agreeable to God, which attested his supreme excellence interceded for men, and had all the conditions of a true oblation. In this manner the Mass subsisted, neither could it be overthrown, but by overthrowing the real presence out of the manducation. Accordingly, when Luther was told that Melancthon had strenuously denied this presence at the Conference of Ratisbon, Hospinian reports, he cried out, "Cheer up, my dear Melancthon, the Mass is now fallen to the ground—thou hast destroyed the mystery which, hitherto, I had struck at, but in vain.†" Thus, by the Protestants' own confession, the sacrifice of the Eucharist will ever remain

\* Mel. ep. Sup. cit. Hosp. Part ii. p. 184, etc. Joan, Sturm. Antip. iv. Part 4.

† Hosp. p. 180.

immovable, as long as in these words, "This is my body," an effectual presence shall be admitted; and in order to destroy the Mass, the effect of our Saviour's words must be suspended, their natural sense be taken away, and "this is" be changed into "this shall be."

32.—*Melancthon's dissimulation—Luther's notable Letters in favour of the Permanent Presence.*

Although Luther permitted Melancthon to say whatever he pleased against the Mass, yet he in nowise departed from his former notions, nor did he reduce the presence of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist to the bare reception of it. It is even plain that Melancthon shifted with him on this subject; and there are two of Luther's letters, in 1543, wherein he commends a saying of Melancthon's, "that the presence was in the action of the Supper, but not in a precise and mathematical point\*." As for Luther, he determined the time to be from the Pater Noster which was said in the Lutheran Mass immediately after the Consecration, until all the people had communicated, and all the remaining particles were consumed. But why stops he there? If, at that instant, the communion had been carried to the absent, as St. Justin tells us was done in his time†, what reason would there have been to say, that Jesus Christ had immediately withdrawn his sacred presence? But why should he not continue it for some days after, when the Holy Sacrament should be reserved for the communion of the sick? It is nothing but mere caprice to take away the presence of Jesus Christ in this case; and Luther and the Lutherans had no longer any rule, when, out of the actual reception, they admitted the use of it but for never so short a time. But what made still more against them is, that the Mass and Oblation always remained; and, had there been but one moment of presence before the communion, this presence of Jesus Christ could not be deprived of any of the advantages which attended it. For which reason Melancthon always aimed, whatever he might say to Luther, at placing the presence in the precise time of the reception alone, and this only way could he find of destroying the Oblation and Mass.

33.—*The Elevation irreprehensible, according to Luther's sentiments.*

Nor was there any other way for destroying the Elevation and Adoration. It has been shown that, at taking away the

\* Jen. t. iv. pp. 585, 586, et ap. Cælest.

† Just. Apol. ii.

Elevation, Luther, so far from condemning it, approved the principle of it. I repeat once more his words:—"The Elevation (he says) may be preserved, as a testimonial of the real and corporal presence; since the doing that is saying to the people, 'Behold, Christians, this is the body of Jesus Christ, which was given for you\*.'" This was what Luther wrote after abolishing the Elevation; but why, then, one may say, did he abolish it? The reason is worthy of the man; and we learn from himself, "that if he attacked the Elevation, it was only out of spite to the Papacy; and, if he retained it so long, it was out of spite to Carlostadius. In a word (concludes he), it should be retained when it was rejected as impious, and it should be rejected when commanded as necessary†." But, upon the whole, he acknowledged what, indeed, is not to be doubted—that there could be no difficulty in showing to the people this divine body from the very time it began to be present.

34.—*The Adoration necessary.—Formal avowal of Luther after many variations.*

As to the Adoration, after having one while held it as indifferent, and another laid it down as necessary, he at length adhered to his last conclusion‡; and in the positions which he published against the Doctors of Louvain, in 1545, that is a year before his death, he called the Eucharist "the adorable sacrament§." The Sacramentarian party, who had so much triumphed when he set aside the Elevation, was in a consternation; and Calvin wrote, "that, by this decision, he had raised up the idol in God's temple||."

35.—*The Divines of Wittemberg and Leipsic own, with Melancthon, that there is no avoiding the sacrifice, the Transubstantiation and the Adoration, but by changing Luther's doctrine.*

Melancthon was then more than ever convinced that it was impossible to destroy the Adoration, or the Mass, without reducing the whole Real Presence to the precise moment of the manducation. He saw, even, that it was necessary to go further, and that all the points of Catholic doctrine relating to the Eucharist returned upon them one after another, if they did not find out a way to separate the body and blood from

\* S. u. 24. Parv. Conf.

† Ibid.

‡ Hosp. 14, 1545.

§ Ad Art. Lov. Thesi. 16. t. ii. 501.

|| Ep. ad Buc. p. 106.

the bread and wine. He then pushed the principle already spoken of so far as that nothing was done for the bread and wine, but all for man: insomuch, that in man only was the body and blood to be really found. Melancthon has never explained in what manner he would have this to be done: but as to the foundation of this doctrine, he never left off insinuating it with great secrecy, and in the most artful manner he was able: for there were no hopes, as long as Luther lived, of making him relent on this point, nor of being able to speak freely what men thought: but Melancthon so deeply rooted this doctrine in the minds of the Wittenberg and Leipsic divines, that, after Luther and he were dead, they plainly explained themselves in favour of it in an Assembly, which, by the Elector's orders, they held at Dresden in 1561. There they feared not to reject Luther's proper doctrine, and the Real Presence which he admitted in the bread; and finding no other means of defending themselves against Transubstantiation, the Adoration, and Sacrifice, they went over to the Real Presence taught them by Melancthon; not in the bread and wine, but in the faithful who received them\*. They declared, therefore, "That the true substantial body was truly and substantially given in the Supper, although there was no necessity of saying that the bread was the essential body or the proper body of Jesus Christ, or that it was corporally and carnally taken by the corporeal mouth; that ubiquity raised a horror in them; that it was a subject of astonishment that men should be so positive in affirming that the body was present in the bread, since it was of much more importance to consider what is done in man, for whom, and not for the bread, Jesus Christ rendered himself present." After that they explained their sentiments concerning the Adoration, and maintained that it could not be denied admitting the Real Presence in the bread, although it should even be explained that the body is not present in it except in the actual use; "That the Monks would always have the same reason for beseeching the eternal Father to hear them through his Son, whom they rendered present in this action; that the Supper having been instituted for the remembrance of Jesus Christ, as he could not be taken nor remembered without believing in, and calling on him, the addressing one's self to him in the Supper as present, and as placing himself in the hands of sacrificing priests after the words of Consecration, could by no means be hin-

\* Wit. et Lips. Theol. Orthod. Conf. Heidelb. an. 1575. Hosp. an. 1561, p. 291.

dered." By the same reason they maintained that, admitting this Real Presence of the body in the bread, the sacrifice could not be rejected, and they proved it by this example. "It was (said they) the ancient custom of all suppliants, to take in their arms the children of those whose assistance they implored, and present them to their fathers, in order to prevail with them by their interposition." They said, in the same manner, that having Jesus Christ present in the bread and wine of the Supper, nothing could hinder us from presenting him to his Father, in order to render him propitious to us; and, lastly, they concluded "that it would be much more easy for the monks to establish their transubstantiation, than for those to impugn it, who, rejecting it in word, affirmed, nevertheless, that the bread was the essential body, that is, the proper body of Jesus Christ."

36.—*Luther's doctrine, immediately after his death, changed by the Divines of Wittenberg.*

Luther had said at Smalcald, and made the whole party subscribe to it, that the bread was the true body of our Lord equally received by saints and sinners: he himself had said, in his last "Confession of Faith," approved by the whole party, "that the bread of the Eucharist is the true natural body of our Lord\*." Melancthon and all Saxony had received this doctrine with all the rest, for Luther would be obeyed: but, after his death, they fell off from it, and owned with us, that these words, "the bread is the true body," import necessarily the change of bread into the body; since, it being impossible for the bread to be the body by nature, it could not become so but by a change; thus they openly rejected their master's doctrine†. But they went much further in the above declaration, and confess that, admitting, as Lutherans had hitherto done, the Real Presence in the bread, there could be no objection to the sacrifice, which Catholics offer to God, nor to the adoration they pay to Jesus Christ in the Eucharist.

37.—*No answering the arguments of these Divines.*

Their proofs are convincing. If Jesus Christ is believed to be in the bread, if faith lays hold of him in this state, can this faith subsist without adoration? Does not this faith itself necessarily imply the highest adoration, since it draws after it the invocation of Jesus Christ, as Son of God, and as there

\* Art. vi. Conc. p. 330.

† S. lib. iv. Parva. Conf. S. n. 14.

present? The proof of the sacrifice is not less conclusive: for, as these divines say, if, by the sacramental words, Jesus Christ is rendered present in the bread, is not this presence of Jesus Christ of itself agreeable to the Father, and can our prayers be sanctified by a more holy oblation than that of Jesus Christ present? What do Catholics say more, and what is their sacrifice else but Jesus Christ present in the sacrament of the Eucharist, and representing himself to his Father the victim by which he had been appeased? There is no way, then, of avoiding the sacrifice, no more than the adoration and transubstantiation, without denying this real presence of Jesus Christ in the bread.

38.—*The Wittemberg Divines return to Luther's sentiment, and why? The Catholics alone have a consistent doctrine.*

Thus the Church of Wittemberg, the Mother of the Reformation, and whence, according to Calvin, the light of the Gospel proceeded in our days as it proceeded formerly from Jerusalem, no longer can maintain the sentiments of Luther, her first founder\*. The whole doctrine of this head of the Reformation contradicts itself: he invincibly establishes the literal sense and real presence: he rejects the necessary consequences therefrom, as maintained by Catholics. If, with him, the real presence is admitted in the bread, the whole Mass, with the Catholic doctrine, must of course be admitted without reserve. This seems too grating to these new Reformers; for what good have they been doing, if they must be forced to approve these things, with the whole worship of the Church of Rome? but, on the other side, what more chimerical than a real presence separated from the bread and wine? Was it not, in shewing the bread and wine, that Jesus Christ said, "This is my body?" Has he said, we should receive his body and blood divided from those things wherein it was his pleasure they should be contained; and if we are to receive the proper substance of them, must it not be after such a manner as he declared at the institution of this mystery? In these inextricable difficulties, the desire of abolishing the Mass prevailed; but the method which Melancthon and the Saxons had taken to destroy it was so bad, that it could not subsist. Those of Wittemberg and Leipsic themselves soon after came back, and Luther's opinion, which placed the body in the bread, kept its ground.

39.—*Luther more furious than ever towards the end of his days: his transports against the doctors of Louvain.*

Whilst this head of the Reformers drew near his end, he daily became more and more furious. His theses against the doctors of Louvain are a proof of it. I never can believe that his disciples will behold, without shame, the prodigious aberrations of his mind even to the last period of his life. Sometimes he plays the buffoon, but in the lowest way imaginable, and fills his theses with these wretched equivoques: *vaccultas*, instead of *facultas*; *cacolyca ecclesia*, instead of *catholica*; because he finds in these two words, *vaccultas* and *cacolyca*, a frigid illusion with kine, wicked men, and wolves. To scoff at the custom of calling doctors our masters, he always styles those of Louvain *nostrolli magistrolli*, *bruta magistrollia*: persuaded he makes them very odious or contemptible by these ridiculous diminutives of his own coining. When he has a mind to speak more seriously, he call these doctors “Downright beasts, hogs, Epicureans, pagans, and atheists, who are unacquainted with any other repentance but that of Judas and Saul, who do not take from scripture, but from the doctrine of men, all they vomit out; and adds, what I dare not translate, *quidquid ructant, vomunt, et cacant.*” \* Thus did he forget all kind of shame, and valued not the making himself a public laughing-stock, provided he drove all to extremes against his adversaries.

40.—*His last sentiments concerning the Zuinglians.*

He treated the Zuinglians no better; and, besides what he said of the adorable sacrament, which utterly destroyed their doctrine, he declared seriously that he held them for heretics, and shut out of the pale of God’s Church †. He wrote, at the same time, a letter, wherein, upon the Zuinglians having called him an unhappy wretch, “They have afforded me a great pleasure,” says he: “I, therefore, the most unhappy of all men, esteem myself happy for one thing only, and covet no other beatitude than that of the Psalmist: happy is the man that hath not been in the council of the Sacramentarians, and hath never walked in the ways of the Zuinglians, nor sat in the chair of those of Zurich.” Melancthon and his friends were ashamed of these extravagances of their master. There were secret murmurings in the party, but none durst speak out. If the Sacramentarians complained of Luther’s

\* Cont. Art. Lov. Thes, 28.

† Hosp. 199.

transports to Melancthon, and those, who were better affected towards them; they answered, "That he softened the expressions in his books by his familiar discourses, and comforted them, for that their master, when he was heated, spoke more than he meant to speak; which, said they, was a great inconvenience \*," but what they could not help.

#### 41.—*Luther's Death.*

The above letter was of the twenty-fifth of January, 1546. The eighteenth of February following, Luther died. The Zuinglians, who could not refuse him praises without ruining the Reformation, of which he had been the founder, to comfort themselves for the implacable enmity he had evinced towards them, even to his death, spread abroad some conversations he had held with his friends, wherein they pretended he was much mitigated. These accounts carried no appearance of truth; but truly, whether they did or no, it is of little importance to the design of this work. I write not on private conversations, but acts only and public works; and if Luther had given these new instances of his inconstancy, it would, however, be the business of the Lutherans to furnish us wherewith to defend him.

#### 42.—*A new piece produced by Mr. Burnet on Luther's sentiment.*

To omit nothing of what I know concerning this fact, I shall observe, moreover, that I find in Mr. Burnet's "History of the English Reformation," a letter of Luther's to Bucer, which is given us under this title: "A paper concerning a reconciliation with the Zuinglians †. This piece of Mr. Burnet's, if considered, not in the extract which this artful historian makes of it in his history, but as it is in his "Collection of Records ‡," will set forth the extravagances that pass in the minds of innovators. Luther begins with this remark, "That it must not be said, they understood not one another." This is what Bucer always pretended, that their disputes were only on words, and that they understood not one another: but Luther could not suffer such an illusion.

\* Ep. Crucig. ad Vit. Theod. Hosp. 194. 199, &c.

† The author was not apprised that Bishop Burnet had falsified this record by changing *nihil minus* into *nihilominus*. This was first charged with, and the fact proved against him, by Dr. Hicks. In the latter editions of his history the fault is corrected in the "Collection of Records," though his inferences from it still remain in the body of his work. T. xi. l. i. An. 1549. p. 105.

‡ Collec. of Records, part ii. lib. i. n. 34.



In the second place, he proposes a new thought to reconcile the two opinions: "The defenders of the figurative sense must allow (says he) that Jesus Christ is truly present: and we (proceeds he) will grant that the bread alone is eaten: *panem solum manducari.*" He does not say, we will grant, "that in the sacrament there is truly bread and wine," as Mr. Burnet has translated it; for that had not been a new opinion, such as Luther here promises. It is sufficiently known that consubstantiation, which admits both the bread and wine in the Sacrament, had been received in Lutheranism from its first beginning.

But the new thing he proposes is, that although the body and blood be truly present, nevertheless there is nothing eaten but bread alone: so absurd a refinement, that Mr. Burnet could not hide the absurdity of it any other way than by suppressing it. But there is no need of troubling oneself to find out sense in this new project of agreement. After having proposed it as useful, Luther turns short; and, considering what an inlet would thereby be opened to new questions tending to introduce Epicurism: "No, (says he,) it is better leaving these two opinions just as they are, than proceed to these new explications of them, which, far from making them pass on mankind, would indeed only serve to exasperate them the more. Finally, to allay this dissension, which, he says, he would have redeemed with his body and blood, he declares, on his side, that he is willing to believe his adversaries are sincere. He demands they would believe as much of him, and concludes for mutually bearing with one another, without specifying in what manner that was to be done: so that he seems to mean nothing else by it, than abstaining from writing and giving one another abusive language, as had already been agreed upon, but with very little success, at the conference of Marpurg. This is all that Bucer could obtain for the Zuinglians, even when Luther was in his best humour, and, probably, during those years when there was a kind of suspension of arms. However that may be, he soon returns to his old temper; and, for fear the Sacramentarians should endeavour, after his death, to wrest him by their equivocations to their own sentiments, towards the end of his life, he made those declarations against them we have already seen, leaving his disciples as much animated against them as he himself had been.

RECORDS CONCERNING THE SECOND MARRIAGE OF THE LAND-  
GRAVE SPOKEN OF IN THIS BOOK VI.

INSTRUCTIO.

*Quid Doctor Martinus Bucer apud Doctorem Martinum Lutherum, et Philippum Melancthonem sollicitare debeat, et, si id ipsis rectum videbitur, postmodum apud Electorem Saxonæ.*

I. Primo, \*ipsis gratiam et fausta meo nomine denunciât, et si corpore animoque adhuc benè valerent, quod id libentor intelligerem. Deinde incipiendo quòd ab eo tempore quo me noster Dominus Deus infirmitate visitavit, varia apud me considerassem, et præsertim quod in me repererim quòd ego ab aliquo tempore, quo uxorem duxi, in adulterio et fornicatione jacuerim. Quia verò ipsi et mei prædicantes sæpè me adhortati sunt ut ad Sacramentum accederem: Ego autem apud me talem præfatam vitam deprehendi, nullâ bonâ conscientia aliquot annis ad Sacramentum accedere potui. Nam quia talem vitam DESERERE NOLO, quâ bona conscientia possem ad mensam Domini accedere? Et sciebam per hoc non aliter quàm ad iudicium Domini, et non ad Christianam confessionem me perventurum. Ulteriùs legi in Paulo pluribus quàm uno locis, quomodo nullus fornicator, nec adulter regnum Dei possidebit. Quia verò apud me deprehendi quòd apud meam uxorem præsentem à fornicatione ac luxuriâ, atque adulterio abstinere non possim: nisi ab hâc vitâ desistant, et ad emendationem me convertam, nihil certius habeo expectandum quàm exhæredationem à regno Dei et æternam damnationem. Causæ autem, quare à fornicatione, adulterio, et his similibus abstinere non possim apud hanc meam præsentem uxorem sunc istæ.

II. Primò quòd initio, quo eam duxi, nec animo nec desiderio eam complexus fuerim. Quali ipsa quoque complexione, amabilitate, et odore sit, et quomodo interdum se superfluo potu gerat, hoc sciunt ipsius aulæ præfecti, et virgines, aliique plures: cumque ad ea describenda difficultatem habeam, Bucero tamen omnia declaravi.

III. Secundò, quia validâ complexione, ut medici sciunt, sum, et sæpè contingit ut in fœderum et Imperii comitiis diu verser, ubi lautè vivitur et corpus curatur; quomodo me ibi gerere queam absque uxore, cum non semper magnam gynæceum mecum ducere possim, facile est conjicere et considerare.

IV. Si porrò diceretur quare meam uxorem duxerim, verè imprudens homo tunc temporis fui, et ab aliquibus meorum

consiliariorum, quorum potior pars defuncta est, ad id persuasus sum. Matrimonium meum ultra tres septimanas non servavi, et sic constantè perrexi.

V. Ulteriùs me concionatores constanter urgent, ut scelera puniam, fornicationem, et alia; quod etiam libenter facerem: quomodo autem scelera, quibus ipsemet immersus sum, puniam, ubi omnes dicerent, "Magister, prius teipsum puni?" Jam si deberem in rebus evangelicæ confederationis bellare, tunc id semper malâ conscientiâ facerem et cogitarem: Si tu in hac vitâ gladio, vel sclopeto, vel alio modo occubueris, ad Demonem perges. Sæpe Deum intereâ invocavi, et rogavi: sed semper idem remansi.

VI. Nunc verò diligenter consideravi scripturas antiqui et novi Testamenti, et quantum mihi gratiæ Deus dedit, studiosè perlegi, et ibi nullum aliud consilium nec medium invenire potui; cùm videam quod ab hoc agendi modo penes modernam uxorem meam NEC POSSIM, NEC VELIM abstinere (quod coram Deo testor) quàm talia media adhibendo, quæ à Deo permissa nec prohibita sunt. Quod pii Patres ut Abraham, Jacob, David, Lamech, Salomon, et alii, plures quàm unam uxorem habuerint, et in eundem Christum crediderent, in quem nos credimus, quemadmodum S. Paulus ad Cor. x. ait; et prætereâ Deus in veteri Testamento tales Sanctos valdè laudârit: Christus quoque eosdem in novo Testamento valdè laudat, insuper lex Moisis permittit, si quis duas uxores habeat, quomodo se in hoc gerere debeat.

VII. Et si objiceretur, Abrahamo et antiquis concessum fuisse propter Christum promissum, invenitur tamen clarè quòd Lex Moisis permittat, et in eo neminem specificet ac dicat, utrum duæ uxores habendæ, et sic neminem excludit. Et si Christus solùm promissus sit stemmati Judæ, et nihominus Samuelis pater, Rex Achab et alii, plures uxores habuerunt, qui tamen non sunt de stemmate Judæ. Idcirco hoc, quod istis id solùm permissum fuerit propter Messiam, stare non potest.

VIII. Cum igitur nec Deus in antiquo, nec Christus in novo Testamento, nec Prophetæ, nec Apostoli prohibeant, ne vir duas uxores habere possit; nullus quoque Propheta, vel Apostolus propterea Reges, Principes, vel alias personas punierit aut vituperârit, quòd duas uxores in matrimonio simul habuerint, neque pro crimine aut peccato, vel quòd Dei regnum non consequentur, judicârit; cùm tamen Paulus multos indicet qui regnum Dei non consequentur, et de his qui duas uxores habent, nullam omnino mentionem faciat. Apostoli quoque cùm gentibus indicarent quomodo se gerere,

et à quibus abstinere deberent, ubi illos primò ad fidem receperant, uti in Actis Apostolorum est; de hoc etiam nihil prohibuerunt, quòd non duas uxores in matrimonio habere possent; cùm tamen multi Gentiles fuerint qui plures quàm unam uxorem habuerunt: Judæis quoque prohibitum non fuit, quia lex illud permittebat, et est omninò apud aliquos in usu. Quando igitur Paulus clarè nobis dicit oportere Episcopum esse unius uxoris virum, similiter et Ministrum: absque necessitate fecisset, si quis tantum unam uxorem deberet habere, quòd id ita præcepisset et plures uxores habere prohibuisset.

IX. Et post hæc ad hunc diem usque in orientalibus regionibus aliqui Christiani sunt, qui duas uxores in matrimonio habent. Item Valentinianus Imperator, quem tamen Historici, Ambrosius, et alii Docti laudant, ipsemet duas uxores habuit, legem quoque edi curavit; quòd alii duas uxores habere possent.

X. Item, licèt quod sequitur non multùm curem, Papa ipsemet Comiti cuidam, qui sanctum sepulchrum invisit, et intellexerat uxorem suam mortuam esse, et ideò aliam vel adhuc unam acceperat, concessit ut is utramque retinere posset. Item scio Lutherum et Philippum Regi Angliæ suasisse, ut primam uxorem non dimitteret, sed aliam præter ipsam duceret quemadmodum *præter propter* consilium sonat. Quando verò in contrarium opponeretur, quòd ille nullum masculum hæredem ex primâ habuerit, judicamus nos plus hic concedi oportere causæ quam Paulus dat, unumquemque debere uxorem habere propter fornicationem. Nam utique plus situm est in bonâ conscientia, salute animæ, christianâ vitâ, abstractione ab ignominia et inordinatâ luxuriâ, quàm in eo ut quis hæredes vel nullos habeat. Nam omninò plus animæ quam res temporales curandæ sunt.

XI. Itaque hæc omni ame permoverunt, ut mihi proposuerim, quia id cum Deo fieri potest, sicut non dubito, abstinere à fornicatione, et omni impudicitia, et viâ, quam Deus permittit, uti. Nam diutius in vinculis diaboli constrictus perseverare non intendo, et aliàs absque hac viâ me præservare **NEC POSSUM, NEC VOLO.** Quare hæc sit mea ad Lutherum, Philippum et ipsum Bucerum petitio, ut mihi testimonium dare velint, si hoc facerem, illud illicitum non esse.

XII. Casu quo autem id ipsi hoc tempore propter scandalum, et quod Evangelicæ rei fortassis præjudicare aut nocere posset, publicè typis mandare non vellent; petitionem tamen meam esse, ut mihi scripto testimonium dent: si id occultò facerem me per id non contra Deum egisse, et quod

ipsi etiam id pro matrimonio habere, et cum tempore viam inquirere velint, quomodo res hæc publicanda in mundum, et quâ ratione persona quam ducturus sum, non pro inhonestâ, sed etiam pro honestâ habenda sit. Considerare enim possent, quòd aliâs personæ quam ducturus sum graviter accideret, si illa pro tali habenda esset quæ non Christianè vel inhonestè ageret. Post quàm etiam nihil occultum remanet, si constantèr ita permanerem, et communis Ecclesia nesciret quomodo huic personæ cohabitarem, utique hæc quoque tractu temporis scandalum causaret.

XIII. Item non metuant quòd propterea, etsi aliam uxorem acciperem, meam modernam uxorem malè tractare, nec cum eâ dormire; vel minorem amicitiam ei exhibere velim, quàm antea feci: sed me velle in hoc casu crucem portare, et eidem omne bonum præstare, neque ab eâdem abstinere. Volo etiam filios, quos ex primâ uxore suscepi, Principes regionis relinquere, et reliquis aliis honestis rebus prospicere: esse proinde adhuc semel petitionem meam, ut per Deum in hoc mihi consulant, et me juvent in iis rebus, quæ non sunt contra Deum, ut hilari animo vivere et mori, atque Evangelicas causas omnes eò liberius, et magis Christianè suscipere possim. Nam quidquid me jusserint quod Christianum et rectum sit, SIVE MONASTERIORUM BONA, seu alia concernat, ibi me promptum reperient.

XIV. Vellem quoque et desidero non plures quàm tantùm unam uxorem ad istam modernam uxorem meam. Item ad mundum vel mundanum fructum hæc in re non nimis attendendum est; sed magis Deus respiciendus, et quod hic præcipit, prohibet, et liberum relinquit. Nam imperator et mundus me et quemcunque permittent, ut publicè meretrices retineamus; sed plures quàm unam uxorem non facilè concesserint. Quod Deus permittit hoc ipsi prohibent: quod Deus prohibet, hoc dissimulant, et videtur mihi sicut matrimonium Sacerdotum. Nam Sacerdotibus nullas uxores concedunt, et meretrices retinere ipsis permittunt. Item Ecclesiastici nobis adedò infensi sunt, ut propter hunc articulum quo plures Christianis uxores permitteremus, nec plus nec minus nobis facturi sint.

XV. Item Philippo et Luthero postmodum indicabit, si apud illos, præter omnem tamen opinionem meam de illis nullam opem inveniam; tum me varias cogitationes habere in animo: quòd velim apud Cæsarem pro hæc re instare per mediatores, etsi multis mihi pecuniis constaret, quod Cæsar absque Pontificis dispensatione non faceret; quamvis etiam Pontificum dispensationem omninò nihili faciam: verùm Cæsaris

permissio mihi omninò non esset contemnenda; quam Cæsaris permissionem omninò non curarem, nisi scirem quòd propositi mei rationem coram Deo haberem, et certius esset Deum id permisisse quàm prohibuisse.

XVI. Verùm nihilominus ex humano metu, si apud hanc partem nullum solatium invenire possem, Cæsareum consensum obtinere, uti insinuatum est, non esset contemnendum. Nam apud me judicabam si aliquibus Cæsaris Consiliariis egregias pecuniæ summas donarem, me omnia ab ipsis impetraturum: sed præterea timebam, quamvis propter nullam rem in terrâ ab Evangelio deficere, vel cum divinâ opè me permittere velim induci ad aliquid quod Evangelicæ causæ contrarium esse posset: ne Cæsareani tamen me in aliis sæcularibus negotiis ita uterentur et obligarent ut isti causæ et parti non foret utile: esse idcirco adhuc petitionem meam, ut me aliàs juvent, ne cogar rem in iis locis quærere, ubi id non libentè facio, et quod millies libentius ipsorum permissioni, quam cum Deo et bonâ conscientia facere possunt, confidere velim, quàm Cæsarea vel ALIIS HUMANIS permissionibus: quibus tamen non ulterius confiderem nisi antecedenter in divinâ Scripturâ fundatæ essent, uti superius est declaratum.

XVII. Denique iteratò est mea petitio ut Lutherus, Philippus, et Bucerus mihi hâc in re scripto opinionem suam velint aperire, ut postea vitam meam emendare, bonâ conscientia ad Sacramentum accedere, et omnia negotia nostræ religionis eò liberius et confidentius agere possim.

*Datum Melsingæ Dominicâ post*

*Catharinæ Anno 1539.*

PHILIPPUS LANDGRAFFIUS HASSIÆ.

THE CONSULTATION OF LUTHER AND THE OTHER PROTESTANT  
DOCTORS CONCERNING POLYGAMY.

*To the most serene Prince and Lord Philip Landgrave of Hesse, Count of Catzenlembogen, of Diets, of Ziegenhain, and Nidda, our gracious Lord, we wish above all things the Grace of God through Jesus Christ.*

Most Serene Prince and Lord,

I. Postquam vestra Celsitudo per Dominum Buceros I. We have been informed by Bucer, and in the instruc-

diuturnas conscientiæ suæ molestias, nonnullas simulque considerationes indicari curavit, addito scripto seu instructione quam illi vestra Celsitudo tradidit; licet ita properanter expedire responsum difficile sit, nolumus tamen Dominum Bucerum, reditum, utique maturantem, sine scripto dimittere.

II. Imprimis sumus ex animo recreati, et Deo gratias agimus, quòd vestram Celsitudinem difficili morbo liberaverit, petimusque, ut Deus Celsitudinem vestram in corpore et animo confortare et conservare dignetur.

III. Nam prout Celsitudo vestra videt, paupercula et misera Ecclesia est exigua et derelicta, indigens probis Dominis Regentibus, sicut non dubitamus Deum aliquos conservaturum, quantumvis tentationes diversæ occurrant.

IV. Circa quæstionem quam nobis Bucerus proposuit, hæc nobis occurrunt consideratione digna: Celsitudo vestra per se ipsam satis perspicit quantum differant universalem legem condere, vel in certo casu gravibus de causis ex

tion which

him, have read, the trouble of mind, and the uneasiness of conscience your Highness is under at this present; and although it seemed to us very difficult so speedily to answer the doubts proposed; nevertheless we would not permit the said Bucer, who was urgent for his return to your Highness, to go away without an answer in writing.

II. It has been a subject of the greatest joy to us, and we have praised God, for that he has recovered your Highness from a dangerous fit of sickness, and we pray that he will long continue this blessing of perfect health both in body and mind.

III. Your Highness is not ignorant how great need our poor, miserable, little, and abandoned Church stands in of virtuous Princes and Rulers to protect her; and we doubt not but God will always supply her with some such, although from time to time he threatens to deprive her of them, and proves her by sundry temptations.

IV. These things seem to us of greatest importance in the question which Bucer has proposed to us: your Highness sufficiently of yourself comprehends the difference there is betwixt settling an universal law, and

concessione divinâ, dispensatione uti; nam contra Deum locum non habet dispensatio.

using (for urgent reasons and with God's permission) a dispensation in a particular case: for it is otherwise evident that no dispensations can take place against the first of all laws, the divine law.

V. Nunc suadere non possumus, ut introducatur publicè, et velut lege sanciantur permissio plures quàm unam, uxores ducendi. Si aliquid hac de re prælo committeretur, facilè intelligit vestra Celsitudo, id præcepti instar intellectum et acceptatum iri, unde multa scandala et difficultates orirentur. Consideret, quæsumus, Celsitudo vestra quàm sinistrè acciperetur, si quis convinceretur hanc legem in Germaniam introduxisse, quæ æternarum litium et inquietudinum (quod timendum) futurum esset seminarium.

V. We cannot at present advise to introduce publicly, and establish as a law in the New Testament, that of the Old, which permitted to have more wives than one. Your Highness is sensible, should any such thing be printed, that it would be taken for a precept, whence infinite troubles and scandala would arise. We beg your Highness to consider the dangers a man would be exposed unto, who should be convicted of having brought into Germany such a law, which would divide families, and involve them in endless strifes and disturbances.

VI. Quod opponi potest, quod coram Deo æquum est id omninò permittendum, hoc certâ ratione et conditione est accipiendum. Si res est mandata et necessaria, verum est quod objicitur; si nec mandata, nec necessaria sit, alias circumstantias oportet expendere ut ad propositam questionem propius accedamus: Deus matrimonium instituit ut tantùm duarum et non plurium personarum esset societas, si natura non esset corrupta; hoc intendit illa sententia: *Erunt duo in carne*

VI. As to the objection that may be made, that what is just in God's sight ought absolutely to be permitted, it must be answered in this manner. If that which is just before God, be besides commanded and necessary, the objection is true: if it be neither necessary nor commanded, other circumstances, before it be permitted, must be attended to; and to come to the question in hand: God hath instituted marriage to be a society of two persons and no more, supposing nature



*und*, idque primatùs fuit observatum.

VII. Sed Lamech pluralitatem uxorum in matrimonium invexit, quod de illo Scriptura memorat tanquam introductum contra primam regulam.

VIII. Apud infideles tamen fuit consuetudine receptum; postea Abraham quoque et posterius ejus plures duxerunt uxores. Certum est hoc postmodum lege Mosis permissum fuisse, teste Scripturâ, Deuter. 2. l. 1. ut homo haberet duas uxores: nam Deus fragili naturæ aliquid indulget. Cum verò principio et creationi consentaneum sit unicâ uxore contentum vivere, hujusmodi lex est laudabilis, et ab Ecclesiâ acceptanda, non lex huic contraria statuenda; nam Christus repetit hanc sententiam: *Erunt duo in carne und*, Matth. xix. et in memoriam revocat quale matrimonium ante humanam fragilitatem esse debuisset.

IX. Certis tamen casibus locus est dispensationi. Si quis apud exterarum nationes

were not corrupted; and this is the sense of that text of Genesis, "There shall be two in one flesh," and this was observed at the beginning.

VII. Lamech was the first that married many wives, and the Scripture witnesses that this custom was introduced contrary to the first Institution.

VIII. It nevertheless passed into custom among infidel nations; and we even find afterwards, that Abraham and his posterity had many wives. It is also certain from Deuteronomy, that the law of Moses permitted it afterwards, and that God made an allowance for frail nature. Since it is then suitable to the creation of men, and to the first establishment of their society, that each one be content with one wife, it thence follows that the law enjoining it is praiseworthy; that it ought to be received in the Church; and no law contrary thereto be introduced into it, because Jesus Christ has repeated in the nineteenth chapter of St. Matthew that text of Genesis, "There shall be two in one flesh:" and brings to man's remembrance what marriage ought to have been before it degenerated from its purity.

IX. In certain cases, however, there is room for dispensation. For example, if a

captivus ad curam corporis et sanitatem, inibi alteram uxorem superinduceret; vel si quis haberet leprosam; his casibus alteram ducere cum consilio sui Pastoris, non intentione novam legem inducendi, sed suæ necessitati consulendi, hunc nescimus, quâ ratione damnare licerit.

X. Cum igitur aliud sit inducere legem, aliud uti dispensatione, obsecramus vestram Celsitudinem sequentia velit considerare.

Primò ante omnia cavendum, ne hæc res inducatur in orbem ad modum legis, quam sequendi libera omnium sit potestas. Deinde considerare dignetur vestra Celsitudo scandalum nimium, quod Evangelii hostes exclamaturi sint, nos similes esse Anabaptistis, qui simul plures duxerunt uxores. Item Evangelicos eam sectari libertatem plures simul ducendi, quæ in Turcia in usu est.

XI. Item principum facta latius spargi quàm privatorum consideret.

married man, detained captive in a distant country, should there take a second wife, in order to preserve or recover his health; or that his own became leprous, we see not how we could condemn, in these cases, such a man as, by the advice of his Pastor, should take another wife, provided it were not with a design of introducing a new law, but with an eye only to his own particular necessities.

X. Since then the introducing a new law, and the using a dispensation with respect to the same law, are two very different things, we intreat your Highness to take what follows into consideration.

In the first place, above all things, care must be taken, that plurality of wives be not introduced into the world by way of law, for every man to follow as he thinks fit. In the second place, may it please your Highness to reflect on the dismal scandal which would not fail to happen, if occasion be given to the enemies of the Gospel to exclaim, that we are like the Anabaptists, who have several wives at once, and the Turks, who take as many wives as they are able to maintain.

XI. In the third place, that the actions of Princes are more widely spread than those of private men.

XII. Item consideret privatas personas, hujusmodi principum facta audientes, facillè eadem sibi permissa persuadere, prout apparet talia facillè irrepere.

XIII. Item considerandum Celsitudinem vestram abundare nobilitate efferi spiritûs, in quâ multi, uti in aliis quoque terris sint, qui propter amplos proventus, quibus ratione cathedralium beneficiorum perfruuntur, valdè evangelio adversantur. Non ignoramus ipsi magnorum nobilium valdè insulsa dicta; et qualem se nobilitas et subdita ditio erga Celsitudinem vestram sit præbitura, si publica introductio fiat, haud difficile est arbitrari.

XIV. Item Celsitudo vestra, quæ Dei singularis est gratia, apud reges et potentes etiam externos magno est in honore et respectu; apud quos meritò est, quòd timeat ne hæc res pariat nominis diminutionem. Cùm igitur hîc multa scandala confluant, rogamus Celsitudinem vestram, ut hanc rem maturo iudicio expendere velit.

XV. Illud quoque est verum quòd Celsitudinem ves-

XII. Fourthly, that inferiors are no sooner informed what their superiors do, but they imagine they may do the same, and by that means licentiousness becomes universal.

XIII. Fifthly, that your Highness's estates are filled with an untractable nobility, for the most part very averse to the Gospel, on account of the hopes they are in, as in other countries, of obtaining the benefices of cathedral churches, the revenues whereof are very great. We know the impertinent discourses vented by the most illustrious of your nobility, and it is easily seen how they and the rest of your subjects would be disposed, in case your Highness should authorize such a novelty.

XIV. Sixthly, that your Highness, by the singular grace of God, hath a great reputation in the empire and foreign countries; and it is to be feared lest the execution of this project of a double marriage should greatly diminish this esteem and respect. The concurrence of so many scandals obliges us to beseech your highness to examine the thing with all the maturity of judgment God has endowed you with.

XV. With no less earnestness do we intreat your High-

tram omni modo rogamus et hortamur, ut fornicationem et adulterium fugiat. Habuimus quoque, ut, quod res est, loquamur, longo tempore non parvum mœrorem, quòd intellexerimus vestram Celsitudinem ejusmodi impuritate oneratam, quam divina ultio, morbi, aliaque pericula sequi possent.

XVI. Etiam rogamus Celsitudinem vestram ne talia extra matrimonium, levia peccata velit aestimare, sicut mundus hæc ventis tradere et parvi pendere solet: Verùm Deus impudicitiam sæpè severissimè punivit: nam pœna diluvii tribuitur regentum adulteriis. Item adulterium Davidis est severum vindictæ divinæ exemplum, et Paulus sæpiùs ait: Deus non irridetur. Adulteri non introibunt in regnum Dei: nam fidei obedientia comes esse debet, ut non contra conscientiam agamus, I Timoth. iii. Si cor nostrum non reprehenderit nos, possumus læti Deum invocare; et Rom. viii. Si carnalia desideria spiritu mortificaverimus, vivemus; si autem secundùm carnem ambulemus: hoc est, si contra conscientiam, agamus, moriemur.

ness, by all means, to avoid fornication and adultery; and, to own the truth sincerely, we have a long time been sensibly grieved to see your Highness abandoned to such impurities, which might be followed by the effects of the divine vengeance, distempers, and many other dangerous consequences.

XVI. We also beg of your Highness not to entertain a notion, that the use of women out of marriage is but a light and trifling fault, as the world is used to imagine; since God hath often chastised impurity with the most severe punishment: and that of the deluge is attributed to the adulteries of the great ones: and the adultery of David has afforded a terrible instance of the divine vengeance: and St. Paul repeats frequently, that God is not mocked with impunity, and that adulterers shall not enter into the kingdom of God. For it is said, in the second chapter of the first Epistle to Timothy, that obedience must be the companion of faith, in order to avoid acting against conscience; and in the third chapter of the first of St. John; if our heart condemn us not, we may call upon the name of God with joy: and in the eighth chapter of the epistle to the Romans, if by the spirit we mortify the desires of the flesh, we shall live: but, on

XVII. Hæc referimus, ut consideret Deum ob talia vitia non ridere, prout aliqui audaces faciunt, et ethnicas cogitationes animo fovent. Libentèr quoque intelleximus vestram Celsitudinem ob ejusmodi vitia angi et conqueri. Incumbunt Celsitudini vestræ negotia totum mundum concernentia. Accedit Celsitudinis vestræ complexio subtilis, et minimè robusta, ac pauci somni, unde meritò corpori parcendum esset, quemadmodum multi alii facere coguntur.

XVIII. Legitur de laudatissimo Principe Scanderbego, qui multa præclara facinora patravit contra duos Turcarum Imperatores, Amurathem et Mahumetem, et Græciam dum viveret, feliciter tuitus est, ac conservavit. Hic suos milites sæpiùs ad castimoniam hortari auditus est, et dicere, nullam rem fortibus viris æquè animos demere ac Venerem. Item quòd si vestra Celsitudo insuper alteram

the contrary, we shall die, if we walk according to the flesh, that is, if we act against our own consciences.

XVII. We have related these passages, to the end that your Highness may consider seriously that God looks not on the vice of impurity as a laughing matter, as is supposed by those audacious libertines, who entertain heathenish notions on this subject. We are pleased to find that your Highness is troubled with remorse of conscience for these disorders. The management of the most important affairs in the world is now incumbent on your Highness, who is of a very delicate and tender complexion; sleeps but little; and these reasons, which have obliged so many prudent persons to manage their constitutions, are more than sufficient to prevail with your Highness to imitate them.

XVIII. We read of the incomparable Scanderbeg, who so frequently defeated the two most powerful Emperors of the Turks, Amurat II. and Mahomet II., and whilst alive, preserved Greece from their tyranny, that he often exhorted his soldiers to chastity, and said to them, that there was nothing so hurtful to men of their profession, as venereal pleasures. And if your Highness, after marrying a

uxorem haberet, et nollet pravis affectibus et consuetudinibus repugnare, adhuc non esset vestræ Celsitudini consultum ac prospectum. Oportet unumquemque in externis istis suorum membrorum esse dominum, uti Paulus scribit: Curate ut membra vestra sint arma justitiæ. Quare vestra Celsitudo in consideratione aliarum causarum, pempe scandali, curarum, laborum ac sollicitudinum, et corporis infirmitatis velit hanc rem æquâ lance perpendere, et simul in memoriam revocare, quòd Deus ei ex modernâ conjuge pulchram sobolem utriusque sextis dederit, ita ut contentus hâc esse possit. Quot alii in suo matrimonio debent patientiam exercere ad vitandum scandalum? Nobis non sedet animo Celsitudinem vestram ad tam difficilem novitatem impellere, aut inducere; nam ditio vestræ Celsitudinis, aliique nos impeterent, quod nobis ed minus ferendum esset, quòd ex præcepto divino nobis incumbat matrimonium, omniaque humana ad divinam institutionem dirigere, atque in eâ quoad possibile conservare, omneque scandalum remove.

second wife, were not to forsake those licentious disorders, the remedy proposed would be to no purpose. Every one ought to be master of his own body in external actions, and see, according to the expression of St. Paul, that his members be the arms of justice. May it please your Highness, therefore, impartially to examine the considerations of scandal, of labours, of care, of trouble, and of distempers, which have been represented. And at the same time remember that God has given you a numerous issue of such beautiful children of both sexes by the Princess your wife, that you have reason to be satisfied therewith. How many others, in marriage, are obliged to the exercise and practice of patience, from the motive only of avoiding scandal? We are far from urging on your Highness to introduce so difficult a novelty into your family. By so doing, we should draw upon ourselves not only the reproaches and persecution of those of Hesse, but of all other people. The which would be so much the less supportable to us, as God commands us in the ministry which we exercise, as much as we are able, to regulate marriage, and all the other duties of human life, according to the divine Institution, and maintain them in that state, and remove all kind of scandal.

XIX. Is jam est mos sæculi, ut culpa omnis in Predicatores conferatur, si quid difficultatis incidat; et humanum cor in summæ et inferioris conditionis hominibus instabile, unde diversa pertimescenda.

XX. Si autem vestra Cel-situdo ab impudicâ vitâ non abtineat, quod dicit sibi impossibile, optaremus Celsitudinem vestram in meliori statu esse coram Deo, et securâ conscientiâ vivere ad propriæ animæ salutem, et ditiorum ac subditorum emolumentum.

XXI. Quòd si denique vestra Cel-situdo omninò concluderit, adhuc unam conjugem ducere, judicamus id secretò faciendum, ut superiùs de dispensatione dictum, nempè ut tantùm vestræ Celsitudini, illi personæ, ac paucis personis fidelibus constet Celsitudinis vestræ animus, et conscientia sub sigillo confessionis. Hinc non sequuntur alicujus momenti contradictiones aut scandala. Nihil enim est inusitati Principes concubinas alere; et quamvis non omnibus è plebe constaret rei ratio, tamen prudentiores intelligerent, et magis placeret hæc moderata vivendi ratio, quàm adulterium et alii belluini et impudici actus; nec curandi aliorum sermones, si rectè cum conscientia agatur. Sic

XIX. It is now customary among worldlings, to lay the blame of every thing upon the Preachers of the Gospel. The heart of man is equally fickle in the more elevated and lower stations of life; and much have we to fear on that score.

XX. As to what your Highness says, that it is not possible for you to abstain from this impure life, we wish you were in a better state before God, that you lived with a secure conscience, and laboured for the salvation of your own soul, and the welfare of your subjects.

XXI. But after all, if your Highness is fully resolved to marry a second wife, we judge it ought to be done secretly, as we have said with respect to the dispensation demanded on the same account, that is, that none but the person you shall wed, and a few trusty persons, know of the matter, and they, too, obliged to secrecy under the seal of confession. Hence no contradiction nor scandal of moment is to be apprehended; for it is no extraordinary thing for Princes to keep concubines; and though the vulgar should be scandalized thereat, the more intelligent would doubt of the truth, and prudent persons would approve of this moderate kind of life, preferably to adultery,

et in tantum hoc approbamus: nam quod circa matrimonium in lege Mosis fuit permissum, Evangelium non revocat, aut vetat, quod externum regimen non immutat, sed adfert æternam justitiam et æternam vitam, et orditur veram obedientiam erga Deum, et conatur corruptam naturam reparare.

and other brutal actions. There is no need of being much concerned for what men will say, provided all goes right with conscience. So far do we approve it, and in those circumstances only by us specified; for the Gospel hath neither recalled nor forbid what was permitted in the law of Moses with respect to marriage. Jesus Christ has not changed the external economy, but added justice only, and life everlasting, for reward. He teaches the true way of obeying God, and endeavours to repair the corruption of nature.

XXII. Habet itaque Celsitudo vestra non tantum omnium nostram testimonium in casu necessitatis, sed etiam antecedentes nostras considerationes quas rogamus, ut vestra Celsitudo tanquam laudatus, sapiens, et Christianus Princeps velit ponderare. Oramus quoque Deum, ut velit Celsitudinem vestram ducere ac regere ad suam laudem et vestræ Celsitudinis animæ salutem.

XXII. Your Highness hath therefore, in this writing, not only the approbation of us all, in case of necessity, concerning what you desire, but also the reflections we have made thereupon; we beseech you to weigh them, as becoming a virtuous, wise, and Christian Prince. We also beg of God to direct all for his glory and your Highness's salvation.

XXIII. Quod attinet ad consilium hanc rem apud Cæsarem tractandi; existimamus illum, adulterium inter minora peccata numerare; nam magnoperè verendum, illum Papisticâ, Cardinalitiâ, Italicâ, Hispanicâ, Saracenicâ imbutum fide, non curaturum vestræ Celsitudinis postulatam, et in proprium emolu-

XXIII. As to your Highness's thought of communicating this affair to the Emperor before it be concluded, it seems to us that this Prince counts adultery among the lesser sort of sins; and it is very much to be feared lest his faith being of the same stamp with that of the Pope, the Cardinals, the Italians,



mentum vanis verbis sustentaturum, sicut intelligimus perfidum ac fallacem virum esse, morisque Germanici oblitum.

XXIV. Videt Celsitudo vestra ipsa, quòd nullis necessitatibus Christianis sincerè consulit. Turcam sinit imperturbatum, excitat tantùm rebelliones in Germaniâ, ut Burgundicam potentiam efferat. Quare optandum ut nulli Christiani Principes illius infidis machinationibus se misceant. Deus conservet vestram Celsitudinem. Nos ad serviendum vestræ Celsitudini sumus promptissimi. Datum Vittembergæ die Mercurii post festum Sancti Nicolai, 1539.

Vestræ Celsitudinis parati ac subjecti servi,

MARTINUS LUTHER.  
PHILIPPUS MELANCTHON.  
MARTINUS BUCERUS.  
ANTONIUS CORVINUS.  
ADAM.  
JOANNES LENINGUS.  
JUSTUS WINTFERTE.  
DIONYSIUS MELANTHER.

Ego Georgius Nuspicher, acceptâ à Cæsare potestate, Notarius publicus et Scriba,

the Spaniards, and the Saracens, he make light of your Highness's proposal, and turn it to his own advantage by amusing your Highness with vain words. We know he is deceitful and perfidious, and has nothing of the German in him.

XXIV. Your Highness sees, that he uses no sincere endeavour to redress the grievances of Christendom; that he leaves the Turk unmolested, and labours for nothing but to divide the empire, that he may raise up the house of Austria on its ruins. It is therefore very much to be wished that no Christian Prince would give into his pernicious schemes. May God preserve your Highness. We are most ready to serve your Highness. Given at Wittemberg the Wednesday after the feast of Saint Nicholas, 1539.

Your Highness's most humble, and most obedient subjects and servants,

MARTIN LUTHER.  
PHILIP MELANCTHON.  
MARTIN BUCER.  
ANTONY CORVIN.  
ADAM.  
JOHN LENINGUE.  
JUSTUS WINTFERTE.  
DENIS MELANTHER.

I George Nuspicher, Notary Imperial, bear testimony by this present act, written and

testor hoc meo chirographo publicè, quòd hanc copiam ex vero et inviolato originali propriâ manu à Philippo Melancthone exarato, ad instantiam et petitionem mei clementissimi Domini et Principis Hassiæ ipse scripserim, et quinque foliis numero exceptâ inscriptione complexus sim, etiam omnia propriè et diligenter auscultârim et contulerim, et in omnibus cum originali et subscriptione nominum concordet. De quare iterùm testor propriâ manu.

signed with my own hand, that I have transcribed this present copy from the true original which is in Melancthon's own handwriting, and hath been faithfully preserved to this present time, at the request of the most serene Prince of Hesse; and have examined with the greatest exactness every line and every word, and collated them with the same original; and have found them conformable thereunto, not only in the things themselves, but also in the signs manual, and have delivered the present copy in five leaves of good paper, whereof I bear witness.

GEORGIUS NUSPICHER,  
Notarius.

GEORGE NUSPICHER,  
Notary.

Instrumentum Copulationis  
Philippi Landgravii, et  
Margareta de Saal.

The Marriage Contract of  
Philip, Landgrave of Hesse,  
with Margaret de Saal.

*In nomine Domini, Amen.*

*In the name of God, Amen.*

Notum sit omnibus et singulis, qui hoc publicum instrumentum vident, audiunt, legunt, quòd Anno post Christum natum 1540, die Mercurii mensis Martii, post meridiem circa secundam circiter, Indictionis Anno 13, potentissimi et invictissimi Romanorum Imperatoris Caroli-quinti, clementissimi nostri Domini Anno regi-

Be it known to all those, as well in general as in particular, who shall see, hear, or read this public instrument, that in the year 1540, on Wednesday the fourth day of the month of March, at two o'clock or thereabouts, in the afternoon, the thirteenth year of the Indiction, and the twenty-first of the reign of the most puissant and most

minis 21, coram me infra-  
scripto Notario et teste, Ro-  
tenburgi in arce comparu-  
erint serenissimus Princeps  
et Dominus Philippus Land-  
gravius Comes in Catznelen-  
bogen, Dietz, Ziegenhain, et  
Niddâ, cum aliquibus suæ  
Celsitudinis consiliariis ex  
unâ parte; et honesta, ac  
virtuosa Virgo Margareta de  
Saal, cum aliquibus ex suâ  
consanguinitate ex alterâ  
parte; illâ intentione et vo-  
luntate coram me publico  
Notario ac teste, publicè  
confessi sunt, ut matrimonio  
copulenter; et postea ante  
memoratus meus clementissi-  
mus Dominus et Princeps  
Landgravius Philippus per  
Reverendum Dominum Dio-  
nysium Melandrum suæ Cel-  
situdinis Concionatorem, cu-  
ravit proponi fermè hunc  
sensum. Cùm omnia aperta  
sint oculis Dei, et homines  
pauca lateant, et sua Celsi-  
tudo velit cum nominatâ vir-  
gine Margaretâ matrimonio  
copulari, etsi prior suæ Cel-  
situdinis conjux adhuc sit in  
viviis, ut hoc non tribuatur  
levitati et curiositati, ut evi-  
tetur scandalum, et nominatæ  
virginis et illius honestæ con-  
sanguinitatis honor et fama  
non patiat; edicit sua Cel-  
situs hęc coram Deo, et in  
suam conscientiam et animam  
hoc non fieri ex levitate, aut  
curiositate, nec ex aliquâ  
vilipensione juris et superi-  
orum, sed urgeri aliquibus  
gravibus et inevitabilibus

victorious Emperor Charles  
V., our most gracious lord;  
the most serene Prince and  
Lord Philip Landgrave of  
Hesse, Count of Catznelen-  
bogen, of Dietz, of Ziegenhain,  
and Nidda, with some of his  
Highness's Counsellors, on  
one side, and the good and  
virtuous Lady Margaret de  
Saal with some of her rela-  
tions, on the other side, have  
appeared before me, Notary  
and witness underwritten, in  
the City of Rotenburg, in the  
castle of the same city, with  
the design and will publicly  
declared before me, Notary  
public and witness, to unite  
themselves by marriage; and  
accordingly my most gracious  
Lord and Prince Philip the  
Landgrave hath ordered this  
to be proposed by the  
Reverend Denis Melander  
preacher to his Highness,  
much to the sense as follows:  
—"Whereas the eye of God  
searches all things, and but  
little escapes the knowledge  
of men, his Highness declares  
that his will is to wed the  
said Lady Margaret de Saal,  
although the Princess his wife  
be still living, and that this  
action may not be imputed to  
inconstancy or curiosity: to  
avoid scandal and maintain  
the honour of the said Lady,  
and the reputation of her  
kindred, his Highness makes  
oath here before God, and  
upon his soul and conscience,  
that he takes her to wife  
through no levity, nor curio-

necessitatibus conscientiae et corporis, adeo ut impossibile sit sine alia superinducta legitima conjuge corpus suum et animam salvare. Quam multiplicem causam etiam sua Celsitudo multis praedictis, piis, prudentibus, et Christianis Praedicatoribus antehac indicavit, qui etiam consideratis inevitabilibus causis id ipsum suaserunt ad suae Celsitudinis animae et conscientiae consulendum. Quae causa et necessitas etiam Serenissimam Principem Christianam Ducissam Saxoniae, suae Celsitudinis primam legitimam conjugem, utpotè altâ principali prudentiâ et piâ mente praeditam movit, ut suae Celsitudinis tanquam dilectissimi mariti animae et corpori serviret, et honor Dei promoveretur ad gratiosè consentiendum. Quemadmodum suae Celsitudinis hæc super relata syngrapha testatur; et ne cui scandalum detur eò quòd duas conjuges habere moderno tempore sit insolitum; etsi in hoc casu Christianum et licitum sit, non vult sua Celsitudo publicè coram pluribus consuetas ceremonias usurpare, et palàm nuptias celebrare cum memoratâ virgine Margaretâ de Saal; sed hîc in privato et silentio in praesentiâ subscriptorum testium volunt invicem jungi matrimonio. Finito hoc sermone nominati Philippus et Margareta sunt matrimonio juncti, et unaquæque persona alteram

sity, nor from any contempt of law, or superiors; but that he is obliged to it by such important, such inevitable necessities of body and conscience, that it is impossible for him to save either body or soul, without adding another wife to his first. All which his Highness hath laid before many learned, devout, prudent, and Christian preachers, and consulted them upon it. And these great men, after examining the motives represented to them, have advised his Highness to put his soul and conscience at ease by this double marriage. And the same cause and the same necessity have obliged the most serene Princess, Christina Duchess of Saxony, his Highness's first lawful wife, out of her great prudence and sincere devotion, for which she is so much to be commended, freely to consent and admit of a partner, to the end, that the soul and body of her most dear spouse may run no further risk, and the glory of God may be increased, as the deed written with this Princess's own hand sufficiently testifies. And lest occasion of scandal be taken from its not being the custom to have two wives, although this be Christian and lawful in the present case, his Highness will not solemnize these nuptials in the ordinary way, that is, publicly before many people, and with the

sibi desponsam agnovit et acceptavit, adjunctâ mutuâ fidelitatis promissione in nomine Domini. Et antememoratus princeps ac Dominus ante hunc actum me infrascriptum Notarium requisivit, ut desuper unum aut plura instrumenta conficerem, et mihi etiam tanquam personæ publicæ, verbo ac fide Principis addixit ac promisit, se omnia hæc inviolabiliter semper ac firmiter servaturum, in præsentia reverendorum prædoctorum Dominorum M. Philippi Melanthonis, M. Martini Buceri, Dionysii Melandri, etiam in præsentia strenuorum ac præstantium Eberhardi de Than Electoralis Consilarii, Hermanni de Malsberg, Hermanni de Hundelshausen, Domini Joannis Fegg Cancellariæ, Rodolphi Schenck, ac honestæ ac virtuosæ Dominae Annæ natæ de Miltitz viduæ defuncti Joannis de Saal memoratæ sponsæ matris, tanquam ad hunc actum requisitorum testium.

wonted ceremonies, with the said Margaret de Saal; but both the one and the other will join themselves in wedlock, privately and without noise, in presence only of the witnesses underwritten." — After Melander had finished his discourse, the said Philip and the said Margaret accepted of each other for husband and wife, and promised mutual fidelity in the name of God. The said Prince hath required of me, Notary underwritten, to draw him one or more collected copies of this contract, and hath also promised, on the word and faith of a Prince, to me a public person, to observe it inviolably, always and without alteration, in presence of the Reverend and most learned masters Philip Melanthon, Martin Bucer, Denis Melander; and likewise in the presence of the illustrious and valiant Eberhard de Than, counsellor of his electoral Highness of Saxony, Herman de Malsberg, Herman de Hundelshausen, the Lord John Fegg of the Chancery, Rodolph Schenck; and also in the presence of the most honourable and most virtuous Lady Anne of the family of Miltitz, widow of the late John de Saal, and mother of the spouse, all in quality of requisite witnesses for the validity of the present act.

Et ego Balthasar Rand de Fuldâ, potestate Cæsaris Notarius publicus, qui huic sermoni, instructioni, et matrimoniali sponsioni, et copulationi cum suprâ memoratis testibus interfui, et hæc omnia et singula audivi, et vidi, et tanquam Notarius publicus requisitus fui, hoc instrumentum publicum meâ manu scripsi, et subscripsi, et consueto sigillo munivi in fidem et testimonium.

BALTHASAR RAND.

And I Balthasar Rand, of Fuld, Notary public imperial, who was present at the discourse, instruction, marriage, espousals, and union aforesaid, with the said witnesses, and have heard and seen all that passed, have written and subscribed the present contract, being requested so to do; and set to it the usual seal, for a testimonial of the truth thereof.

BALTHASAR RAND.

## BOOK VII.

**A**n Account of the Variations and Reformation of England under Henry VIII., from the year 1529 to 1547; and under Edward VI., from 1547 to 1553; with the subsequent history of Cranmer, until his death, in 1556.

**A** brief Summary.—The English Reformation condemned even from Mr. Burnet's own history.—The divorce of Henry VIII.—His furious transports against the Holy See.—His Ecclesiastical Supremacy.—The grounds of, and consequences from, this doctrine.—This point excepted, the Catholic Faith remains whole and entire.—Henry's decisions in matters of Faith.—His Six Articles.—The History of Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, author of the English Reformation.—His base compliances, corruption, and hypocrisy.—His shameful sentiments concerning the Hierarchy.—The conduct of the pretended Reformers, and in particular of Thomas Cromwell, the King's Vicar-General and Vicegerent in Spirituals.—That of Anne Boleyn, against whom the divine vengeance declares itself.—The prodigious blindness of Henry through the whole course of his life.—His death.—The minority of Edward VI., his son.—Henry's decrees reversed.—The King's Ecclesiastical Supremacy alone remains in force.—It is carried to such a pitch, that even Protestants are ashamed of it.—Cranmer's Reformation built on this principle.—The King looked upon as judge in matters of Faith.—Antiquity despised.—Continual Variations.—The death of Edward VI.—Cranmer's treason, in conjunction with others, against Queen Mary, the late King's sister.—The Catholic Religion re-established.—Cranmer's ignominious end.—Some particular remarks on Mr. Burnet's History and the English Reformation.

---

1.—*The death of Henry VIII., King of England.—On this occasion the account of the beginning and progress of the English Reformation is entered upon.—1547.*

THE death of Luther was soon followed by another death, which caused great changes in religion. It was that of

Henry VIII., who, after giving such great hopes in the first years of his reign, made so bad use of the rare qualifications of body and mind, with which the divine bounty had so liberally endowed him. Nobody is ignorant of the irregularities of this Prince, nor of the blindness he fell into by his unhappy amours, nor how much blood he shed after he had given himself up to them, nor of the dreadful consequences of his marriages, fatal, almost every one of them, to those he took to his bed. Nor is it less known on what occasion he, once a very Catholic Prince, made himself the author of a new sect, equally detested by Catholics, Lutherans, and Sacramentarians. The Holy See having condemned the divorce, which, after a marriage of five-and-twenty years, he had made from Catherine of Arragon, relict of his brother Arthur, and the marriage he had contracted with Anne Boleyn, he not only rose up against the authority of that See which condemned him, but also, by an attempt till then unheard of among Christians, declared himself head of the Church of England, as well in spirituals as temporals; and from thence begins the English Reformation, whereof so ingenious a history has been given us of late years, and, at the same time, so full of rancour against the Catholic Church.

2.—*The foundation here built upon is Mr. Burnet's own history.—The Doctor's pompous words concerning the English Reformation.*

The author of it, Dr. Gilbert Burnet, upbraids us in his very Preface, and through the entire progress of his History, with having derived great advantage from the conduct of Henry VIII. and that of England's first Reformers. Above all, he complains of Sanders, a Catholic historian, whom he accuses of having invented heinous facts to make the English Reformation odious. These complaints are then turned against us and the Catholic doctrine. "A religion (says he) whose foundation was laid in falsehood, and superstructure raised on imposition, may be supported by the same means which gave it birth\*." He even carries this outrageous invective to a higher pitch: "Sanders's book might well serve the ends of that Church, which has, all along, raised its greatness by public cheats and forgeries." The colours he paints us in are not more black than the ornaments he decks his own Church with are pompous and glittering. "The Reformation (proceeds he) was a work of fight, and

\* Appen. t. iii. p. 303.



needs not the aid of darkness to give it a lustre. A full and distinct narrative of what was then done will be its apology as well as its history." These are fine words, nor could more magnificent ones be used, if, in the changes that happened in England, he had been to shew us even the same sanctity which shone forth at the first birth of Christianity. Since he desires it, let us then consider this history, which, by its naked simplicity alone, justifies the Reformation. We stand not in need of a Sanders; Mr. Burnet will suffice to let us clearly see what was this work of light, and the bare series of facts related by this artful defender of the English Reformation is enough to give us a just idea of it. And if England there finds the sensible marks of that blindness, which God sometimes diffuses over kings and nations, let her not blame me, who do but follow a history which the whole body of the Parliament has honoured with so authentic an approbation\*; but let her adore the hidden judgments of God, who has permitted the errors of this learned and illustrious nation to rise to so visible a height, only to the end she might, by this means, the more easily know herself.

3.—*The first fact avowed that the Reformation began by a man equally rejected by all parties.*

The first important fact I observe in Mr. Burnet, is what he advances even in his preface, and continues to give proofs of through the whole body of his book: that "when Henry VIII. began the Reformation, the King's design seemed to have been in the whole progress of these changes to terrify the Court of Rome, and force the Pope into a compliance with what he desired; for, in his heart, he continued addicted to the most extravagant opinions of that Church, such as Transubstantiation and the other corruptions in the Sacrifice of the Mass, so that he rather died in this communion than in that of the Protestants." Whatsoever Mr. Burnet may please to say of this matter, we shall not admit this Prince, whom he seems to offer us, a member of our communion; and since he casts him off from his own, the immediate result of this fact is, that the author of the English Reformation, and who, in reality, laid the true foundation of it, in the hatred he excited against the Pope and Church of Rome, is one equally rejected and excommunicated by all sides.

\* Ext. from the Journ. of the House of Lords and Com. 3 Jan. 1681, 23 Dec. 1680, and 5 Jan. 1681, in the beginning of the 2d vol. of Bur. Hist.

4.—*What was the faith of Henry VIII., author of the Reformation.*

What in this place mostly deserves our observation is, that this prince was not content with believing in his heart, and outwardly professing all those points of faith, which Mr. Burnet calls the greatest and most extravagant of our corruptions, but even by law, in his new capacity of supreme head, under Jesus Christ, of the Church of England, made them that church's articles of faith. He caused them to be approved by all the Bishops and all his Parliaments, that is, by all the tribunals in which the highest degree of ecclesiastical authority in the Church of England resides at this day, he made them be subscribed, and put in practice throughout all England, and in particular by the Cromwells, the Cranmers, and all the rest of Mr. Burnet's heroes, who, whether Lutherans or Zuinglians in their hearts, and zealous for setting up the new Gospel, went nevertheless, as usual, to Mass, as to the public worship which was paid to God, or said it themselves; in a word, practised all the rest of the doctrine and service received in the Church in spite of their religion and consciences.

5.—*What were the instruments made use of by Henry VIII. in the Reformation.—Cromwell, his Vicegerent in spirituals.*

Thomas Cromwell was the person the King appointed his Vicar-General in spirituals in 1533, immediately after his condemnation; and whom, in 1536, as Supreme Head of the Church, he made his Vicegerent, whereby he placed him at the head of all ecclesiastical affairs, and of the whole sacred order, though he were no more than a layman, and always remained such\*. Till then that title had not been met with on the list of the Crown-officers of England, nor among the employments recorded in the review of the empire†, nor in any Christian kingdom whatsoever; and it was Henry VIII. that first shewed England, and the Christian world, a Lord Vicegerent and a King's Vicar-General in spirituals.

6.—*Thomas Cranmer is Mr. Burnet's hero.*

Cromwell's intimate friend and chief manager of the English Reformation was Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canter-

\* Burn. l. iii. p. 181.

† Notitia Imperii.

bury. This is Mr. Burnet's great hero. He abandons Henry VIII., whose scandals and cruelties are too flagrant. But he was well aware, should he do the same by Cranmer, whom he looks upon to be the author of the Reformation, this would be giving us at once a too bad idea of this whole work. Therefore he enlarges much in the praises of this prelate; and not content with admiring everywhere his moderation, his piety, and prudence, he sticks not at making him as irreprehensible, or even more so, than St. Athanasius and St. Cyril; and of such extraordinary worth, that "we shall find as eminent virtues, and as few faults in him, as in any prelate that has been in the Christian Church for many ages\*."

7.—*Mr. Burnet's heroes are not always, even in his judgment, the best of men.—What he relates of Montluc, Bishop of Valence.*

The truth is, we must not rely much on the praises Mr. Burnet gives the heroes of the Reformation: witness those he bestowed on Montluc, Bishop of Valence. "He was," says he, "one of the wisest ministers of his time, and always for moderate councils in matters of religion, which made him be sometimes suspected of heresy. And, indeed, the whole sequel of his life declared him to be one of the greatest men of that age: only being so long, and so firmly, united to the interest of Queen Catherine Medicis, takes off a great deal of the high character which the rest of his life has given of him†." The crime certainly was not very great, since he owed all to this Princess, who besides was his Queen, the wife and mother of his Kings, and always in union with them; so that this Prelate, against whom this only exception could be made of being faithful to his benefactress, in Mr. Burnet's judgment, must have been the most irreproachable of all his contemporaries. But the eulogiums the Reformers bestow on the great men of their sect are not to be taken literally. The same Mr. Burnet, in the very book wherein he so highly extols Montluc, speaks thus of him—"This Bishop was eminent; but he had his faults." After what he has said of him, these faults, we ought to think, will be but trifling; but read to the end, and you will find they consisted in this, that "he had endeavoured to corrupt the daughter of an Irish gentleman who had received him into his house; and had with him an English mistress whom he kept,‡" who having

\* Preface, towards the end.

† 2d Part. l. i. p. 85.

‡ 2d Part. l. i. p. 204.

drunk, without reflection, the precious balm which Solyman the Magnificent had made this Prelate a present of, "he fell into such a rage, that all the house was disturbed with it, whereby he discovered both his lewdness and passion at once." Here are the trifling faults of a Prelate, "the whole course of whose life declared him to be one of the greatest men of that age." The Reformation, either not over nice in virtue, or indulgent to her heroes, easily forgives them such abominations; and if Montluc, for having only a little spice of Reformation, was a man, notwithstanding such crimes, almost irreproachable, no wonder so great a Reformer as Cranmer should have merited such high encomiums.

Thus warned against any imposition for the future, from the great commendations, wherewith Mr. Burnet extols his Reformers and Cranmer most particularly; let us now form the history of this Prelate on the facts related by this historian, his perpetual admirer, and observe, at the same time, in what spirit the Reformation was conceived.

8.—*Cranmer, a Lutheran according to Mr. Burnet.—How he came into the King's favour and that of Anne Boleyn.*

Ever since the year 1529, Thomas Cranmer had put himself at the head of that party, which favoured the Queen's divorce, and the marriage the King was resolved upon with Anne Boleyn. In 1530, he wrote a book against the validity of Catherine's marriage, and we may judge how successfully, by thus flattering the predominant passion of his Prince, he made his court. From that time, he began to be considered at Court as a kind of favourite, and looked on as the person likeliest to succeed in credit to Cardinal Wolsey. Cranmer was then devoted to Luther's doctrine, and as Mr. Burnet says, was looked on as the most learned of those who had embraced it\*. Anne Boleyn, proceeds this author, had also received some impressions of this doctrine†. Afterwards he makes her appear wholly devoted to the sentiments of those whom he calls the Reformers. By this word we must always understand the hidden or avowed enemies of the Mass and Catholic doctrine. Crome, Shaxton, Latimer, and others, adds he, of that society favoured the King's cause‡. Here we have the secret which linked Cranmer and his adherents with Henry's mistress: here lies the foundation of this new favourite's interest, and the beginnings of the English Reformation. The unhappy Prince, who knew nothing of these

\* Burn. lib. ii. p. 87.

† Ibid.

‡ Ibid.

associations and designs, did himself insensibly combine with the enemies of that faith, which he till then had so well defended, and through their secret machinations, became unwittingly subservient to the designs of destroying it.

9.—*Cranmer, sent to Rome on account of the divorce, is there made the Pope's Penitentiary.—He marries, though a Priest, but in private.*

Cranmer was sent into Italy and Rome in behalf of the divorce, and there carried the dissimulation of his errors so far, that the Pope made him his penitentiary; which shews he was a priest. He accepted of this employment, Lutheran as he was. From Rome he went into Germany, there to manage his good friends the Protestants; and then it was he married Osiander's sister. Some say, he had debauched her, and was forced to marry her; but I shall not vouch for these scandalous facts till I find them well attested by those of the party, or at least by unsuspected authors\*. As for the marriage, the fact is certain. These men are accustomed, in spite of the canons, in spite of the profession of continency, to look on such marriages as good. But Henry was of another mind, and held married priests in abhorrence†. Cranmer had been already expelled Jesus College, in Cambridge, for a former marriage. The second he contracted, whilst a priest, would have brought him into much more dreadful circumstances, since, by the canon law, he would have been excluded from this holy order by a second marriage, though contracted even before priesthood. The Reformers, in their hearts, made but a jest both of the sacred canons and their own vows; but for fear of Henry, it was necessary to keep this marriage private, and this great Reformer set out by deceiving his master in a concern of this importance.

10.—*Cranmer, nominated Archbishop of Canterbury, receives the Pope's Bulls, though a married man and a Lutheran.*

Whilst he was in Germany, in the year 1533, the Archbishopric of Canterbury became vacant by Warham's death. The King of England nominated Cranmer, and he accepted of it‡. The Pope, who knew no error in him, but that of maintaining the nullity of Henry's marriage, (a thing at that time undecided,) gave him his bulls; Cranmer received them, and dreaded not, by so doing, to contaminate himself by re-

\* Burn, t. i. lib. ii. p. 92.

† Ibid. p. 75.

‡ Ibid. p. 128.

ceiving, as the party used to speak, with the character of the beast.

11.—*Cranmer's consecration; profession of submission to the Pope; his hypocrisy.*

At his consecration, and before they proceeded to ordain him, he took the usual oath of fidelity to the Pope, introduced some ages before. This was not without scruple, as Mr. Burnet tells us; but Cranmer had ways and means of coming off, and salved all by protesting that he intended not to restrain himself by this oath from what he owed his conscience, his king, and his country: a protestation in itself quite needless; for who of us imagines he engages himself by this oath to anything that is contrary to his conscience, or the service of his king and country? Far from thinking we prejudice any of these, it is even expressed in the oath, that we take it without prejudice to the rights of our order, *Salvo ordine meo*. The submission, which is sworn to the Pope in spirituals\*, is of a different order from what we naturally owe our Prince in temporals, and without protesting, we have always well understood, that one does not interfere with the other. But in a word, either this oath is a mere empty form, or it obliges to acknowledge the Pope's spiritual jurisdiction. The new Archbishop, therefore, acknowledged it in word, though he believed no such thing. Mr. Burnet† grants that this expedient did but little agree with Cranmer's sincerity; and in order to extenuate as far as he was able so criminal a dissimulation, adds a little after, "by which, if he did not wholly save his integrity, yet it was plain he intended no cheat." What is it, then, we call a cheat, or can there be a greater than to swear what you do not believe, and come prepared with shifts to elude your oath, by a protestation conceived in words so indeterminate? But Mr. Burnet thinks not fit to tell us that Cranmer, who was consecrated with all the ceremonies of the Pontifical, besides this oath he pretended to evade the force of, made other declarations, against which he did not protest: viz. "To receive with submission the traditions of the Fathers, and the constitutions of the Holy See-Apostolic, to render obedience to St. Peter in the person of his vicar the Pope and his successors, according to canonical authority; to keep chastity," which in the intention of the Church, as expressly declared from the time one is admitted to subdeaconship, imported celibacy and continency. This is what

\* Pontif. Rom. in Conser. Ep. † Burn. lib. ii. p. 129.

Mr. Burnet makes no mention of. He does not tell us that Cranmer said Mass according to custom together with his consecrator. Cranmer ought also to have protested against this act, and against all the Masses he said when officiating in his Church; or, at least, during the whole reign of Henry VIII., that is, for thirteen years successively. Mr. Burnet speaks not a word of all these fine actions of his hero. He tells us not, that when he made priests, as doubtless he did in the space of so many years as he was Archbishop, he made them according to the terms of the Pontifical, wherein Henry changed nothing, no more than in the Mass. He, therefore, gave them power "of changing the bread and wine into the body and blood of Jesus Christ by their holy benediction, of offering the sacrifice, and saying Mass as well for the living as the dead \*." It would have been much more important to protest against so many acts so contrary to Lutheranism, than against the oath of obedience to the Pope. But the thing was, Henry VIII., whom a protestation against the Pope's supremacy did not offend, would not have endured the rest. This was the cause of Cranmer's dissimulation. Here then we have him, all at once, a Lutheran, a married man, a concealer of his marriage, an Archbishop according to the Roman Pontifical, subject to the Pope, whose power he detested in his heart, saying Mass which he did not believe in, and giving power to say it; yet, nevertheless, if we believe Mr. Burnet, a second Athanasius, a second Cyril, one of the most perfect prelates the Church ever had. What a notion would he give us, not only of St. Athanasius and St. Cyril, but also of St. Augustin, St. Ambrose, St. Basil, and all the Saints in general, had they nothing in them more excellent, nor less defective, than a man who practises, for so long a time, what he believes the very height of sacrilege and abomination? Thus are men blind in the new Reformation; and thus the darkness which overcast the minds of the first Reformers, is diffused around their defenders to this very day.

### 12.—*Reflection on Cranmer's pretended moderation.*

Mr. Burnet pretends that his Archbishop did all he could to waive this eminent dignity, and admires his moderation. For my part, I am far from disputing with the greatest enemies of the Church, certain moral virtues, to be met with in heathens and philosophers; which, in heretics, were nothing

\* Pont. Rom. in Ord. Presbyt.

else but a snare of Satan to intrap the weak, and a part of that hypocrisy which seduces them. But Mr. Burnet has too much wit not to see that Cranmer, who had on his side Anne Boleyn, with whom the King was so smitten; who did all which could be required to favour the amorous passion of that prince; and who, after declaring against Catherine's marriage, had made himself so necessary to the breaking of it, was very sensible Henry could never choose an Archbishop more favourable to his designs: so that nothing was more easy for him than to obtain the Archbishopric by refusing it, and thus add the repute of moderation to the honour of so great a prelacy.

13.—*Cranmer proceeds to a sentence of Divorce.—He takes the title of Legate of the Apostolic See in giving the sentence.*

Accordingly, no sooner was Cranmer raised to this dignity, but he bestirred himself to make an interest in the Parliament in favour of the divorce. Before this time, in the year 1532, the King had already privately married Anne Boleyn: she was with child, and the secret was ready to break out. The Archbishop, who was privy to it, signalized himself in this juncture, and evinced much vigour in flattering the King. By his archiepiscopal authority, he wrote him a very serious letter on his incestuous marriage with Catherine: "a marriage (said he) the world had long been scandalized with\*," and declared to him that, for his part, he was determined to suffer no longer so great a scandal. Here is a man of wonderful resolution, a second John the Baptist. Thereupon he cites the King and Queen to appear before him: he proceeds: the Queen does not appear: the Archbishop declared her contumacious, and the marriage null from the beginning; nor did he forget, in his sentence, to take upon him, as was customary with the Archbishops of Canterbury †, the quality of Legate to the See Apostolic. Mr. Burnet insinuates ‡, this might be done in order to make the sentence firmer: that is to say, the Archbishop, who in his heart neither owned Pope nor Holy See, was willing, for the King's sake, to take that title which would best authorize his pleasures. Five days after, he confirmed the private marriage of Anne Boleyn, though contracted before that of Catherine was declared void, and the Archbishop hesitated not to ratify so irregular a proceeding.

\* Burn. lib. ii. p. 131.

† Ibid.

‡ Ibid.



14.—*The sentence of Clement VII., and Henry's rage against the See.*

The definitive sentence of Clement VII. against the King of England is known sufficiently. It followed soon after that which Cranmer had given in his behalf; Henry, entertaining still some hopes from the court of Rome, had again submitted himself to the decision of the Holy See, even after the Archbishop's judgment. There is no need of relating to what excess of wrath the King was transported, and Mr. Burnet himself owns "he kept no measure in his resentments\*." Accordingly, from that period he began to carry his title, of Supreme Head of the Church of England, to its utmost extent.

15.—*More and Fisher condemned to Death for refusing to own the King Head of the Church.—1534.*

Then it was the world lamented the death of two, the greatest men of England for piety and learning: of Thomas More, Lord High Chancellor; and Fisher, Bishop of Rochester †. Mr. Burnet himself grieves at the occurrence, and looks upon the "tragical end of these two great men to have left one of the greatest blots on this King's proceedings ‡."

These were the two most illustrious victims of the ecclesiastical supremacy. More being very much urged to own it, made this fine answer: "That he should distrust his own understanding, were he alone against the whole Parliament: but, although the great council of England was against him, the whole Church, the great Council of Christendom, was on his side." Fisher's end was not less glorious, nor less Christian.

16.—*The memorable date of Henry's Cruelties and other excesses.*

Then began executions indifferently against Catholics as well as Protestants, and Henry became the most sanguinary of all princes. But remarkable is the date: "It does not appear (says Burnet) that cruelty was natural to him. For, in twenty-five years' reign, none had suffered for any crime against the State §" but two men, whose punishment could not be imputed to him. "Yet, in the ten last years of his life (says the same author) many instances of severity

\* Burn, lib. ii. p. 134. † P. 156. ‡ P. 155, 156. § Lib. iii. p. 180.

occurred \*.” Mr. Burnet will not have him imitated, nor condemned with too much severity; but none condemns him more sharply than Burnet himself, who thus speaks of this Prince: “The vastness and irregularity of his expense procured many heavy exactions, and twice extorted a public discharge of his debts, embased the coin, with other irregularities. His proud and impatient spirit occasioned many cruel proceedings; the taking so many lives only for denying his supremacy, particularly Fisher’s and More’s, the one being extreme old, and the other one of the glories of his nation, for probity and learning.” The rest may be seen in his Preface; but I cannot omit the last touch: “That which was the first of all, and deserved most to be blamed, was the laying a precedent for the subversion of justice, and oppressing the clearest innocence, by attainting men without hearing them.” All this notwithstanding, Mr. Burnet would have us believe, that although “upon slight grounds he was too ready to bring his subjects to the bar, yet they were indicted and judged always according to law,†”—as if the making unjust laws, such as condemning the accused without allowing them a hearing, and laying snares for the innocent in the formalities of justice, were not the height of cruelty and tyranny. But what can be more horrible than what is added by the same historian? “That this Prince, whether impatient of contradiction, or perhaps blown up, either with the vanity of this new title of Head of the Church, or with the praises which flattery bestowed on him; he thought all persons were bound to regulate their belief by his dictates ‡.” These are, indeed, “such odious blemishes in the life of a Prince (as Mr. Burnet speaks) that no honest man can excuse;” and we are obliged to this author for having saved us the trouble of looking out for proofs of all these excesses in histories that might be more suspected. But what cannot be dissembled is, that Henry, so averse before to these horrible disorders, did not fall into them, according to Mr. Burnet’s own confession, till the ten last years of his life; that is, he fell into them immediately after his divorce, after his open rupture with the Church, after he had usurped, “by an example unprecedented” in all ages, the ecclesiastical supremacy: and forced he is to own, that one of the causes of his prodigious blindness was, “this glorious title of Head of the Church,” which his people had bestowed upon him. I now leave the Christian reader to judge, whether these be the characters of a Reformer; or rather, of a Prince, whose excesses the divine

\* Burn. lib. iii. p. 181.

† P. 180.

‡ Ibid.

justice revenges by other excesses; whom it delivers over to the desires of his own heart, and abandons visibly to a reprobate sense.

17.—*Cromwell made Vicegerent.—Everything concurs to excite the King against the Faith of the Church.—1535.*

The death of Fisher and More, and so many other bloody executions, cast terror into all minds; everybody swore to Henry's Supremacy, and none durst stand up against it. This Supremacy was established by divers Acts of Parliament, and "the first act of the king's supremacy was the nominating Cromwell vicar-general in spirituals, and visitor of all the monasteries and other privileged places throughout England\*." This was properly declaring himself Pope; and what is more remarkable, this was placing the whole ecclesiastic power in the hands of a Zuinglian, for I am persuaded Cromwell was one, or, if Mr. Burnet likes better, at least a Lutheran. It has appeared, that Cranmer, Cromwell's intimate friend, was of the same party, and that both of them acted unanimously, in order to excite the incensed King against the ancient faith†. The new Queen favoured them with all her power, and took Shaxton and Latimer, hidden Protestants, to be her chaplains, and promoted them to the bishoprics of Salisbury and Worcester. But although every thing went contrary to the old religion, and the chief ecclesiastic and secular powers conspired its utter subversion, it is not always in the hands of men to carry on their evil purposes as far as they desire. Henry was provoked only against the Pope and Holy See. Accordingly, he attacked only this authority; and God willed it so, that the Reformation, from her infancy, should bear marked on her forehead the impression of this Prince's hatred and revenge. Whatever, therefore, might be the vicar-general's aversion to the Mass, power was not then given him, like another Antiochus, against the perpetual sacrifice‡; one of his visitorial injunctions was, that every priest should say Mass daily, and the religious observe their rule carefully, and particularly their three vows§.

18.—*Cranmer's Metropolitan Visitation by the King's authority.*

Cranmer, also made his metropolitanical visitation, but it was after he had obtained the King's licence for it: they began

\* Burn. lib. iii. p. 181.

† Lib. ii. p. 171.

‡ Dan. viii. p. 12.

§ Burn. lib. iii. p. 186. Ibid. p. 184.

to perform all acts of ecclesiastical jurisdiction in virtue of the royal authority. The whole drift of this visitation, as of all the actions of those days, was firmly to establish the King's ecclesiastical supremacy\*. At that time, the complying archbishop had nothing so much at heart as this, and the first act of jurisdiction, which the bishop of the first See in England did, was to enslave the Church, and subject to the earthly Kings that power which she had received from Heaven.

19.—*The Plundering of Monasteries.*

The visitations were followed by the suppression of Monasteries, whose revenues the King appropriated to himself. Protestant and Catholic countries indifferently cried out shame against the sacrilegious rapine of goods consecrated to God; but to the character of revenge, which the English Reformation bore from the beginning, was to be joined that also of an infamous avarice; and this was one of the first fruits of Henry's supremacy, who made himself head of the Church, to have a title to plunder it.

20.—*The Death of Queen Catherine.—A comparison betwixt this Princess and Anne Boleyn.—1536.*

Soon after this, died Queen Catherine: "she was a devout and pious Princess, (says Mr. Burnet,) and led a severe and mortified life. In her greatness, she wrought much with her own hands, and kept her women well employed about her;" and to join common with great virtues, the same historian adds that, by the writers of those times, "she is represented as a most wonderful good woman†." These characters are widely different from those of her rival Anne Boleyn. Allowing she might be vindicated from those infamous actions, which her favourites, at their death, charged her with, Mr. Burnet‡ does not deny that her gaiety was immodest, her liberties indiscreet, her behaviour irregular and licentious. A virtuous woman, not to say a queen, never bears with the failure of due respect, so far as to suffer such declarations as men of all degrees, even the lowest, made to this Princess. Why do I say suffer?—be pleased with them,—and not only take part therein, but also draw them on herself, and not blush to say to one of her gallants, "that he looked for dead men's shoes, and if aught came to the King but good, he would look to have her§." All these things are owned

\* Burn. lib. iii. p. 183. † Ibid. p. 192. ‡ Ibid. p. 197. § Ibid. p. 199.

by Anne, and far from shewing a greater discountenance to those bold lovers, it is certain, without entering farther into the matter, she did but treat them the better for it. In the midst of this strange conduct, "we are assured that she grew more full of good works, and alms-deeds\*," and with the exception of her advancing the pretended Reformation, which nobody disputes, this is all that is told us of her virtues.

21.—*Sequel of the comparison, and visible mark of God's Judgment.—Cranmer annuls the King's Marriage with Anne.*

But if we carry our reflections still higher, we cannot but acknowledge the hand of God on this Princess. She enjoyed but three years that glory to which so many troubles had elevated her: a new fit of love raised her up, and a new amour pulled her down; and Henry, who had sacrificed Catherine to her, soon sacrificed Anne to the youth and charms of Jane Seymour. But Catherine, when she lost the King's affections, preserved, at least, his esteem to the very end; whereas, he had Anne executed infamously on a scaffold†. This death happened a few months after that of Catherine. But Catherine preserved to the very last the character of gravity and constancy, which she had kept up during the entire course of her life. As for Anne, at the moment she was taken, whilst she prayed to God in tears, she was observed to break out into a fit of laughing, like a distracted person‡: the words she vented in passion against her lovers, who had betrayed her, shewed the disorder she was in, and the troubled state of her conscience. But here is a visible mark of the hand of God. The King, always hurried on by his new amours, caused his marriage with Anne to be annulled in favour of Jane Seymour, as he had annulled Catherine's in favour of Anne. Elizabeth, Anne's daughter, was declared illegitimate, as Mary, Catherine's daughter, had been before. By a just retaliation, Anne fell into the same pit she had dug for her innocent rival. But Catherine, even to death, maintained the dignity of a Queen, the truth of her marriage, and the honour of Mary's birth. Anne, on the contrary, through a shameful compliance, owned what was false,—that she had married Henry whilst Lord Piercy was living, with whom she had before contracted; and by confessing, contrary to her con-

\* Burn. lib. iii. p. 196.

† Ibid. p. 192.

‡ Ibid. p. 199.

science, the nullity of her marriage with the King, involved her daughter Elizabeth in her own shame. To the end that God's justice might appear more manifest in this memorable event, Cranmer, that same Craumer who had annulled Catherine's marriage\*, annulled, likewise, that of Anne, to whom, of all persons living, he was most obliged. God struck with blindness all who had contributed to the breach of so solemn a marriage as was that of Catherine: Henry, Anne, the archbishop himself, not one escaped. Cranmer's baso pusillanimity, and his extreme ingratitude to Anne, excited the abhorrence of all good men; and his shameful compliance, in breaking all marriages just as it pleased Henry, took from his first sentence all the appearance of authority which the name of an Archbishop could have given to it.

22.—*Cranmer's base compliance ill excused by Mr. Burnet.*

Mr. Burnet † sees with great concern so odious a blot in the life of his great Reformer, and to excuse him says, that Anne declared, in his presence, her marriage with Lord Piercy; by which it was evident, that which she had made with the King was not valid; upon which confession he could not but separate her from this Prince, and give sentence for the nullity of the marriage. But here is a too manifest imposition: it was notorious in England that Anne's engagement with Piercy, far from being a concluded marriage, was not even a promise of marriage to be concluded, but a bare proposal of a marriage desired by this lord: which, so far from invalidating a subsequent marriage, would not even have been an impediment to the contracting of it. Mr. Burnet agrees herein, and lays down all these facts as certain ‡. Cranmer, who knew the whole secret of what had passed between the King and Anne, could not be ignorant of them; and Piercy, the Queen's pretended husband, had "taken his oath before the two Archbishops, that there was no contract, nor promise of marriage even between them, and received the Sacrament upon it before the principal of the King's privy-council; wishing it might be to his damnation, if there were any such thing §." So solemn an oath received by Cranmer discovered to him plainly that Anne's confession was not free. When she made it, she was adjudged to die, and, as Mr. Burnet says, "even thunderstruck with the terrible sentence

\* Cranmer's letter, Burn. lib. iii. p. 200.

† Ibid. l. iii. p. 203.

‡ Ibid.

§ Ibid.

of being burnt\*.” This the laws had condemned her to ; and the mitigating so cruel a part of her judgment depended on the King alone. Cranmer might easily judge that, in such a condition, she might be wrought upon to confess what they pleased, “ either by some hopes of life, or by mitigating her sentence †.” Then was the time for an Archbishop to lend his helping hand to an oppressed person, whom trouble, or hopes of softening her punishment, makes to speak against her conscience. If Anne, his benefactress, did not move him, he ought, at least, to have compassionated the innocence of Elizabeth just going to be declared born in adultery, and, as such, incapable of inheriting the crown and this on no other grounds but a declaration extorted from the Queen her mother. Nor does God bestow so great an authority on bishops, but with the obligation of lending the assistance of their eloquence to the infirm, and their strength to the oppressed. But virtues, to which Cranmer was a stranger, were not to be expected from him : not even the courage to represent to the King, the manifest contrariety of the two sentences, which he caused to be pronounced against Anne ; one of which condemned her to death for defiling the King’s bed by her adulteries ; the other, by reason of a pre-contract, declared she never had been married to the King ‡. Cranmer dissembled so flagrant an iniquity ; and all he did in behalf of the unhappy Princess was to write a letter to the King, wherein he wishes she may declare herself innocent § ; which he concludes with a postscript, protesting he is exceedingly sorry that such faults can be proved, as he heard by relation || : so much did he fear giving Henry the least suspicion that he disapproved of any thing he did.

### 23.—*The Execution of Anne Boleyn.*

It had been thought his credit was shaken by Anne’s downfall. And, indeed, immediately upon it, he was forbidden to approach the King ; but he soon found means of ingratiating himself at the expense of his benefactress, and by cancelling her marriage ¶. The unfortunate Princess was in hopes of moving the King, by owning all he desired. This confession only saved her from the stake, and Henry condemned her to the block. She comforted herself on the day of her death, because she had heard say the executioner was very dexterous ; and besides, said she, I have a slender neck. At the same

\* Burn. lib. iii. p. 203.

† Ibid.

‡ Ibid.

§ Ibid. p. 200.

|| Ibid. p. 201.

¶ Ibid. p. 203.

time, adds the witness of her death, she put her hands about it, laughing heartily; either from ostentation of an uncommon intrepidity, or because her head was turned at death's approach; and it seems to have been God's judgment on that unhappy Princess, that her end, dismal as it was, should yet have something in it no less ridiculous than tragical.

24.—*Henry's decisions of Faith.—He confirms that of the Church concerning the Sacrament of Penance.*

It is time to relate the definitions of faith which Henry made in quality of Supreme Head of the Church of England. In these articles, drawn up by the King himself, we have a confirmation of the Catholic doctrine. Here we find "the absolution of the priest taught, as instituted by Jesus Christ, and to be looked upon as valid as if given by God himself," with the necessity of confession to a priest, if it may be had\*. On this foundation are built the three acts of penance divinely instituted, contrition and confession in express terms, and satisfaction under the name of worthy fruits of penance, which we must bring forth, although it be true that God pardons sins only for the satisfaction of Jesus Christ, and not on account of our merits. Here is the whole substance of the Catholic doctrine. Nor must it be imagined by Protestants, that what is said of satisfaction is peculiar to themselves, since the council of Trent has ever believed that the forgiveness of sins is a pure grace, granted on account of the sole merits of Jesus Christ.

25.—*Concerning the Eucharist.*

In the Sacrament of the Altar is owned, "The very same body of Christ, that was born of the Virgin Mary, truly and substantially given under the forms of bread and wine;" or, as the English original speaks, "Under the form and figure of bread:" which marks most distinctly the Real Presence of the body, and gives to understand, according to the usual expression, that nothing but the species of bread remains.

26.—*Concerning Images and Saints.*

Images were retained, with full liberty of incensing them, kneeling before them, bringing offerings, and shewing respect to them, in consideration that these homages were a relative honour, directed to God, and not to the Image †. This was

\* Burn. lib. iii. p. 216.

† Ibid.



not only approving the honour of Images in general, but those things, in particular, wherein it is carried to its greatest height.

The people were to be taught that it was good to pray to the saints, that they would pray for, and with us, yet so as not to think to obtain those things at their hands which were only to be obtained of God\*.

When Mr. Burnet looks upon this as a kind of "Reformation, that the immediate worship of Images was removed, and the direct invocation of saints changed into a simple prayer of praying for the faithful †," he does but trifle: since there is not a Catholic but will own to him that he hopes for nothing from the saints but by their prayers, nor renders any honour to images but what is here expressed with relation to God.

### 27.—*Of Ceremonies.—Of the Cross.*

Touching ceremonies, these are expressly approved of, "viz. holy water, blessed bread, hallowing the font, the exorcisms in baptism, giving ashes on Ash-Wednesday, bearing palms on Palm-Sunday; creeping to the cross on Good-Friday, and kissing it in memory of Christ's death ‡:" all these ceremonies were looked upon as a kind of mysterious language, which brought to mind God's benefits, and excited the soul to raise itself up to heaven, which, in reality, is the very notion all Catholics have of them.

### 28.—*On Purgatory and Masses for the dead.*

The custom of praying for the dead is warranted as having a certain foundation in the book of Maccabees, and a continuation in the Church from the beginning: all is approved of, and it is held "consistent with the due order of charity to pray for them, and to make others pray for them, in Masses and Exequies, and to give alms to them for that end §:" whereby that was acknowledged in the Mass, which was the great aversion of the new Reformation, viz. that virtue by which, independently of communion, it profited those for whom it was said, inasmuch as those souls, doubtless, did not communicate.

\* Burn. lib. iii. p. 217.

† Ibid. p. 218.

‡ Ibid. p. 217.

§ Collec. of Records, t. i. add. p. 306.

29.—*The King decides concerning Faith, by his own authority.*

With relation to each of these articles, the King said, that he enjoined all Bishops to announce them to the people, "By him committed to their spiritual charge;" a language till then quite unheard of in the Church. The truth is, when he decided these points of Faith, he had before heard the Bishops, as judges hear lawyers; but it was he that prescribed and decided. All the Bishops signed, after Cromwell, the Vicar-general, and Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury.

30.—*Cranmer and the rest subscribed Henry's articles against their consciences.—Mr. Burnet strives in vain to excuse them.*

Mr. Burnet is ashamed to see his Reformers approve the chief articles of the Catholic doctrine, and even the Mass itself, which alone contained them all. But he excuses them, saying, "That some of the Bishops and Divines were not then so fully convinced about some matters, which afterwards they arrived to a clearer understanding of, and so it was their ignorance, and not their cowardice or policy, that made them compliant in some things\*." But is not this bantering the world in too gross a manner, to make the Reformers ignorant of what was most essential in the Reformation†? If Cranmer and his adherents sincerely approved all these articles, even the Mass, wherein could they be called Lutherans? and if, from that time, they rejected in their hearts all these pretended abuses, as doubtless they did, what was their signing them else but a shameful prostitution of their consciences? Nevertheless, Mr. Burnet will have it, at all events, that the Reformation took a great step at that very time, because in the first of Henry's articles the "Scriptures and the ancient Creeds were made the standards of the people's faith‡," with a prohibition of saying anything that was not conformable to them; a thing which nobody denied, and which, consequently, stood in no need of being reformed.

Such are the articles of faith which were established by Henry in 1536. But although he had omitted some, and in particular no mention was there made of four Sacraments, Confirmation, Extreme Unction, Order, and Matrimony, it is certain, however, that he altered nothing therein no more than in the other points of our faith; but his design was to express particularly, in those articles, what was most contro-

h \* Burn. l. iii. p. 219.

† Ibid. p. 21.

‡ Ibid. p. 218.

verted at that time, to the end that he might leave no doubt of his perseverance in the ancient faith.

31.—*To draw in the Gentry, Church lands are sold at low rates.*

At the same time, by Cromwell's advice, and in order to draw in the gentry to his sentiments, he sold them in their several counties the lands of those monasteries that had been suppressed, and at very low prices\*. Such was the cunning of the Reformers, and such the ties that linked men to the Reformation.

32.—*Cromwell and Cranmer confirm anew the Faith of the Church, which they detested in their hearts.*

The Vicegerent published also a new ecclesiastical regulation, which had the doctrine of the above articles, so conformable to Catholic doctrine, for its foundation. Mr. Burnet finds a great likelihood that these injunctions were opened by Cranmer†, and gives us a new instance, that, in point of religion, this Archbishop was capable of the most criminal dissimulations.

33.—*Henry's Six Articles.—1539.*

Henry explained himself more distinctly as to the ancient faith, in the famous declaration of those six articles which he published in 1539. In the first, he established Transubstantiation; in the second, Communion in one kind; in the third, the Celibacy of Priests, with the penalty of death for those who should trespass against it; in the fourth, the obligation of keeping Vows; in the fifth, the use of private Masses; in the sixth, the necessity of auricular Confession‡. These articles were published by authority of the King and Parliament; and it was enacted that those who obstinately opposed them should suffer death, and the rest be prisoners during the King's pleasure.

34.—*The King's marriage with Anne of Cleves, Cromwell's design, who proposed it.—The King's new amours.—Cromwell condemned to death.—1540.*

Whilst Henry declared himself in so terrible a manner against the pretended Reformation, Cromwell, the Vicegerent, and the Archbishop, saw no other way of advancing it, than by

\* Burn. lib. iii. p. 223.

† Ibid. p. 225.

‡ Ibid. p. 256.

giving the King a wife, who might protect them and their designs. The Queen, Jane Seymour, died in the year 1537, in child-bed of Edward. If she experienced not Henry's fickleness, Mr. Burnet is of opinion, it was owing, in all likelihood, to the shortness of her life. Cromwell, who remembered how much power Henry's wives had over him as long as they continued in his affection, believed that Anne of Cleves\* beauty would be a great prop to his measures, and prevailed with the King to marry her; but unluckily this Prince fell in love with Catherine Howard†, and scarce had he accomplished his marriage with Anne, but he bent all his thoughts to break it off. The Viceregent underwent the punishment of having advised him to it, and found his ruin where he thought to meet with his support. It was perceived that he gave private encouragement to the new preachers, enemies of the Six Articles and Real Presence‡, which the King defended vehemently. Some words spoken by him on this occasion against the King, were brought to his ears§. Whereupon the Parliament, by the King's orders, condemned him for a heretic and traitor to his country||. It was observed, he was condemned without being heard, and so bore the punishment of that detestable advice he had been the first author of, to attaint people without hearing them. And after this, will any one say that the arm of God was not visible on these miserable Reformers, the most wicked, as we see, no less than the greatest hypocrites of all mankind?

35.—*Cromwell's hypocrisy—Mr. Burnet's vain artifices.*

Cromwell, above all the rest, prostituted his conscience to flattery; he, in his quality of Viceregent, authorizing in public all Henry's articles of faith, which he strove secretly to destroy. Mr. Burnet conjectures, that, if he was refused a hearing, it was because "It was very probable that in all he had done that way, viz. for the pretended Reformation, he had the King's warrant for it, and acted only by his order, whose proceedings towards a Reformation are well known. ¶" But this time the artifice is too gross, and, to be deluded by it, a man must wilfully blind himself. Will Mr. Burnet have the face to say, that the proceedings towards a Reformation, which he attributes to Henry, were in prejudice to his Six Articles, or the Real Presence, or the Mass? This would be giving himself the lie, since he owns throughout

\* Burnet, p. 271.

† Ibid. p. 276.

‡ Ibid. p. 277.

§ Ibid. p. 278.

|| Ibid. p. 277.

¶ Ibid. 279.

his whole work, that this Prince was always very zealous for, or, to use his own words, addicted to, all these articles. Nevertheless he would have us believe, that Cromwell had secret orders to undermine them, when at the same time he is put to death for having favoured those who impugned them.

36.—*Cranmer's prostitution of conscience—he annuls the King's marriage with Anne of Cleves—the magnificent terms of this unjust sentence—the King marries Catherine Howard, who is favourable to the Reformation, and soon beheaded for her infamous behaviour—the judgment of the Convocation.*

But let us leave Mr. Burnet's conjectures, and his vain shifts to colour the Reformation, and confine ourselves to facts which truth will not suffer him to deny. After Cromwell's attainder, it was still requisite, for the King's satisfaction, to rid him of his odious wife, by making void the marriage with Anne of Cleves. The pretext was very gross. The betrothing of this Princess to the Marquis of Lorraine whilst both parties were minors, and which they never ratified when of age, was alleged as the cause of nullity. It was plain nothing could be more weak in order to dissolve a perfectly complete marriage. But, though reasons were wanting, the King had a Cranmer ready for all jobs. By means of this Archbishop this marriage was cancelled similarly to the two others. "The sentence was pronounced the 9th of July, 1540, and the whole convocation, without one disagreeing vote, judged the marriage null. The sentence was signed by all the ecclesiastics of both chambers, and sealed with the seals of both Archbishops." Mr. Burnet is ashamed, and owns\* "this was the greatest piece of compliance that ever the king had from their clergy; for they all knew there was nothing of weight in that pre-contract," which was made the foundation of the divorce†. Therefore they acted openly against their consciences; but lest we should, at another time, be imposed upon by the specious terms of the new Reformation, it is proper to take notice that they pass this sentence, as representing the great Council, after having said that the King required nothing of them but what was true, was just, was honourable, and holy: in this manner spoke those corrupted Bishops‡. Cranmer, who presided over this assembly, and carried the result of it to the Parliament, was the greatest

\* Burnet, p. 281. Coll. n. 19.

† Ibid.

‡ Collec. Rec. Lib. iii. n. 19. p. 197.

coward of them all; and Mr. Burnet, after having strained hard to palliate the matter, is forced to own that, overcome with fear (for he knew it was contrived to send him quickly after Cromwell), he consented with the rest\*. Such was the courage of this second Athanasius, the virtue of this second Cyril. Upon this unjust sentence the King married Catherine Howard, no less zealous for the new Reformation than Anne Boleyn. But strange was the destiny that attended these female Reformers. Her scandalous life soon brought her to the scaffold, nor was Henry's house ever clear from the stains of blood and infamy.

37 — *A new declaration of Faith conformable to the Church's doctrine.*

The prelates made a new confession of faith, which this Prince confirmed by his authority; wherein the belief of the seven sacraments was declared in express terms, that of penance, in the absolution given by the priest; the necessity of confession, transubstantiation, concomitancy. "So that (says Mr. Burnet) communion in both kinds was not necessary; the veneration of images and praying to saints, in the same sense we have seen in the King's first declaration, which is the sense of the Church; the necessity and merit of good works in order to obtain life everlasting; prayers for the dead; and, in short, all the rest of the Catholic doctrine, except the article of Supremacy, whereof we shall speak apart."

38.—*Cranmer's hypocrisy, who signs all of them.*

Cranmer, with the rest, subscribed to every one; for, although Mr. Burnet asserts that some articles passed which were contrary to his sentiments, yet he yielded to the plurality, and we observe no opposition on his part to the common judgment. The same exposition had been published by the King's authority ever since the year 1538, signed by nineteen Bishops, eight Archdeacons, and seventeen Doctors, without any opposition. Such, at that time, was the faith of the Church of England and of Henry, whom she had owned for her head. The Archbishop approved of all against his conscience. His master's will was his sovereign rule; and, instead of the Holy See with the Catholic Church, the King alone was to him infallible.

\* Burnet, p. 281.

† Part i. Lib. iii. p. 290, et seq.

39.—*Nothing considerable was changed in the Missals and the other books of the Church—Continuation of Cranmer's hypocrisy.*

Meanwhile, he continued saying Mass, which he rejected in his heart, although nothing was changed in the Mass-books. Mr. Burnet agrees, "The alterations they made were inconsiderable, and so slight, that there was no need of reprinting either the Missals, Breviaries, or other Offices: for (proceeds this historian) a few rasures of these Collects, in which the Pope was prayed for, of Thomas Becket's Office (St. Thomas of Canterbury), and the Offices of other Saints, whose days were, by the King's injunctions, no more to be observed, with some other deletions, made that the old books did still serve\*." After all, then, the same worship was still practised. Cranmer complied with it; and if you would know all that troubled him, it was, as we learn from Mr. Burnet, because, excepting Fox, Bishop of Hereford†, as great a dissembler as himself, the other Bishops that adhered to him‡ were rather clogs than helps to him, because they would not be managed and governed by politic and prudent measures, but were flying at many things that were not yet abolished. Cranmer, who betrayed his conscience, and attacked in secret what he approved and practised in public, was more cunning, since he knew how to introduce his skill, in managing his politic measures, into the very heart and vitals of religion.

40.—*Cranmer's behaviour in relation to the Six Articles.*

One may wonder, perchance, how a man of this temper ventured to speak against the Six Articles; for this is the only place where Mr. Burnet makes him courageous; but he himself discovers the cause to us. It was because he had a *particular interest* in the article which condemned married priests to death, for he was then married himself§. It had been too much to suffer his own condemnation to pass in Parliament for a standing law, and his fear even made him then shew some kind of courage: accordingly, though he spoke but faintly against the other articles, yet he delivered himself fully against this. But, after all, it does not appear that he did any more on this occasion than, after a vain struggle to dissuade the law, to fall in at last, as his custom was, with the general opinion.

\* Burnet, Lib. iii. p. 294.

† Ibid. p. 254.

‡ Ibid. p. 255.

§ Ibid. p. 257.

41.—*Mr. Burnet's account of Cranmer's resistance.*

But here is the greatest act of his resolution. Mr. Burnet would have us believe, upon the credit of an author of Cromwell's life, that the King, being concerned for Cranmer on account of the act on behalf of the Six Articles, was desirous of knowing why he opposed them, and ordered him to put all his arguments in writing, which he did\*. The paper, written out fair by his secretary, fell into the hands of one of Cranmer's enemies. It was immediately carried to Cromwell, then living, with the design of having the author taken up; but Cromwell stifled the thing, and so Cranmer escaped this hazard†.

This account naturally leads us to believe that the King knew nothing at all of Cranmer's writing against the Six Articles; and that, had he known it, this prelate would have been utterly ruined; and, lastly, that he escaped purely by his cunning and perpetual dissimulation: however, if Mr. Burnet had rather have it so, I am willing to believe the King found so great a propensity in Cranmer to approve, in public, all his master could desire, that this Prince had no reason to be under any concern what a person of that compliance might think in private, nor could he find in his heart to part with so commodious a counsellor.

42.—*Cranmer's shameful sentiments on the Ecclesiastical authority, which he sacrifices to the Crown.*

It was not only with regard to his new mistresses that the King experienced him so great a flatterer: Cranmer had forged for him, in his own brain, that new idea of supremacy annexed to the Crown: and what he says concerning it, in a paper produced by Mr. Burnet among his Records, is unexampled‡. He teaches then, "That all Christian Princes have committed unto them immediately of God the whole cure of all their subjects, as well concerning the administration of God's word, for the cure of souls, as concerning the ministration of things political and civil, governance: and, in both these ministrations, they must have sundry ministers under them to supply that which is appointed to their several offices; as for example, the Lord Chancellor, Lord Treasurer, Lord Great Master, and the Sheriffs for Civil Ministers; and the Bishops, Parsons, Vicars, and such other Priests *as be appointed by his Highness* in the ministration of the word; as for example,

\* Burnet, p. 265.

† Ibid. p. 266.

‡ Rec. p. i. Lib.iii. n. 21. p. 220.



the Bishop of Winchester, the Parson of Winwick, &c. All the said Officers and Ministers, as well of that sort as the other, must be appointed, assigned, and elected, and in every place, by the laws and orders of Kings and Princes, with divers solemnities, *which be not of necessity*, but only for good order and seemly fashion; for if such offices and ministrations were committed without such solemnity, they were, nevertheless, truly committed; and there is no more promise of God, that grace is given in the committing of the ecclesiastical office, than it is in the committing of the civil office."

43.—*Cranmer's Answer to an Objection.—Shameful Doctrine concerning the authority of the Church during persecutions.*

After thus making all ecclesiastical ministry to rest on a simple delegation of Princes, without so much as ordination or ecclesiastical consecration being necessary on the occasion, he obviates an objection which immediately occurs; to wit, how Pastors exercised their authority under Princes that were not Christians; and answers conformably to his principles, that there was no remedy then for the correction of vice, or appointing of ministers in the Church of God; but the people accepted of such as were presented to them by the apostles, or others whom they looked upon as filled with the spirit of God, and this of their own voluntary will; and afterwards gave ear to them, as a good people ready to obey the advice of good counsellors. This is what Cranmer spoke in an assembly of bishops; and this was the notion he had of that divine power which Jesus Christ gave to his ministers.

44.—*Cranmer always persisted in these Sentiments.*

I am under no necessity of rejecting this prodigy of doctrine so strongly refuted by Calvin and all the other Protestants, since Mr. Burnet himself blushes for Cranmer, and is willing to take for a retractation of this opinion, what he elsewhere signed concerning the divine institution of bishops. But, besides what has already appeared, that his subscriptions are not always a proof of his real sentiments, I must tell Mr. Burnet, that he conceals from us, with too much artifice, Cranmer's true notions. It made not against him, though the institution of bishops and priests was divine, and he acknowledges this truth in that very piece of which we have just produced the extract. For at the close of this ninth

question, it is expressly mentioned, that "all of them were agreed," and consequently Cranmer, "that the apostles had received from God the power of creating bishops or pastors\*. Neither could it be denied, without too manifestly contradicting the Gospel. But what Cranmer and his adherents pretended was, that Jesus Christ had instituted pastors to exercise their power dependently of the prince in every function; which certainly is the most monstrous and the most scandalous flattery that ever entered into the heart of man.

45.—*The dogma, which makes all Ecclesiastical power flow from the Crown, reduced to practice.*

Accordingly, it thence came to pass, that Henry VIII. gave the bishops power to visit their diocese with this preface:— "That all jurisdiction, as well ecclesiastical as secular, proceeded from the regal power, as from the first foundation of all magistracy in all kingdoms; that those who, till then, had exercised this power *precariously*, were to acknowledge it as coming from the liberality of the prince, and give it up to him when he should think fit; and upon these grounds he gives power to such a bishop, as to the King's vicar, to visit his diocese by the regal authority; and to promote whom he shall judge proper to holy orders, and even priesthood; and, in short, to exercise all the episcopal functions, with power to subdelegate if he thought it necessary†.

46.—*Cranmer acts conformably to this dogma,—the only one wherein the Reformation has not varied.*

Let us say nothing against a doctrine which destroys itself by its own enormity, and only take notice of that horrid proposition which makes the power of bishops so to flow from that of the King, that it is even revocable at his will. Cranmer was so persuaded of this royal power, that he was not ashamed, himself archbishop of Canterbury, and primate of the whole Church of England, to take out a new commission of the same from under Edward VI., though but a child, when he reformed the Church according to his own model: and of all the articles published by Henry, this was the only one he retained‡.

\* Omnes conveniunt. Rec. part 1. lib. iii. n. xxi. p. 223.

† Powers Commis. Ibid. xiv. p. 181.

‡ Burn, part 2. lib. i. p. 6.

47.—*Queen Elizabeth's scruple concerning the power given her in the Church.*

This power was carried to such a pitch in the English Reformation, that Elizabeth had some scruples about it; and the horror men had of seeing a woman the Church's supreme head, and the fountain of all pastoral power, whereof, by her sex, she was incapable, opened their eyes at length to see, in some measure, the excesses to which they had been carried\*. But we shall see, without diminishing the force, or removing the grounds of it, they did no more than just palliate the matter; nor can Mr. Burnet, at this day, but lament to see excommunication, belonging only to the spiritual cognisance, and which ought to have been reserved for the bishop with the assistance of the clergy, by a fatal neglect given over to secular tribunals; that is, not only to Kings, but likewise to their officers;—"an error (proceeds this author) grown since into so formed a strength, that it is easier to see what is amiss, than to know how to rectify it."

48.—*A manifest contradiction in the English doctrine.*

And, certainly, I do not conceive any thing can be imagined more contradictory, than to deny their Kings, on one side, the administration of the word and sacraments; and grant them, on the other, excommunication, which, in reality, is nothing else but God's word armed with the censure which comes from Heaven, and one of the most essential parts of the administration of the sacraments; since, undoubtedly, the right of depriving the faithful of them can appertain to none else but those who are appointed by God to give them to the people. But the Church of England went much further, inasmuch as she has attributed to her Kings and to the secular authority, the right of making rituals and liturgies, and even of giving final judgment without further appeal, in points of faith; that is, of that which is most essential in the administration of the sacraments; and the most inseparably annexed to the preaching of God's word. And as well under Henry VIII. as in the succeeding reigns, we find no ritual, no confession of faith, no liturgy, which derives not their ultimate sanction and force from the authority of the King and parliament, as the sequel will make plain. They went even to that excess, that, whereas the orthodox emperors, if formerly they made any Constitutions concerning faith, either they made them in order to put

\* Burnet, lib. iii. p. 386, 376. part ii. lib. i. p. 44.

in execution Church decrees, or at least waited for the confirmation of their ordinances. In England they taught, on the contrary, "that the decrees of councils, in points of faith, were not laws, nor of any force, till they were ratified by princes\*;" and this was the fine idea which Cranmer gave of Church decisions in a discourse of his reported by Mr. Burnet.

49.—*Cranmer's flattery, and Henry's disorders, the cause of the English Reformation.*

This Reformation, therefore, took its rise from Henry's vices, and the flatteries of this archbishop. Mr. Burnet takes great pains to heap up examples of very vicious princes, whom God has made subservient to great ends†. Who questions it? But without examining the histories he quotes, where he blends truth with falsehood, and what is certain with what is doubtful; can he shew one only example, where God, intending to reveal to men some important, and, during so many ages, unknown truth—not to say utterly unheard of—ever did choose so scandalous a King as Henry VIII., and so base, so corrupt a bishop as Cranmer? If the schism of England, in the English Reformation, be a divine work, nothing in it is more divine than the King's ecclesiastical supremacy, since, by that, not only did commence the breach with Rome, the necessary foundation, according to Protestants, of every good reformation, but that also is the only point wherein they have never varied since the schism. God made choice of Henry VIII. to introduce this new article of faith among Christians, and, withal, made choice of this very prince to be a remarkable instance of his most profound and most terrible judgments; not of that sort by which he subverts monarchies, and gives to impious Kings a manifestly disastrous end; but of that other, whereby, delivering them over to their flatterers and passions, he suffers them to run headlong into the utmost excess of wilful blindness. Meantime, while he thinks fit, he withholds them on this brink, in order to make manifest in them those mysteries of his counsels he is willing men should know. Henry VIII. attempts nothing against the other Catholic verities. All his attacks are levelled only at St. Peter's chair; by that, it became apparent to the whole universe, that this prince's design was only to revenge himself on that pontifical power which had condemned him, and that his hatred was his sole rule of faith.

\* Burnet, part ii. lib. ii. p. 176.

† Pref.

50.—*It concerns not Faith to examine the conduct of Clement VI., and his methods of proceeding.*

After that, I am under no necessity of examining all Mr. Burnet relates, whether as to the intrigues of Conclaves, or the behaviour of Popes, or the artifices of Clement VII. What advantage can he draw from thence? Neither Clement, nor the other Popes are, amongst us, the authors of any new article of faith. Nor have they separated us from the holy Society in which we were baptized; nor have they taught us to condemn our ancient pastors. In a word, they make no sect among us, and their vocation has nothing in it that is extraordinary. If they enter not by the door, which is always open in the Church, that is, by canonical ways, or, if they make ill use of the ordinary and lawful ministry intrusted to them from above, this is the very case specified in the Gospel\*, of honouring their chair without approving, or imitating the persons. Nor ought I at all concern myself whether Julius II.'s dispensation were well given, nor whether Clement VII. could, or ought to revoke it, and annul the marriage. For, although I look upon it as certain, that this last Pope acted well in the main, and, in my opinion, nothing can be blamed on this occasion but, at the most, his policy, which was at one time too timorous, and at another too hasty: this is not a question for me to decide in this place, nor a pretext for impeaching the Church of Rome of error. These matters of dispensation are often regulated by simple probabilities; nor is one obliged to look therein for the certainty of faith, whereof they are not always even capable. But since Mr. Burnet makes from this a capital accusation against the Church of Rome, I cannot, methinks, but dwell a little upon it.

51.—*The account of the Marriage Dispute entered upon—  
The fact is laid down—The vain pretexts with which  
Henry covered his passion.*

It is a fact, notoriously known, that Henry VII. had obtained a dispensation from Julius II. to marry the widow of Arthur, his eldest son, to Henry, his second son and successor. This Prince, after he had seen all the reasons for doubting, consummated, when a King and at age, this marriage, with the unanimous consent of all the estates of his realm, the 3d of June, 1509, that is, six weeks after his coming to the crown †. Twenty years elapsed without calling in question a marriage so sincerely and honestly contracted. Henry, falling in love

\* Matth. xxiii. 2.

† Burn. p. i. lib. ii. p. 36.

with Anne Boleyn, called conscience in to assist his passion ; and his marriage becoming odious to him, at the same time became doubtful and suspected. Meanwhile, a Princess had sprung from this marriage, who from her infancy had been acknowledged heir of the kingdom\* ; so that the pretext which Henry took for breaking off the marriage, lest, said he, the succession of the realm should be doubtful, was a mere trick, since none dreamed of disputing it with his daughter, Mary, who, in fact, was unanimously owned for Queen, when the order of birth called her to the crown. On the contrary, if anything could obstruct the succession of this great kingdom, it was Henry's doubt : and, it appears, that all he published relating to the doubtfulness of his succession, was nothing but a cloak, as well for his new amour, as for the disgust he had taken to the Queen his wife, on account of some infirmities she had contracted, as Mr. Burnet himself owns †.

52.—*Julius's dispensation attacked by Arguments from fact and right.*

A Prince, whom passion rules, would have it believed he has reason on his side : so to please Henry, the dispensation, on which his marriage was grounded, was attacked several ways, some taken from fact, others from right. As to fact, the dispensation was maintained to be null, because granted on false allegations. But as these arguments of fact, reduced to these minute niceties, were over-ruled by the favourable condition of a marriage that had subsisted so many years ; those from right were chiefly insisted on, and the dispensation maintained null, as granted in prejudice to the law of God, which the Pope could not dispense with.

53.—*Arguments of right grounded on Leviticus—The state of the question.*

The question was, whether or no the prohibition in Leviticus, not to contract within certain degrees of consanguinity or affinity, and, among others, that of marrying the brother's widow, did so appertain to the law of nature, as to be obligatory in the Gospel law ‡. The reason for doubting was, because we do not read that God ever dispensed with what was purely of the law of nature: for example, since the multiplication of mankind, there has been no instance of God's permitting the marriage of brother and sister, nor others of this nature in the first degree, whether ascending, or descending, or collateral. Now, there was an express law in Deu-

\* Burn. p. i. lib. ii. p. 36.

† Ibid.

‡ Levit. xviii. 20.

teronomy\*, which, in certain cases, enjoined a brother to take his sister-in-law and the widow of his brother to wife. God, therefore, not destroying nature, which he is the author of, gave thereby to understand that this marriage was not of that sort which nature rejects; and this was the foundation which Julius II.'s dispensation was grounded upon.

54.—*The Protestants of Germany favourable to Julius's dispensation, and Henry's first marriage.*

We must do the Protestants of Germany this justice: Henry could never obtain from them the approbation of his new marriage, nor the condemnation of Julius II.'s dispensation. When this affair was spoken of in a solemn embassy, which this Prince sent to Germany, in order to join himself to the Protestant confederacy, Melancthon decided thus: "We have not been of the English Ambassador's opinion; for, we believe, the law of not wedding a brother's wife, is susceptible of dispensation, although we do not believe it to be abolished †." And, again, more concisely in another place: "The Ambassadors pretend, that the prohibition against marrying a brother's wife is indispensable; and we, on the contrary, maintain it may be dispensed with †." This was exactly what they stood for at Rome, and Clement VII.'s definitive sentence against the divorce rested on this foundation.

55.—*Bucer of the same opinion.*

Bucer was of the same opinion upon the same motives; and we learn from Mr. Burnet, that, according to this author, one of England's Reformers, "The law of Leviticus did not bind, and could not be moral, because God hath dispensed with it §."

56.—*Zuinglius and Calvin of the contrary opinion.*

Zuinglius and Calvin, with their disciples, were favourable to the King of England; and it is not unlikely but that a design of settling their doctrine in that kingdom, contributed not a little to their complaisance: but the Lutherans sided not with them, although Mr. Burnet makes them to vary a little in the matter: At first, "they thought (says he) the laws in Leviticus were not moral, and did not oblige Christians; yet, after much disputing, they were induced to change their

\* Deut. xxv. 5.

† Melanc. lib. iv. ep. 185.

‡ Ibid. ep. 183.

§ Burn. lib. ii. p. 92.

minds, but could not be brought to think that a marriage once made might be annulled \*."

57.—*The odd decision of the Lutherans.*

And truly their decision, as reported by Mr. Burnet, is a very odd one; since, after their owning that "The law of Leviticus is divine, natural, and moral, and to be observed as such in all churches, insomuch that a marriage, contracted contrary to this law with a brother's widow, is incestuous †;" they conclude, nevertheless, that this marriage ought not to be broken; with some doubt at first, but, at length, by a final and definitive determination, as Mr. Burnet owns; so that an incestuous marriage, a marriage made contrary to divine, moral, and natural laws, which still remain in their full force throughout the whole Christian Church, ought to subsist, in their judgment; nor is a divorce, in this case, allowable.

58.—*Remarks on the conformity of the Protestants' opinions with the sentence of Clement VII.*

This decision of the Lutherans is, by Mr. Burnet, referred to the year 1530: that of Melancthon, just mentioned, is posterior, and in 1536. However, it is a favourable precedent for Julius II.'s dispensation, and the sentence of Clement VII., that these Popes have met with defenders among those who sought nothing more than to censure their proceedings at any rate. The Protestants of Germany were so resolute in this sentiment that, for all the ties and interests Cranmer had then with them, he could engage none on his master's side, but only his brother-in-law, Osiander, whose authority will hereafter appear of no great weight.

59.—*Henry bribes some Catholic Doctors.*

As for Catholics, Mr. Burnet acquaints us that Henry VIII. had bribed two or three Cardinals. Without informing myself of the truth of these facts, I shall observe, only, that a cause must be bad indeed that stands in need of such infamous supports. And as for the Doctors, whose subscriptions Mr. Burnet boasts to us, where is the wonder that, in so corrupted an age, so great a King was able to find those who were not proof against his presents and solicitations? Our historian will not allow us to call in question the autho-

\* Burn. lib. ii. p. 94.

† Collec. of Rec. part v. lib. ii. n.



riety of Fra-Paolo, nor of Thuanus\*. Let him give ear to these two historians. One says, “that Henry having consulted in Italy, in Germany, and in France, he found one part of the divines favourable, and the other contrary. That the greatest number of those of Paris were for him, and many believed they had done it more from the persuasion of the King’s money than that of his arguments†.” The other says, “that Henry made diligent inquiry into the opinions of divines, and in particular of those at Paris, and the report ran, that these being gained by money, had subscribed in favour of the divorce‡.”

60.—*Concerning the pretended Consultation of the Paris Faculty of Divinity.*

I will not decide whether the conclusion of the Faculty of Divinity, at Paris, produced by Mr. Burnet§ in favour of Henry’s pretensions, be true or no; others will take this question in hand: this only shall I say, that it is very much to be suspected, as well on account of the style, far different from that which the faculty is accustomed to make use of, as because Mr. Burnet’s conclusion is dated the 2nd of July, 1530, at the Mathurins; whereas, at that time, and for some years before, the assemblies of the faculty were held commonly in the Sorbonne.

61.—*The testimony of the Lawyer, Charles du Moulin.*

In the notes which Charles du Moulin, that renowned civilian, has made on Decius’s Consultations, he speaks of the debate of the Doctors of Divinity at Paris, in favour of the King of England, the 1st of June, 1530, but this author places it in the Sorbonne||. He makes but little account of this declaration, wherein the party that favoured the King of England carried it by fifty-three votes against forty-two; “which majority of eight voices (says he) deserved no great weight, on account of the English *angels* of gold which were distributed for the purchase of it: this (he affirms) he knew from the attestations which the President du Fresne and Poliot had given in by order of Francis I.” Whence he concludes, the true judgment of the Sorbonne, that is, their genuine and unbought judgment, was that which favoured the King’s marriage with Catherine. It is, moreover, very

\* Burnet, t. i. Pref.

† Hist. del. Conc. Trid. lib. i. An. 1534.

‡ Thu. Hist. lib. i. An. 1534, p. 20.

§ Rec. part i. lib. ii. n. 34. p. 89.

|| Not. ad Cons. 602.

certain that, during the deliberation, Francis, who then favoured the King of England, had charged M. Lisset, the first President, to solicit the Doctors in his behalf, as appears by the original letters still kept in the King's library, wherein the President gives an account of his diligent compliance. Whether, then, this deliberation was made by the faculty in body assembled, or whether it was only the judgment of several Doctors published in England under the name of the faculty, as happens in like cases, is a matter which I am not interested in examining into at present. It is apparent enough that the King of England's conscience was rather burdened than eased by such consultations, carried on by intrigue, by money, and by the authority of two so great monarchs. The rest of them, alleged by our author, were not transacted with more integrity. Mr. Burnet himself assures us, "that the King of England's agent in Italy, in many of his letters, said that, if he had money enough, he did not doubt but he should get the hands of all the divines in Italy\*." Money, therefore, not the good-will, was wanting†. But not to dwell any longer on the minute stories Mr. Burnet is so triflingly circumstantial in, there is nobody but will own that Clement VII. had been too unworthy of his place, if in an affair of this importance, he had shewn the least regard to these mercenary consultations.

62.—*Reasons for the decision of Clement VII.*

And, indeed, the question was determined on more solid principles. It appeared, clearly, that the prohibition of Leviticus bore not the character of a natural and indispensable law, since God derogated from it in other places. The dispensation of Julius II., grounded on this reason, had so probable a foundation, that it appeared such even to the Protestants of Germany. No matter what diversity of sentiments there might have been on this subject, it was sufficient that the dispensation was not evidently contrary to the divine laws, which oblige Christians. This matter, then, was of the nature of such things, wherein all depends on the prudence of superiors, where sincerity and uprightness of heart must give all the repose conscience can have. It was also but too manifest that, had it not been for Henry VIII.'s new fit of love, the Church never had been troubled with the shameful proposal of a divorce, after a marriage

\* Burnet, lib. ii. p. 90.

† Ibid.

contracted and continued with a good conscience so many years. Here is the knot of the affair ; and without speaking of the process, whereit, perchance, policy, good or bad, might intervene, Clement VII.'s decision, when all is said, will be a testimony to future ages, that the Church knows not how to flatter the passions of Princes, nor approve their scandalous proceedings.

63.—*Two points of Reformation under Henry VIII., according to Mr. Burnet.*

We might here conclude what concerns the reign of Henry VIII., did not Mr. Burnet oblige us to consider two commencements of Reformation, which he remarks at this time : one is, his putting the Scriptures into the hands of the people ; the other, his shewing that every nation might reform itself independently of all others.

64.—*First Point—The reading of the Scriptures how granted to the people under Henry VIII.*

As for what regards the Bible ; this is what Henry VIII. said in 1540, in his Preface to the Exposition of the Christian Faith above spoken of : “That, whereas there were some teachers whose office it was to instruct the people ; so the rest ought to be taught, and to those it was not necessary to read the Scriptures ; and that, therefore, he had restrained it from a great many, esteeming it sufficient for such to hear the doctrine of the Scriptures taught by their preachers.” Afterwards he allowed the reading of them that same year, upon condition “that his subjects should not presume to expound, or take arguments from Scripture\* ;” which was obliging them anew to refer themselves to the pastors of the Church for Scripture interpretation† ; in which case it is agreed the reading of this divine book must undoubtedly be very wholesome. Moreover, if at that time the Bible was translated into the vulgar language, there was nothing new in that practice. We have the like versions for the use of Catholics in ages preceding the pretended Reformation ; nor is that a point of our controversies.

65.—*Whether the progress of the Reformation be owing to the reading of the Scriptures, and in what manner.*

Mr. Burnet, pretending to shew, that the progress of the new

\* Burnet, lib. liii. p. 293.

† Ibid. p. 303.

Reformation was owing to the reading of Scripture allowed to the people, ought to have stated that this reading was preceded by artful and cunning preachers, who had filled their heads with new interpretations. In this manner was it that an ignorant and headstrong people found, indeed, nothing in Scripture but those errors they had been prepossessed with: and what hastened and completed their ruin was the rashness inspired into them, of every man's deciding for himself which was the true sense of Scripture, of every man's making for himself his own creed. Thus it was that ignorant and prejudiced people found, in Scripture, the pretended Reformation: but what man is there of the least sincerity that will deny me, that, by the same means, they would as clearly have found Arianism in it, as they conceived they did Lutheranism or Calvinism?

66.—*How men are deceived by Scripture ill-interpreted.*

When this notion is once put into the heads of the ignorant, that all is clear in Scripture, that they understand it in all that is necessary for them, and, therefore, that the judgment of all pastors and of all ages is quite needless to them, they take for certain truth the first sense that offers, and what they are accustomed to always appears the most genuine. But, they ought to be made sensible that, in this case, it is the letter often which kills, and in those very passages, which appear the most plain, God has often hid the greatest and most awful mysteries.

67.—*Proof from Mr. Burnet of the snares laid for the unlearned in the pretended perspicuity of Scripture.*

For example, Mr. Burnet proposes to us this text, "Drink ye all of this," as one of the most clear that can be imagined, and which leads us the most directly to the necessity of both kinds. But it will now appear to him, from what he owns himself, that what he thinks so plain becomes a snare to the ignorant; for these words "Drink ye all of this," in the institution of the Eucharist, are not, after all, more plain than these in the institution of the Passover: "Thus shall ye eat the paschal lamb, with your loins girded, and your staff in your hand\*:" consequently, standing; and in the posture of people ready to depart, for that, indeed, was the spirit of this Sacrament. Nevertheless, we are assured by Mr. Burnet†, this was not practised by the Jews, who, afterwards, changed this custom into the common table posture, and lay down,

\* Exod. xii. 11.

† Part 2. l. i. p. 171.

according to the custom of the country, at the eating of the lamb, as at other meals; and that this change, which they made in the Divine institution, we are sure was not criminal, since our Saviour made no scruple in complying with it\*. I ask him in this case, whether a man who should have taken this divine commandment literally, without consulting the tradition and interpretation of the Church, would not have found in it his certain death, since he would have found in it the condemnation of Jesus Christ; and whereas this author adds afterwards, it seemed reasonable to allow the Christian Church the like power in such things with the Jewish, why then should a Christian, in the new Passover, believe he has seen everything relating to the Supper, upon reading the words only of the institution? and will not he be obliged to examine, besides these words, the tradition of the Church, in order to know what she always looked upon as necessary and indispensable in the Communion? Without pushing this examination any further, this is enough to show Mr. Burnet they must of necessity come into it; nor can the pretended perspicuity, which the illiterate think they find in these words, "Drink ye all of this," be anything but an illusion.

68.—*Henry VIII.'s second point of Reformation according to Mr. Burnet; that the Church of England acted by a schismatical principle, when she believed she could regulate her Faith independently of all the rest of the Church.*

The second ground of Reformation, pretended to be laid by Henry VIII., Mr. Burnet makes to consist in the establishment of this principle, that every national Church was a complete body within itself, so that the Church of England, with the authority and concurrence of their head and King, might examine and reform all errors and corruptions, whether in doctrine or worship. These are fine words. Discover but their meaning, and you will find that such a Reformation is nothing but a schism. A nation, which looks on itself as a complete body, which regulates its faith, in particular, without regard to what the rest of the Church believes, is a nation which separates itself from the universal Church, and renounces unity of faith and sentiments, so much recommended to the Church by Jesus Christ and his Apostles. When a Church thus cantoned makes the King her head, she gives herself, in matters of religion, a principle of unity, which

\* Part 2. l. i. p. 171.

† Ibid.

Jesus Christ and the Gospel have not established\*; changes the Church into a body politic, and gives room to erect as many separate Churches, as states may be formed. This idea of Reformation and Church was first conceived in the brain of Henry VIII. and his flatterers, nor had Christians ever before been acquainted with it.

69.—*Whether the Church of England in this followed the ancient Church, as Mr. Burnet pretends it did.*

We are told, that all the provincial councils in the ancient Church were so many precedents for this, who condemned heresies, and reformed abuses†. But this is visibly imposing on mankind. True it is, provincial councils were obliged immediately to condemn heresies which arose in their respective countries: for in order to suppress them, ought they to have waited till the contagion had spread and alarmed the whole Church? Nor is that our question. What he should have made appear to us is, that these Churches looked on themselves as a complete body, in the same manner they do in England; and reformed their doctrine, without taking for their rule what the whole body of the Church unanimously did believe. Of this, I say, no example will ever be produced. When the African Fathers condemned the infant heresy of Celestius and Pelagius, they laid for a foundation the prohibition of interpreting the Holy Scripture otherwise than the Catholic Church, spread over the whole earth, had always interpreted and understood it. Alexander of Alexandria laid down the same foundation against Arius, when, condemning him, he said: “ We know but one Catholic and Apostolic Church, which, incapable of being subverted by the world’s whole power, overthrows every impiety and every heresy.” And again, “ In every one of these articles we believe what hath pleased the Apostolic Church‡.” Thus did the Bishops and particular Councils condemn heresies by a prior judgment, by conforming themselves to the common faith of the whole body. These decrees were sent to all churches, and from this unity they drew their utmost force.

70. *Whether the Church of England had reason to believe, that now-a-days it is too difficult a thing to consult the Faith of the whole Church.*

But, say they, the remedy of an universal council, easy as

\* Pref. and part. 1. l. iii. p. 294. † Ibid.

‡ Conc. Milev. cap. 2. Epis. Alex. Episc. Alexandriae ad Alex. Constantinop.

it was under the Roman empire, when the Churches had one common sovereign, is become too difficult, now that Christendom is divided into so many states: another fallacy. For, in the first place, the consent of Churches may be declared otherwise than by general councils: witness, in St. Cyprian, the condemnation of Novatian; witness, that of Paul of Samosata, of whom it was written, that he had been condemned by the council and judgment of all the Bishops of the world, because all had consented to the council held against him at Antioch\*; lastly, witness the Pelagians, and so many other heresies, which, without a general council, have been sufficiently condemned by the united authority of the Pope and all the Bishops. When the necessities of the Church required a general council to be assembled, the Holy Ghost always provided means; and so many councils, as have been held since the fall of the Roman empire, have made it plainly appear, that to assemble the pastors when requisite, there needed not its assistance. The reason is because, in the Catholic Church there is a principle of unity independent of the kings of the earth. To deny this, is making the Church their captive, and rendering the heavenly government, instituted by Jesus Christ, defective. But the English Protestants would not acknowledge this unity, because the Holy See is the external and common bond thereof; and it was more agreeable to them to have, in matters of religion, their king for their head, than to own, in St. Peter's chair, a principle by God established for the unity of all Christians.

71.—*All sorts of novelties crept into England in spite of the severities of Henry VIII.—The reason why.*

The Six Articles published by the authority of King and Parliament had the force of law during the whole reign of Henry VIII. But what sway over consciences can decrees concerning religion have, which, drawing all their strength from regal authority, to which God has intrusted no such commission, have nothing in them but what is political? Though Henry VIII. enforced them with innumerable executions, and cruelly put to death, not only Catholics, who detested his supremacy, but also the Lutherans and Zuinglians, who impugned the other articles of his faith, all manner of errors crept insensibly into England, nor did the people any longer know what to stand to, when they saw St. Peter's chair despised, from whence it was notorious

\* Ep. Alex. Episc. Alex. ad Alex. Constanti.

faith first came to this great isle, whether the conversion of its inhabitants under Pope Eleutherius be considered, or that of the English, which was procured by St. Gregory the Great.

The whole establishment of the Church of England, the whole order of her discipline,—the whole disposition of the hierarchy in this kingdom; in a word, the mission, as well as the consecration of bishops, was so certainly derived from this great Pope and the chair of St. Peter, or from bishops holding him for the head of their communion, that the English could not renounce this power without weakening among them even the origin of Christianity, and all the authority of ancient traditions.

72.—*They argued in England from false principles, when they rejected the Pope's Supremacy.*

When they set about rejecting the authority of the Holy See in England, it was observed by them “that Gregory the Great had exclaimed against the ambition of that title of Universal Bishop, and refused it much about the time that England received the faith from those he sent over; whence concluded Cranmer and his associates, “When our ancestors received the faith, the authority of the See of Rome was within the limits of a laudable moderation\*.”

73.—*Whether St. Gregory Pope, under whom the English were converted, had different notions of the authority of his See from what we have.*

Not to dispute, in vain, on this title of Universal which the Popes never do assume, and may be more or less supportable according to the different senses it is taken in; let us consider for a moment what St. Gregory, who rejected it, believed nevertheless relating to the authority of his See. Two passages known to the whole world will decide this question. “As for what concerns (says he) the Church of Constantinople, who questions its being subjected to the See Apostolic, which neither the Emperor nor our brother Eusebius, bishop of that city, do cease to acknowledge †?” And in the following letter, speaking of the primate of Africa, as to what he says, “that he is subject to the See Apostolic, I know no bishop that is not subject to it when delinquent.” Furthermore, when delinquency requires not otherwise, we are all

\* Burn. part 1. l. ii. p. 139.

† Lib. vii. Ind. 2. Ep. 64.



brethren according to the law of humility\*." Here, then, have we all bishops manifestly subject to the authority and correction of the Holy See, and this authority acknowledged even by the Church of Constantinople, at that time the second Church of the whole world in dignity and power. Here is the foundation of the pontifical power; the rest, which custom or toleration, or, if you please, even abuse might have introduced or increased, might be preserved, or suffered, or extended more or less, as order, peace, and public tranquillity should require. Christianity was born in England with the confession of this authority. Henry VIII. could not endure it, even with this laudable moderation owned by Cranmer in St. Gregory: his passion and policy made him annex it to his crown, and by this so strange an innovation, he opened the way for all that followed.

#### 74.—*Death of Henry VIII.*

Some say this unhappy Prince, towards the end of his days, felt some remorse for the excesses he had run into; and, in order to calm his conscience, sent for some bishops to him. I vouch it not; those who, in scandalous sinners, but particularly in Kings, are for discovering such biting stings of conscience as appeared in an Antiochus, are not acquainted with all God's ways, nor reflect sufficiently on that deadly insensibility and false peace he sometimes suffers his greatest enemies to fall into. Be that as it will, should Henry have consulted his bishops, what could be expected from a body which had enslaved the Church? Whatever indications Henry might give of desiring to be sincerely advised in this juncture, he could not restore to the bishops that liberty which his cruelties had deprived them of; dreadful to them were the vicissitudes of temper this Prince was subject to; and he who could not brook truth from the mouth of Thomas More, his Chancellor, nor from the holy Bishop of Rochester, both of whom he put to death for speaking it freely to him, never more deserved to hear it.

#### 75.—*Everything is changed after his death.—The young King's Guardian is a Zuinglian.—1547, 1548.*

In this state he died; and no wonder if, after his death, things grew worse. The foundations once shaken, by little and little, all goes to ruin. Edward VI., his only son, succeeded him according to the law of the land. As he was

\* Lib. vii. Ind. 2. Ep. 65.

scarce ten years old, the kingdom was governed by a Council, appointed by the deceased King; but Edward Seymour, brother to Queen Jane, and the King's uncle by the mother's side, had the chief authority, with the title of Protector of the Kingdom of England. He was a Zuinglian in his heart, and Cranmer was his bosom friend. This Archbishop then threw off the mask, nor did he longer conceal any of that venom which lay lurking in his heart against the Church.

76.—*The Reformation founded on the ruin of Ecclesiastical Authority.*

In order to prepare the way for their intended reformation under the King's name, they set out by declaring him, as Henry had been before, the supreme head of the Church of England in spirituals and temporals\*. In Henry's time it was a settled maxim, that the King was Pope in England. But far different prerogatives were conferred on this new papacy than the Pope had ever pretended to. The bishops took out new commissions from Edward, revocable at the King's pleasure, as heretofore had been enjoined in King Henry's time; and, in order to advance the reformation, it was judged necessary to keep them under the subjection of an arbitrary power. The Archbishop of Canterbury, and primate of all England, was the first to bend his neck under this shameful yoke. This is not to be wondered at, since he was the person who inspired all these sentiments: the rest did but follow the pernicious example he set to them †. This was somewhat moderated afterwards, and the Bishops were obliged to look upon it as a favour to hold their bishopricks of the King during life ‡. In the tenor of their commissions, it was plainly expressed, as under Henry, pursuant to Cranmer's doctrine, that the episcopal power, as well as that of the secular magistracy, flowed from the crown as from its source, that the bishops exercised it only precariously as delegates in the King's name, and which they were to deliver up again when it should please him to call for it, from whom they had received it §. "The King gave them faculties to ordain and deprive ministers, inflict censures and punish scandalous persons, and to do all the other parts of the episcopal function, all which they were to execute and do in the King's name and under his authority ||." At the same time, it was owned, that this pastoral charge was com-

\* Burn. part 1. l. iii. p. 267. part 2. l. i. p. 6. Col. of Rec. part 2. l. i. p. 90.

† Ibid. ‡ Ibid. § Ibid. and part 1. p. 276. || Part 2. l. i. p. 218.

mitted to bishops by the word of God. It was necessary to make use of this word to give themselves credit. But although nothing was found therein for the regal power, except what related to the concerns of this world, it was nevertheless extended to what is most sacred in the pastoral charge. Commissions for consecrating bishops were issued out by the King, and directed to whom he pleased: so that, according to this new hierarchy, as the bishops were not consecrated but by the royal authority, so by the same only could they proceed to ordination\*. Even the form and prayers of ordination, as well of bishops as of priests, were regulated by Parliament. The same was done in respect to the liturgy and public service, and the whole administration of the sacraments. In a word, all was subject to the King, and, upon abolishing the ancient law, the Parliament, it seems, was to make a new body of canons. All these attempts were grounded on a maxim which the Parliament of England had laid down for a new article of their faith, viz., that all jurisdiction, both spiritual and temporal, was derived from the King, as from its source †.

77.—*Sequel of the ruin of Ecclesiastical Authority.*

It is not here to our purpose to deplore the calamities of the Church thus enslaved, and shamefully degraded by her own ministers. Our business is to relate facts, and a bare relation of them will suffice to shew their enormity. “Not long after, the King declared he intended to visit his kingdom, therefore, neither the archbishops nor any other should exercise any jurisdiction while that visitation lasted †. There was proclamation from the King, commanding all to remember him in the public prayers as the supreme head of the Church of England, which was to be observed under the pains of excommunication, sequestration, or deprivation §.” Thus, together with ecclesiastical censures the whole pastoral authority is openly invaded by the King, and the most sacred depositum of the sanctuary wrested from the priestly order, without sparing even that of faith, which the Apostles had left to their successors.

78.—*Reflection on the miserable beginnings of the Reformation, wherein the sacred order had no share in the affairs of Religion and Faith.*

I cannot but stop here a moment to consider the ground-

\* Burn. part 1. l. i. pp. 141, 142, 143.

† Ibid. p. 43.

‡ Ibid. p. 27; and Col. n. 7.

§ Ibid. p. 29.

work of the English Reformation, "that work of light, a full and distinct narrative whereof makes its apology as well as history." The Church of England glories above all the other Churches of the Reformation, for having proceeded orderly and by lawful assemblies. To afford some colour for this boasting, it was, in the first place, and above all, necessary that ecclesiastics should have had the chief share in the management of this great alteration in religion. But quite the reverse was done, and ever since the time of Henry VIII. "they were cut off from meddling with it, except as they were authorized by the King\*." All the complaint they made amounted to no more than that an encroachment was made on their privileges; as if for them to meddle with religion were only a privilege, and not essential to the very being of the ecclesiastical order.

But perchance one may imagine they met with better treatment under Edward, when, as Mr. Burnet pretends, the Reformation was set on a more solid basis. Quite the contrary; they begged it as a favour of the Parliament, "at least, that matters of religion should not be determined till they had been consulted, and had reported their opinions and reasons†." What a wretched state had they brought themselves to, not to intermeddle otherwise than by barely offering their opinions; they who were the proper judges in such cases, and of whom Christ had said, "He that hears you, hears me!" but this, says our historian, could not be obtained‡. But, at least it may be allowed them to decide on articles of faith, of which they were the preachers. By no means. The King's councillors resolved to follow the method begun by the late King, of sending visiters over England with ecclesiastical injunctions and articles of faith; and it was the business of the King's council to regulate the articles of religion that were to be proposed to the people by his authority§. Meanwhile, the Six Articles of Henry VIII. were to be adhered to, until they should think better of the matter; nor were they ashamed to require of the bishops an express declaration, "to make profession of such doctrine as afterwards, at any time, should be certified by the archbishop to the other bishops in the King's name||." Besides, it was but too evident the clergy were only named for form-sake, since all was done in the King's name.

\* S. n. 2. Burn. part 2. l. i. p. 49.

§ Ibid. p. 26.

† Ibid.

|| Ibid. p. 59.

‡ Rec. n. pp. 16, 17.

79.—*The King is made absolute master of the Pulpit, and forbids Preaching all over his Kingdom till further orders.*

It seems we need say no more, after the relation of such great excesses. But lamentable as it is, let us continue it. It is in some manner labouring to heal the Church's wounds to bewail them in the sight of God. The King took to himself so absolute an authority over the word and preaching, that a proclamation was issued, by which none were to preach without licence from the King or his visiters—the archbishop of Canterbury or the bishop of the diocese; so that the chief right was in the King, nor had the bishops, but by his permission only, any share therein. Some time after, the Council allows those to preach who were lively to set forth the pure word of God after such sort as the Holy Ghost should for the time put in the preacher's mind\*. The Council, it seems, had changed their minds; after they had made preaching depend on the regal power, they here leave it to the discretion of those who should imagine themselves filled with the Holy Ghost, and by this means all fanatics are admitted to it. The year following they changed again. "To restrain the clashing and contention of pulpits, the power of granting licences to preach was taken from the bishops of each diocese, so that none might give them but the King and the archbishop†." By this means it is an easy matter to authorise the preaching up of any heresy. But the effects of this restraint are not what we are now upon. What ought to be considered is, that the whole authority of the word was delivered up to the Prince alone. Things were carried so far, that after declaring to the people that the King had employed learned men to take away all subjects of controversies, "till the order now preparing should be set forth, he did inhibit all manner of persons to preach in any public audience‡." Here then was preaching suspended throughout the whole kingdom, the bishops silenced by the King's proclamation, and all waiting in suspense, ignorant what religion the King would think fit to coin for them. "To this was tacked an admonition, exhorting all persons to receive with submission the orders that should, in a short time, be sent down to them." Thus was the English Reformation brought about; that work of light, a distinct narrative whereof makes, according to Mr. Burnet, its history as well as apology.

\* Rec. n. p. 61.

† Ibid. p. 80.

‡ Ibid. p. 81.

80.—*The Six Articles abolished.*

These preparations being thus made, the English Reformation was set on foot, in the King's name, by the Duke of Somerset and Cranmer; and here the regal power pulled down that faith which the regal power had before set up. The Six Articles, which Henry VIII. had caused to be published with his whole spiritual and temporal authority, were repealed\*; and, notwithstanding all the precautions he had taken in his will to preserve those precious remains of the Catholic religion, and perhaps, in time, to restore it wholly, the Zuinglian doctrine, so much detested by this prince, gained the ascendant.

81.—*Peter Martyr called over, and Zuinglianism established.*—1549, 1550, 1551.

Peter Martyr, a Florentine, and Bernardin Ochin, afterwards the declared enemy of Jesus Christ's divinity, were called over to begin this Reformation. Both of them, like the rest of the reformers, had exchanged the monastic state for that of wedlock. Peter Martyr was a downright Zuinglian. The doctrine which he proposed in England concerning the Eucharist in 1549, was reduced to these three positions:—

I. There is no transubstantiation.

II. The body and blood of Jesus Christ are not corporeally in the Eucharist, nor under the species of bread and wine.

III. The body and blood of Christ are united to the bread and wine sacramentally, that is, figuratively, or at most, virtually†.

82.—*Bucer not hearkened to.*

Bucer did not approve the second proposition; for, as hath been seen, he was for excluding a local Presence, but not a corporeal and substantial one. He maintained that Jesus Christ could not be separated from the Supper, and that he was after such a manner in heaven, as not to be substantially removed out of the Eucharist. Peter Martyr believed it was an illusion to admit a corporeal and substantial presence in the Supper, and not admit in it the reality which Catholics maintained, together with the Lutherans; and what respect soever he might have for Bucer, the only Protestant he had any consideration for, yet he did not come into his senti-

\* Rec. n. part 2. l. i. p. 40.

† Hosp. part 2. An. 1547. pp. 207, 208, et seq. Burn. part 2. l. i. p. 106.

ments. A set of articles\* was drawn up in England, conformable to Peter Martyr's opinion: it was there specified, "That the body of Jesus Christ was nowhere but in heaven: that he could not be really present in different places; so that no corporeal or Real Presence of the body and blood of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist was to be believed." This is what was defined. But, as yet, their faith was not in its utmost perfection, and, in due time, we shall see this article pretty much reformed.

83.—*Mr. Burnet's Confession concerning the Belief of the Greek Church.*

We are here obliged to Mr. Burnet for owning a thing of no small weight: for he grants us that the Real Presence is acknowledged by the Greek Church. These are his words: "The Lutherans seemed to agree with that which had been the doctrine of the Greek Church, that, in the Sacrament, there was both the substance of bread and wine, and Christ's body likewise †." Herein he is more sincere than the greatest part of those of his religion; but, at the same time, opposes a greater authority against the novelties of Peter Martyr.

84.—*The Reformers repent themselves of having said that in the Reformation of the Liturgy they had acted by the assistance of the Holy Ghost.*

Then did the spirit of change entirely possess England. In the reformation of the Liturgy and common prayers, which was made by the authority of Parliament (for God gave ear to none but such), it had been set forth in the preamble to the Act, that the commissioners named by the King to draw them up "had finished the work with one uniform agreement, and by the aid of the Holy Ghost †." Men were astonished at this expression. But the Reformers had their answer ready, viz. "That this was not so to be understood, as if they had been inspired by extraordinary assistance; for then there had been no room for any correction of what was now done §." Now these Reformers were still for correcting and changing on; and never did pretend to frame their religion all at once. And, indeed, very considerable alterations were soon made in this Liturgy, and their chief aim was to deface all the trappings of antiquity that hitherto had been preserved.

\* Burn. p. 170. Col. n. 55.

† Ibid. p. 93.

† Ibid. p. 104.

§ Ibid. p. 94.

85.—*All the remains of Antiquity at first retained in the Liturgy are now destroyed.*

In the consecration of the Eucharist this prayer had been retained, "With thy Holy Spirit vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the body and blood of thy most dearly beloved Son \*;" &c. They were willing to preserve, in this prayer, somewhat of the Church of Rome's Liturgy, which St. Augustin the Monk sent to the English by St. Gregory, had brought in with Christianity. But although they had maimed it by lopping off some words, yet still it was found "too much to favour transubstantiation †," or even the corporeal presence, and was afterwards razed out entirely.

86.—*England abrogates the Mass, which she had heard from her first conversion to Christianity.*

The words of that prayer were yet much stronger, as the Church of England used it at the time she embraced Christianity: for, whereas they had put in the reformed Liturgy, that these gifts may be unto us the body and blood of Jesus Christ; in the original it stands thus, that "This oblation be made unto us the body and blood of Jesus Christ." This word *made* imports a true action of the Holy Ghost, who changes the gifts, conformably to what is said in the other liturgies of antiquity: "Make, O Lord, of this bread, thy own body; and of this wine, the own blood of thy Son; changing them by thy Holy Spirit †." And these words, "be made unto us the body and blood," were said in the same spirit with those of Isaiah, "Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given §:" not implying, that the sacred gifts are then only made the body and blood when we receive them, as the Reformers will have it; but signifying that it is for us they were formed in the Eucharist, as for us they were formed in the Virgin's womb. The English Reformation has corrected everything that too much favoured transubstantiation. The word oblation would likewise have too much favoured a sacrifice: to give the sense of it in some manner, they substituted gifts. At length, it was wholly taken away, and the Church of England would no longer hear that sacred prayer she heard, when, coming forth from the baptismal font, she first received the bread of life.

\* Lib. i. p. 76.

† Lit. of S. Basil, &c.

† Ibid. p. 170.

§ Is. ix. 6.



87.—*The Gallican Mass and the rest, in the main, are the same with that of Rome.*

If it be insisted on that the holy priest Augustin brought them the Gallican Liturgy or Mass, rather than the Roman, the free choice of either having been left to him by St. Gregory, that alters not the case: the Gallican Mass, said by the Hilaries and the Martins, in the main, differed not from the Roman, nor the rest \*. The Kyrie Eleison, the Pater, the Pax, or the blessing, may be given in one place of the Mass rather than another, and such things, as little essential, made the whole difference; and for this reason was it that St. Gregory left the choice thereof to the holy priest he sent into England †. As well in France, as at Rome, and in all the rest of the Church, a prayer was made to beg the transformation and change of bread and wine into the body and blood; the merit and mediation of saints with God was everywhere employed, but a merit grounded on the divine mercy; and a mediation supported by that of Jesus Christ. In all of these Liturgies the dead were frequently prayed for; and, with respect to all these things, there was but one language in the East and West, in the South and North.

88.—*The Reformation corrects itself with respect to Prayers for the Dead.*

The English Reformation had retained, in Edward's time, something of prayer for the dead; for, at funerals, they recommended the soul departed to God's mercy, and, as we now do, they prayed that his sins might be pardoned ‡. But all these remains of the primitive spirit are abolished: this prayer savoured too much of purgatory. It is certain it was said from the first ages, both in the East and West: no matter, it was the Pope's Mass, and that of the Church of Rome: it must be banished England, and every word of it turned to the most odious sense.

89.—*Sequel of Alterations.*

The Church of England, I may venture to say it, altered everything she derived from antiquity §. Confirmation must be nothing but a catechism to renew the baptismal vows. But, said Catholics, the fathers, from whom we receive it by a tradition founded on the Acts of the Apostles, and as ancient as the Church, say not so much as a word of this notion

\* Burn. part 2. l. i. p. 72.

‡ Burn. p. 77.

† Greg. lib. vii. ind. ii. ep. 64.

§ Ibid.

of catechism. This is true, and they are forced to own it. Confirmation, nevertheless, is turned to this form, otherwise it would be too papistical. The holy chrism is taken away, which the most ancient fathers had called the instrument of the Holy Ghost\*; the use of oil, even in extreme unction, will at last be laid aside, whatever St. James may say; and though St. Innocent Pope spoke of this unction in the fourth age, it will be decided that extreme unction was not heard of till the tenth century.

90.—*Ceremonies and the sign of the Cross retained.*

Among these alterations three things remained; holy ceremonies, the festivals of saints, abstinence and Lent. They thought it but meet that priests, in the public service, should put on a mysterious dress, symbols of purity and the other dispositions which the divine worship does require. Ceremonies were looked upon as a mystical language, and Calvin appeared too extravagant in rejecting them†. The use of the cross was retained, “as a public declaration that they were not ashamed of the cross of Christ‡.” At first, it was ordered to be kept up “in the sacrament of baptism, and in the office of confirmation, and in the consecration of the sacramental elements, as an outward expression of the veneration” they had for this holy ceremony§. Nevertheless, it was at last suppressed, in confirmation and the consecration, in which St. Augustin, with all antiquity, bears testimony that it was ever practised; nor can I devise why it was retained only in baptism.

91.—*England justifies us in the observance of Festivals, even those of Saints.*

Mr. Burnet justifies us with relation to fasts and holy-days; which days he will not have accounted holy of their own nature, nor from any magical virtue in that time||. This we consent to, and certainly, such a natural or magical virtue, which he thinks himself obliged to reject, never entered into any man’s head. He says, “that none of these days were properly dedicated to any saint; but only to God in remembrance of such saints¶.” This is our very doctrine. In a word, he everywhere, and in everything, vindicates us on this subject, since he agrees to a conscientious observing of such times\*\*. Wherefore, those who object to us, that we

\* Burn. p. 170.

† Ibid. p. 75.

‡ Ibid. p. 79.

§ Ibid. p. 170.

|| Ibid. p. 191.

¶ Ibid.

\*\* Ibid.

follow the commandments of men\*, need but object this to the Church of England, and she will vindicate us.

92.—*The same in abstinence from Flesh.*

They do no less evidently justify us from the reproach of teaching the doctrine of devils, when we abstain from certain meats for penance sake. Mr. Burnet answers for us, when he blames carnal men, who will not conceive “that the frequent use of fasting, with prayer and true devotion joined to it, is perhaps one of the greatest helps that can be devised to advance one to a spiritual temper of mind, and to promote a holy course of life†.” Since it is from this spirit, not a kind of temporal policy, as many do imagine, that the Church of England hath forbidden flesh on Fridays and Saturdays, on Vigils, the four Ember-weeks, and throughout Lent, we have nothing on this subject to upbraid one another with. There is only reason to wonder that the King and Parliament should command these holidays and abstinences‡; that the King should declare what were fish-days, and grant licences and dispensations from these observances§; and, lastly, that in matters of religion they should prefer the King’s commandments to those of the Church.

93.—*Cranmer in his Reformation inverts all order.*

But something still more surprising in the English Reformation, was a maxim of Cranmer’s. Whereas, in reality, the worship depends on faith, and should by that be regulated, Cranmer confounded this order; and, before he had examined the doctrine, suppressed, in the worship, what most displeased him. According to Mr. Burnet, the belief of Christ’s presence in every crumb of bread gave occasion to laying aside the cup||. And indeed, argues he, in this hypothesis, “communion in both kinds was not necessary¶.” So that the question about the necessity of both kinds depended on that of the Real Presence. Now, in 1548, England still believed the Real Presence, and the Parliament declared, that “the whole body of Christ was contained in every piece of consecrated bread, whether it were small or great\*\*.” The necessity, nevertheless, of communicating under both kinds had been already established; that is, they had drawn the consequence before they were well assured of the principle.

\* Matth. xv. 9. † Burn. p. 96. ‡ Ibid. p. 95. § Ibid. p. 191.  
 || Ibid. part 2. p. 42. ¶ Ibid. part 1. p. 290. \*\* Ibid. p. 651.

94.—*Sequel.*

The year following, Christ's presence in the sacrament was greatly called in question, and the thing left undecided. Yet the adoration of Jesus Christ in the sacrament had already been suppressed provisionally; as if one, seeing the people stand in great awe as in the King's presence, should say,—Good people, let us, in the first place, lay aside these exterior tokens of respect; there will afterwards be time to examine whether the King be present or no, and whether this honour be agreeable to him. The oblation of the body and blood was in like manner taken away; although this oblation, after all, be nothing else but the consecration made before God of this body and blood as really present before the manducation; and without examining the principle, that which inevitably ensued from it, was already destroyed.

The cause of so irregular a proceeding was the leading the people by motives of hatred, and not of reason. It was an easy matter to excite hatred against certain practices, whereof they concealed from the people the beginning and right use, especially when some abuses were interwoven with them\*: thus it was easy to render priests odious who abused the Mass for sordid gain; and hatred once inflamed against them, was by a thousand artifices insensibly turned against the mystery they celebrated, and even, as hath appeared, against the Real Presence, the foundation of it.

95.—*How the public hatred was raised against the Catholic doctrine.—Example in the Instruction of young Edward, and concerning Images.*

The same was done with respect to Images, and a French letter, which Mr. Burnet gives us of Edward VI. to his uncle, the protector, makes it palpable. To exercise this young prince's style, his master sent him about collecting all the passages wherein God speaks against idols. "In reading the Holy Scripture, I was desirous (said he) to note several places which forbid both *to adore and to make* any images, not only of strange Gods, but also to form any thing; thinking *to make it like to the Majesty of God the Creator.*" In this credulous age, he had simply believed what was told him, that Catholics made images, thinking they made them like to the Majesty of God. "I am quite astonished (proceeds he) God himself and his Holy Spirit having so often for-

\* S. l. vi. n. 21. et seq.

bidden it, that so many people have dared to commit idolatry *by making and adoring images\**." He fixes the same hatred, as we see, on the making, as on the adoring them; and, according to the notions that were given him, is in the right, since, undoubtedly, it is not lawful to make images with the thought of making something "*like to the Majesty of the Creator.*" For, as this prince adds, God cannot be seen in things that are material, but will be seen in his own works. Thus was a young child deluded by them. His hatred was stirred up against Pagan images, in which man pretends to represent the Deity: it was shewn him that God forbids to make such images, but they not having as yet taken it into their heads to say that it is unlawful to make such as ours, or unlawful to represent Jesus Christ and his saints, they took care to conceal from him, that those of Catholics were not of this nature. A youth of ten or twelve years old could not discover it of himself; to make images odious to him in general, and confusedly, was enough for their purpose. Those of the Church, though of a different order and design, passed in the same light as the others: dazzled with the plausible reasoning and authority of his masters, every thing was an idol to him; and the hatred he had conceived against idolatry was easily turned against the Church.

96.—*Whether any advantage can be drawn from the sudden progress of the pretended Reformation.*

The people were not more cunning, and it was but too easy to animate them by the like artifices. After this, can the sudden progress of the Reformation be taken for a visible miracle, the work of God's own hand? With what assurance could Mr. Burnet say it;—he! who has so thoroughly discovered to us the deep causes of this lamentable success? A prince blinded with inordinate passion, and condemned by the pope, sets men at work to exaggerate particular facts, some odious proceedings and abuses which the Church herself condemned. All pulpits ring with satires against ignorant and scandalous priests; they are brought on the stage, and made the subject of farce and comedy, insomuch that Mr. Burnet himself expresses his indignation at it†. Under the authority of an infant King, and a protector violently addicted to Zuinglianism, invective and satire are still carried to a higher pitch. "The laity, that had long

\* Rem. part ii. l. ii. p. 68.

† Lib. iii. p. 318.

looked on their pastors with an evil eye\*," greedily swallowed down the poisonous novelty. The difficulties in the mystery of the Eucharist are removed, and the senses, instead of being kept under subjection, are flattered. Priests are set free from the obligation of continency; monks from all their vows; the whole world from the yoke of confession, wholesome, indeed, for the correction of vice, but burdensome to nature. A doctrine of great liberty was preached up, and which, as Mr. Burnet says, "shewed a plain and simple way to the kingdom of heaven†." Laws so convenient met with but too ready a compliance. Of sixteen thousand Ecclesiastics, who made up the body of the English clergy, we are assured by Mr. Burnet, three parts renounced their celibacy in Edward's time‡; that is, in the space of five or six years; and good Protestants were made of these bad Ecclesiastics, who thus renounced their vows. Thus was the clergy gained. As for the Laity, the Church revenues, exposed to rapine, became their prey. The vestry plate enriched the prince's exchequer: the shrine alone of St. Thomas of Canterbury, with the inestimable presents that had been sent to it from all parts, produced a royal treasure of immense sums of money§. This was enough to degrade that holy martyr. He was attainted, that he might be pillaged; nor were the riches of his tomb the least of his crimes. In short, it was judged more expedient to plunder the Churches, than, conformably to the intention of the founders, to apply their patrimony to its right use. Where is the wonder, if the nobility, the clergy, and the people were so easily gained upon? is it not rather a visible miracle that there remained a spark in Israel, and that all other kingdoms did not follow the example of England, Denmark, Sweden, and Germany, which were reformed by the same means?

97.—*Whether the Duke of Somerset had the shew of a Reformer.*

Amidst all these Reformations, the only one that visibly made no progress was that of manners. The success of Luther's Reformation in Germany, as to this point, I have already observed upon, and we need but read Mr. Burnet's history to be convinced that things went on no better in England. We have seen Henry VIII., her first Reformer; the ambi-

\* Lib. iii. p. 31.

† Ibid.

‡ Ibid. part ii. l. ii. p. 276.

§ Ibid. part i. l. ii. p. 244.

tious Duke of Somerset was the second. He equalled himself to crowned heads, though but a subject; and assumed the title of "Duke of Somerset, by the grace of God\*." In the midst of the calamities which afflicted the whole nation, when London "was much disordered by the plague, his thoughts were only bent on designing such a palace as had not been seen in England; and to aggravate his guilt by sacrilege, he built it upon the ruins, and with the materials, of three Episcopal palaces and a parish church; and the revenues extorted from several Bishops and Chapters, who "had resigned many manors to him for obtaining his favour, none daring to oppose his will†." He did this, it is true, with leave obtained from the King; but his abusing thus the authority of a minor, and the inuring his pupil to such sacrilegious donations, enflamed the guilt. I pass over the rest of his misdeeds, for which the Parliament condemned him, first to resign the authority he had usurped over the council, and afterwards to lose his head. But not to examine the reasons he had to condemn the Admiral, his brother, to the block; how shameful a thing to have subjected a man of that dignity, and his own brother, to that iniquitous law, of "attainting a man" on the bare allegation of witnesses, "without bringing him to make his own defence!" By virtue of this law, the Admiral, besides many others, was judged without a hearing‡. The Protector prevailed upon the King to order the Commons to proceed in it without hearing the party accused, and in this manner it was that he tutored up his pupil to do justice.

98.—*Vain forwardness of Mr. Burnet to excuse Cranmer in little things, without speaking a word in great ones.*

Mr. Burnet takes a great deal of pains to justify his Cranmer for signing, Bishop as he was, the death of this unhappy person, and meddling in a cause of blood, contrary to the canons. In order to this, he lays down, according to his custom, one of those specious plans, whereby he always strives, indirectly, to make odious the Church's faith, and elude the canons, but keeps at a distance from the main point§. If Cranmer was to be excused, it ought not to have been merely for violating the canons, which, as an Archbishop he was obliged, above all others, to have a great regard for; but for breaking through the law of nature, sacred even

\* Burnet, part ii. lib. i. p. 134.

† Ibid.

‡ Ibid. p. 100.

§ Ibid.

among heathens, of "not delivering any man to die, before that he which is accused, have the accusers face to face, and have licence to answer for himself\*." Cranmer, notwithstanding this law, condemned the Admiral and signed the warrant for his execution: Should not so great a Reformer have stood up against so barbarous a procedure? no truly: he deemed it a business of more importance to demolish altars, beat down images, not sparing even those of Jesus Christ, and abolish the Mass, which had been said and heard by so many Saints ever since the first establishment of Christianity among the English.

99.—*Cranmer and the rest of the Reformers spirit up rebellion against Queen Mary.—1553.*

To conclude the life of Cranmer: at the death of Edward VI. he set his hand to the entail of the Crown, in which this young Prince, out of hatred to the Princess his sister, who was a Catholic, changed the order of succession. Mr. Burnet would have us believe that the Archbishop signed it with great reluctance, and is satisfied if this great Reformer shews but some scruple in committing crimes†. Yet the Council, which Cranmer was at the head of, gave all necessary orders to arm the people against Queen Mary, and maintain the usurper Jane Grey; preachers were set to work in the cause, and Ridley, Bishop of London, had orders to "set out Queen Jane's title in a sermon at Paul's‡." When her affairs proved desperate, Cranmer, with the rest of them, owned his crime, and had recourse to the Queen's clemency. This Princess re-settled the Catholic religion, and England reunited herself to the Holy See. As Cranmer had always suited his religion to that of the King, it was easily believed he would also follow that of the Queen, and manifest no more difficulty with regard to saying Mass than he had done under Henry, thirteen years together, without believing in it. But his engagement was too strong, and had he thus turned with every wind, he had too openly declared himself void of all religion§. He was sent to the Tower both for the crime of treason and that of heresy, and deposed by the Queen's authority||. This authority was lawful with respect to him who had owned and even established it. It was by this authority he himself had deposed Bonner, Bishop of London, and was therefore punished by laws of his own making. For the like reason

\* Acts xxv. 16.

† Burnet, part ii. p. 223.

‡ Ibid. lib. ii. p. 238.

§ Ibid. p. 250.

|| Ibid. p. 274.



the Bishops, who, by patents, had received their Bishoprics for a certain time, were deprived; and till the ecclesiastical order should be entirely re-established, the Protestants were proceeded against according to their own maxims.

100.—*Cranmer declared heretic, and for what article.*—1555.

Cranmer, after his deposition, was left some time in prison. Afterwards, declared a heretic, he himself owned that it “was because he had denied the presence of Jesus Christ on the altar\*.” By that is seen wherein the principal part of the Reformation under Edward VI. was made to consist, and I am willing to take notice of it here, because all that will take a new turn under Elizabeth.

101.—*Cranmer’s false answer before his judges.*—1556.

When Cranmer’s punishment was to be determined according to form, Commissioners from the Pope, and those of Philip and Mary (for the Queen had then married Philip II., King of Spain) sate in judgment against him. The accusation turned on his marriages and heresies†. Mr. Burnet assures us that the Queen forgave him the treason for which he had been already condemned by Parliament. He confessed the facts which were imputed to him concerning his doctrine and marriages, “only said he had never forced any to subscribe‡.”

102.—*Cranmer condemned by his own principles.*

From these words, so full of meekness, one might be induced to think Cranmer had never condemned any person on account of doctrine. Not to mention here the imprisonment of Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, that of Bonner, Bishop of London§, and other things of the like nature, the Archbishop had signed and consented, in Henry’s time, to Lambert’s and Anne Askew’s death, for denying the Real Presence||; and under Edward, to that of Joan of Kent and of George Van Pere, both burnt for heresy. What is still more, Edward, thinking it a piece of cruelty, refused to sign the warrant for burning her, and could not be persuaded to it but by Cranmer’s authority¶. If, then, he was condemned for heresy, he himself had often enough set the example.

\* Burnet, lib. ii. p. 283.

† Ibid. part ii. p. 257.

‡ Ibid. p. 332.

§ Ibid. part ii. lib. i. p. 37.

|| Ibid. part ii. lib. i. p. 112.

¶ Ibid. p. 111.

103.—*Cranmer twice abjures the Reformation a little before his execution.*

With the design of putting off the time of his execution, he declared "he was willing to go to Rome and defend his doctrine before the Pope, yet denied any authority the Pope had over him\*:" from the Pope, in whose name he was condemned, he appealed to a General Council, but seeing nothing availed, he renounced all the errors of Luther and Zuinglius, and, together with the Real Presence, distinctly owned all the other points of the Catholic faith. The abjuration which he signed, was conceived in such terms as expressed the truest sorrow for his former errors. The Protestants were extremely shocked at it. However, their Reformer made a second abjuration; that is, when he saw, notwithstanding his preceding abjuration, the Queen was determined not to pardon him, he returned to his first errors; but he soon recanted them, "all this time (says Mr. Burnet) being under some small hopes of life." So that, continues this author, having been "dealt with to renew his subscription, and then to write the whole over again, he also did it." But here was the secret he found out to secure his conscience. Mr. Burnet goes on: "But conceiving likewise some jealousies that they might burn him, he wrote secretly a paper, containing a sincere confession of his faith; and, being brought out, he carried that along with him." This confession, thus secretly written, shews us clearly enough that he was determined not to appear a Protestant as long as any hopes remained. At last, finding himself utterly disappointed, he resolved to declare what his heart had concealed, and so give himself the appearance of a martyr.

104.—*Mr. Burnet compares Cranmer's fault to that of St. Peter.*

Mr. Burnet uses all his address to hide the shame of so miserable a death; and after alleging, in behalf of his hero, the faults of St. Athanasius and St. Cyril, which we find no mention of in ecclesiastical history, he now produces St. Peter's denial, so memorable in the Gospel. But what comparison is there betwixt a momentary weakness of this great Apostle, and the wretchedness of a man who betrayed his conscience during almost the whole course of his life, and for thirteen years together, to begin from the very time he was made a

\* Burnet, part ii. lib. i. p. 332, 333.

Bishop? who never dared to avow his sentiments but when he had a King to back him? And, lastly, on the very brink of death, confessed all that was required of him, as long as he had but a glimpse of hope; \*so that his counterfeit abjuration was manifestly nothing else but a continuation of the base dissimulation of his whole life.

105.—*Whether it be true, that Cranmer complied no more with Henry VIII. than his conscience permitted.*

Nevertheless, our author will still boast to us the steady firmness (good God) of this perpetual flatterer of kings, who sacrificed every thing to the will of his masters, annulling as many marriages, setting his hand to as many condemnations, and consenting to as many laws as they pleased, even to those which were, either in fact or in his opinion, the most unjust; who, finally, was not ashamed to bring the heavenly authority of Bishops under subjection to that of the Kings of the earth, and enslave the Church, in discipline, in preaching the word, in the administration of Sacraments, and in Faith. Nevertheless, but one only blemish of his life does Mr. Burnet find, that of his abjuration\*; and, as for the rest, allows only, that he was somewhat too much subjected to the will of Henry VIII. †, yet, to justify him completely in all his compliances, he affirms, “he thought none of them a sin ‡,” consequently was no further obsequious to Henry than his conscience allowed him. His conscience then allowed him to annul two marriages on pretexts notoriously false, founded on no other principle than Henry’s new amours. His conscience allowed him, though a Lutheran, to set his hand to articles of faith, wherein Lutheranism was condemned, and the Mass, the unjust object of the horror of the new Reformation, was established. His conscience allowed him to say Mass as long as Henry lived, without believing in it; to offer to God, even for the dead, a sacrifice which he held for an abomination; to ordain priests, giving them also the power of offering; and according to the form of the Pontifical, which he durst not alter, to exact chastity of those whom he made sub-deacons, although he did not think himself obliged to it, being a married man; to swear obedience to the Pope, whom he looked upon as anti-Christ; to accept his Bulls, and receive Archbishopal institution by his authority; to pray to Saints, and incense their images, notwithstanding that, in the Lutheran principles, all this was nothing less than idolatry; in a word, to profess and practise

\* Burnet, p. 336.

† Ibid.

‡ Pref. tom. i.

all that he believed ought to be banished from the house of God, as an execration and a scandal.

106.—*Mr. Burnet but all excuses his Reformers.*

But the thing was, “the Reformers (it is what Mr. Burnet tells us) did not know, as yet, that it was absolutely a sin to retain all these abuses till a proper occasion offered for abolishing them\*.” Doubtless, they did not know it was a sin to change, according to their notion, the Lord’s Supper into sacrilege, and to defile themselves with idolatry. To make them abstain from such things, God’s commandment was not sufficient: they were to wait till the King and Parliament should think it fitting.

107.—*Illusion in Mr. Burnet’s examples.*

Naaman is brought forward as an instance, who obliged, by his office, to give the King his hand, would not remain standing whilst his master knelt down in the temple of Remmon; and acts of religion are compared with the duty and decorum of a secular employment†. The Apostles are brought forward to us, who, “After the law was dead, continued to worship at the temple, to circumcise, and to offer sacrifices‡;” and the ceremonies, which God had instituted, and which all the Fathers allow ought to be buried honourably, are compared with actions believed to be manifestly impious§. The same Apostles are adduced to us, who made themselves all things to all men, and also the primitive Christians, who adopted some ceremonies of paganism. But if the primitive Christians adopted ceremonies that were indifferent, does it follow from thence, that men ought to practise such as they believe are full of sacrilege? How blind, how contradictory to itself is the Reformation, which, in order to raise a horror of the Church’s practices, must call them idolatrous! Obligated to excuse the same things in her first authors, she holds them for indifferent, and makes it more conspicuous than the sun, that she banters the whole universe by calling that idolatry which is not so, or that those she admires for her heroes were, of all men, the most corrupt. But God hath revealed their hypocrisy by their own historian, and Mr. Burnet is the man that hath exposed their shame in full view.

108.—*Mr. Burnet not always to be credited in his facts.*

However, if to convict the pretended Reformation by their

\* Burn. t. i. Pref.

† Ibid. 4 Reg. v. 18, 19.

‡ Ibid.

§ Ibid.

own witnesses, I have only, as it were, abridged Mr. Burnet's history, and received as true the facts I have related: I do not mean thereby to grant the rest, and allow all he relates as fact for the sake of those truths, he was not able to deny, though prejudicial to his own religion. I shall not, for example, allow him, what he asserts without witnesses or proof, that there was a resolution taken between Francis I. and Henry VIII. to withdraw themselves by agreement from the Pope's obedience\*, and change the Mass into a bare Communion†; that is, to suppress the Oblation and Sacrifice. This fact, averred by Mr. Burnet, was never even heard of in France. We are as much at a loss to know what this historian means by affirming, that the reason which made Francis I. alter his resolution of abolishing the Pope's power was, because Clement VII. "had granted him so great power over his own clergy, that he could scarce have expected more, if he had set up a patriarch in France‡;" for here is nothing but mere empty words, a thing unknown to our historians. Mr. Burnet is no better versed in the history of the Protestant religion, when he so boldly advances, as a thing avowed among the Reformers, that good works were indispensably and absolutely necessary to salvation§, for he hath seen, and will see this proposition, good works are necessary to salvation, expressly condemned by the Lutherans in their most solemn assemblies. It would be departing too much from my design, were I to descend to other facts of the like nature; but I cannot but make it known to the world, how little credit this historian merits, with relation to the Council of Trent, which he ran over in so negligent a manner, that he did not so much as take notice of the very title, which this council placed at the beginning of all its decisions. For he upbraids it with "having usurped the most glorious title of the most holy Oecumenical Council, representing the Catholic Church||," although this quality be not found in any one of its decrees: a thing of little importance in itself, since it is not this expression that makes a council; yet it never could have escaped a man that had but just opened the book with the least attention.

109.—*Mr. Burnet's fallacy with regard to Fra-Paolo.*

It behoves one, therefore, to be very cautious how he credits

\* Burn. part i. l. ii. p. 133.

† Ibid. l. iii. p. 140.

‡ Ibid. p. 133.

§ Part-d. l. iii. p. 286, 287. Sup. l. v. n. 12. Inf. l. viii. n. 30, et seq.

|| Part ii. l. i. p. 20.

our historian in what he pronounces touching this council on the testimony of Fra-Paolo, its declared enemy rather than historian. Mr. Burnet pretends that this author ought, with respect to Catholics, to be above all exception, because he is one of their own party\*; and this is the common artifice of all Protestants. But they are very well convinced in their consciences, that this Fra-Paolo, who counterfeited our religion, was in reality nothing but a Protestant in a monk's disguise. None knows him better than Mr. Burnet, who boasts him to us. He who, in his history of the Reformation, sets him forth for an author of our party, in another book, lately translated into our language, takes off the mask and shews him a Protestant, that had concealed himself†; that looked upon the English common-prayer book as his pattern; that occasionally, from the falling out between Paul V. and the republic of Venice, laboured for nothing more than to bring this republic‡ “to an entire separation, not only from the Court, but also from the Church of Rome; who believed himself to be in a defiled and idolatrous Church, wherein he continued nevertheless; heard Confessions, said Mass, and quieted the remorse of his conscience by passing over many parts of the canon, and not joining in those parts of the offices that went against his consciences.” This is what Mr. Burnet writes in the Life of William Bedell, the Protestant Bishop of Kilmore, in Ireland, who was present at Venice at the time of the difference, and to whom Fra-Paolo had disclosed his sentiments. There is no need of mentioning this author's letters, which are all Protestant, and were in every library, and which Geneva at length hath made public. I speak to Mr. Burnet only of what he wrote himself, at the time he counted amongst our authors Fra-Paolo, a Protestant under a monk's disguise, who said Mass not believing in it, and who remained in a Church whose worship appeared to him idolatry.

110.—*The plans of Religion which Mr. Burnet makes after Fra-Paolo's example.*

But what he deserves the least to be pardoned in is, when, in imitation of Fra-Paolo, and with as little truth, he lays before us those ingenious plans of Primitive-Church-doctrine. This invention, I must own, is equally commodious and agreeable. An artful historian, in the midst of his narration, slyly

\* Part 1. Pref. † The Life of Bedell, Bishop of Kilmore, p. 8.

‡ Ibid. p. 23.

§ Ibid. p. 16.

introduces all he pleases of antiquity, and erects for us a scheme of his own contrivance. Under pretext, that an historian ought not to enter into proofs, or play the Doctor, he is content with alleging such facts as are favourable to his own religion. Is he inclined to ridicule the veneration of images or relics, or the Pope's authority, or prayer for the dead, or even, to omit nothing, the *pallium*? he gives to these practices such a form and such a date as he thinks fit. He says, for example \*, of the *pallium*, "that this was a device set up by Pope Paschal II.;" although it be found five hundred years before, in the letters of Pope Vigilius and St. Gregory. The credulous reader, finding a history all over interspersed with these reflexions, and seeing everywhere, in a work whose character ought to be sincerity, an abridgment of the antiquities of several ages, without once dreaming that the author gives him, either his prejudices or conjectures for certain truths, admires the erudition and agreeable turns of the work, believes he has reached to the very original of things, and drinks at the fountain-head. But it is not just that Mr. Burnet, under the insinuating title of an historian, should thus peremptorily decide on Church-antiquity, nor that Fra-Paolo, whom he copies after, should acquire a right to make what he pleases pass for truth concerning our religion, because that, under a Monk's habit, he hid a Calvinistic heart, and laboured under-hand to discredit the Mass he said daily.

111.—*Gerson cited strangely from the purpose.*

Let not Mr. Burnet, therefore, be any longer credited as to what he relates of the Church's *dogmata* †, since he turns all of them to a wrong sense. Whether he speaks of himself, or introduces in his history a third person that speaks of our doctrine, his inward design is ever to decry it. Can his Cranmer be borne with, when, abusing a treatise which Gerson had made *De auferibilitate papæ*, he concludes, as from this Doctor, "That the papal power is a quite needless thing"? whereas, he means only, as the sequel of this work demonstrates, so as to leave no room for doubt, that the Pope may be deposed in certain cases. When an author relates such things seriously, his design is to trifle with mankind, and he destroys his own credit with all thinking persons.

\* Life of Bedell, Bishop of Kilmore, p. 340.

† Burn, part ii. l. ii. p. 175.

112.—*A gross Error relating to Celibacy and the Roman Pontifical.*

But the subject on which our historian has exhausted all his ingenuity, and has employed, as I may say, all his finest colouring, is that regarding the Celibacy of Ecclesiastics. I shall not discuss what he says, either in his own, or Cranmer's name. One may judge of his remarks on antiquity\*, by those he makes on the Roman Pontifical, which will easily be granted me has nothing in it obscure with respect to celibacy: "It was considered (says he) that the promise made by clergymen, according to the rites of the Roman Pontifical, did not necessarily oblige them to celibate. He that confers the orders asks of him that receives them, Wilt thou promise to live in chastity and sobriety? To which the sub-deacon answers, I will." Mr. Burnet concludes from these words, that no other chastity was here understood, but that which one is obliged to "in a state of marriage, as well as out of it." But the imposition is too gross to be borne with. The words he relates are not said in the ordination of a sub-deacon, but in that of a bishop †. And in that of a sub-deacon, he that presents himself to this order is stopped to hear declared to him that, till then, he was free; but if he proceeds further, he must keep chastity. Will Mr. Burnet now say again, that the chastity here in question is that which is kept in a state of marriage, and which teaches us "to abstain from all unlawful embraces?"—Must we then wait for the sub-deaconship to enter into this obligation? And who is it that does not acknowledge here that profession of continency, which is imposed, according to the ancient canons, on the principal clerks from the very time they are raised to the sub-deaconship?

113.—*A vain shift.*

Mr. Burnet still replies ‡, that, whatever might be required by the Roman Pontifical, the English priests, who were married in the time of Edward, had been ordained without any such "question or answer made, and so were not precluded from marriage by any vow." But the contrary appears from himself, he having owned that in the time of Henry VIII. nothing was altered in the rituals, nor in the other books of offices, except some extravagant prayers addressed to saints, or some other matter of light importance; and it is easy to be seen, that this Prince was far enough from taking from

\* Burn. part ii. l. i. pp. 91, 92.

† Pont. Rom. in Consec. Ep.

‡ Ibid.



ordination the profession of continency, as he had even prohibited the violation of it; first, under pain of death, and, when he was most mitigated, “under the forfeiture of goods and chattels\*.” And this, indeed, was the reason why Cranmer never durst declare his marriage during the life of Henry VIII.; but, to save himself, was forced to add to a forbidden marriage the reproach of clandestinity.

114.—*Conclusion of this Book.* “

No wonder then, that under such an Archbishop, no regard was had to the doctrine of his holy predecessors, St. Dunstan, St. Lanfranc, St. Anselm, and such others, whose admirable virtues, and particularly that of continency, were an honour to the Church. Nor do I wonder, that in his time, St. Thomas of Canterbury’s name, whose life was the condemnation of Thomas Cranmer, was effaced from their Calendar of Saints — St. Thomas of Canterbury resisted the attempts of unjust Kings; Thomas Cranmer prostituted his conscience to them, and indulged their passions. The one, banished, his goods confiscated, persecuted in his own and the persons of his dearest friends, every way afflicted, purchased the glorious liberty of speaking what his conscience dictated for truth, with a generous contempt of all the conveniences of life, and life itself: the other, to please his Prince, spent his life under a shameful dissimulation, and an outward conformity in every thing to a religion, which he inwardly condemned. The one combated even to blood for the Church’s minutest rights; and by maintaining her prerogatives, as well those which Jesus Christ had acquired by his death, as those which pious Princes had endowed her with, defended the very outworks of the holy city: the other surrendered to the Kings of the earth her most sacred trust; the word, worship, sacraments, keys, censures, authority, even faith itself. In a word, everything was intralled, and the whole ecclesiastical authority being united to the royal throne, the Church had no more power than the State pleased to allow. Lastly, the one, intrepid and exemplarily pious through the whole course of his life, was yet more so in the last period of it: the other, always dastardly and trembling at death’s approach, shrunk even below himself, and at the age of three-score and two, sacrificed even, to the dregs of despicable life, his faith and conscience. Accordingly, he has left but an odious name amongst men; nor can anything but stress of

\* Part i. l. iii. p. 282.

wit and quirk, which plain facts belie, excuse him even to his own party: but the glory of St. Thomas of Canterbury will live as long as the church; and his virtues, which France and England have venerated with a kind of emulation, will never be forgotten. Nay, the more doubtful the cause of this holy martyr appeared to the politic world, the more did the divine power declare itself in his behalf, by the signal chastisements of Henry II., this holy Prelate's persecutor, by the exemplary penance of this Prince, which alone could appease the wrath of heaven, and by miracles of so great a lustre, wrought at his tomb, that they drew to it the Kings of France as well as England. Miracles, I say, so continual, and so well attested by the unanimous consent of all the historians of those times, that to deny them is to reject at once the truth of all history whatsoever. The English Reformation, nevertheless, hath struck the name of so great a man out of the Calendar of Saints. More flagrant still have been their attempts: nothing but the degradation of all that nation's saints, since it first became Christian, can satisfy them. Bede, their venerable historian, tells them nothing but fables; at most, but legendary stories, when he relates the miracles of their conversion, the holiness of their pastors, of their Kings, and their religious. St. Augustin the Monk, who brought them to the Gospel, and St. Gregory, Pope, who sent him, escape not the hands of the Reformation: they are attacked and defamed by her chief writers. To believe them\*, the mission of those saints, who laid the foundation of the English church, was the work of the ambition and policy of Popes; and St. Gregory, so humble, so holy a Pope, by converting the English, aimed rather at subjecting them to the Holy See, than to Jesus Christ. It is what is published in England, and her Reformation establishes itself by trampling under foot and polluting the whole Christianity of the nation in its very source. But so learned a nation, it is to be hoped, will not always remain under this seduction: the respect they retain for the Fathers, and their curious and continual researches into antiquity, will bring them back to the doctrine of the first ages. I cannot believe the Chair of St. Peter, whence they received Christianity, will always be the object of their hatred — The time of vengeance and illusion shall pass away, and God will give ear to the prayers of his Saints.

\* Whitak. cont, Duræ, Fulk. cont. Stapl, Jewel, Apol, Ecc, Angl.

## BOOK VIII.

[From the year 1546 to the year 1561.]

A brief Summary.—The war begun between Charles V. and the Confederates of Smalcald.—Luther's Theses which had excited the Lutherans to take up arms.—A new subject of war on account of Herman, Archbishop of Cologne.—The prodigious ignorance of this Archbishop.—The Protestants defeated by Charles V.—The Elector of Saxony and the Landgrave of Hesse made prisoners.—The Interim, or the Emperor's book, which regulates matters of Religion provisionally for the Protestants alone, till the Council's meeting.—The disturbance caused in Prussia by Osiander, a Lutheran: his new doctrine concerning Justification.—Disputes among the Lutherans after the Interim.—Illyricus, Melancthon's Disciple, strives to undo him on account of indifferent ceremonies.—He renews the doctrine of Ubiquity.—The Emperor presses the Lutherans to appear at the Council of Trent.—The confession called Saxon, and that of the Duchy of Wirtemberg, drawn up on this occasion.—The distinction between mortal and venial Sins.—The merit of Good Works acknowledged anew.—The Conference at Worms for reconciling Religions.—The Lutherans at variance among themselves, however unanimously agreeing that Good Works are not necessary to Salvation.—Melancthon's death under a dreadful perplexity.—The Zuinglians condemned by the Lutherans in a Synod held at Jena.—Assembly of the Lutherans at Faumburg in order to agree about the true edition of the Confession of Augsburg.—The uncertainty still as great as ever.—Ubiquity set up as far almost as Lutheranism extended.—New decision on the co-operation of Free will.—The Lutherans inconsistent with themselves, and, in order to answer Libertines as well as weak Christians, they fall into Demipelagianism.—An account of the Book of Concord compiled by the Lutherans, and containing all their decisions.

1.—*Luther's Theses in order to stir up the People to take up Arms.*—1540, 1545.

FORMIDABLE was the Smalcaldic league which Luther had excited in a manner so furious, that the worst excesses were to be dreaded from it. Elated with the power of so many confederated Princes, he had published the Theses above-mentioned. Never was anything seen more violent\*. He had maintained them from the year 1540, but we learn from Sleidan that he published them anew in 1545, that is, a year before his death. There he compared the Pope to a mad wolf, "against whom the whole world takes up arms at the first signal, without waiting for commands from the magistrate. And if, after he has been shut up in an inclosure, the magistrate sets him at liberty, you may continue (said he) to pursue this savage beast, and with impunity attack those who prevented his destruction. If you fall in the engagement before the beast has received its mortal wound, you have but one thing only to repent of, that you did not bury your dagger in its breast. This is the way to deal with the Pope; all those who defend him must also be treated like a band of robbers under their captain, be they kings, be they Cæsars †." Sleidan, who relates a great part of these bloody Theses, durst not venture to repeat these last words, they appeared so horrible to him; but they were in Luther's Theses, and still are to be seen in the edition of his works ‡.

2.—*Herman, Archbishop of Cologne, calls the Protestants into his Diocese.*—*His extreme Ignorance.*

A fresh subject of feud happened at this time. Herman, Archbishop of Cologne, took it into his head to reform his diocese after the new fashion, and to that purpose had sent for Bucer and Melancthon. Of all Prelates, this was certainly the most illiterate; and a man ever resigned to the will of whosoever governed him. Whilst he gave ear to the sage counsel of the learned Gropper, he held very holy councils for the defence of the ancient faith, for the true reformation of manners. Afterwards, the Lutherans got possession of his mind, and made him fall blindly into all their sentiments. As the Landgrave was one day speaking to the Emperor about this new reformer §, "What will the poor man reform? (answered he) scarce does he understand

\* Sleid. l. i., n. 25.

† T. i. Wit, p. 407.

‡ Sleid. lib. xvi. p. 261.

§ Sleid. lib. xvii. p. 276.

Latin : he never said Mass but thrice in all his life. I heard him twice ; he did not know so much as the beginning of it." The fact is certain ; and the Landgrave, who durst not say he knew a word of Latin, replied only, " he had read good books in the German tongue, and understood religion." Understanding it, in the Landgrave's notion, was favouring the party. As the Pope and the Emperor joined together against him, the " Protestant Princes promised him their assistance, in case he were attacked on the score of religion\*."

3.—*It is doubted among the Confederates whether Charles V. should be treated as Emperor.—The victory of Charles V. —The Book of Interim.—1546.*

They soon came to open force. The more the Emperor declared that he did not take up arms on account of religion, but in order to do himself justice on certain rebels that were headed by the Elector of Saxony and the Landgrave, the more these published in their manifestoes, that this war was not entered upon but by the secret instigation of the Roman Antichrist and the Council of Trent. In this manner they endeavoured, conformably to Luther's Theses, to make the war they waged against the Emperor appear lawful † : yet there was a dispute amongst them how Charles V. was to be treated in their public writings. The Elector, more conscientious than the rest, would not have him styled Emperor, because, " If so (said he), they could not lawfully wage war against him." The Landgrave had none of these scruples ; and, besides, who had degraded the Emperor ? Who had deprived him of the empire ? Was it to become a maxim, that whosoever united himself with the Pope, resigned the title of Emperor ? The thought was as ridiculous as criminal. In conclusion, to please all parties, it was resolved, without owning or denying Charles V. for Emperor, that he should be treated as bearing himself for such, and by this expedient all hostilities were allowable. But the issue of the war was not favourable to the Protestants. Overthrown by the famous victory of Charles V. near the Elb (1547), the Duke of Saxony and the Landgrave taken prisoners, they knew not which way to turn themselves. The Emperor, of his own authority, proposed to them a form of doctrine called the Interim (1548), or the Emperor's book, which he enjoined them to follow provisionally till the Council sate. In it all

\* Epist. Wit. Theod. inter Ep. Cal. p. 82.

† Sleid. lib. xvii. p. 289, 295, &c. Ibid. p. 297.

the errors of the Lutherans were rejected ; and the marriage of such priests as had become Lutherans, with communion under both kinds where it was re-established, were tolerated only. The Emperor was blamed at Rome for undertaking to pronounce in matters of religion. Those on his side answered, he had not taken upon him to make a decision or law for the Church, but only to prescribe to the Lutherans what they might best do till the Council met. This question belongs not to my subject ; it is sufficient to observe by the way, that the Interim cannot pass for an authentic act of the Church, since neither the Pope nor the Bishops have ever approved it. Some Lutherans accepted of it rather by force than otherwise : the greatest part rejected it, and the project of Charles V. had but little success.

4.—*The project of the Interim.—Conference of Ratisbon in 1541.*

Whilst I am on the subject of this book, it will not be amiss to observe, that it had been formerly proposed at the conference of Ratisbon in 1541. Three Catholic divines, Pflugius, bishop of Naumburg, Gropper and Eckius, by the Emperor's orders, were there to treat about the reconciliation of religions with Melancthon, Bucer, and Pistorius, three Protestants. Eckius rejected the book, and the Prelates, together with the Catholic States, did not think it fit that a body of doctrine should be proposed, without being communicated to the Pope's Legate, then at Ratisbon. Cardinal Contarenus was the man, a very learned divine, and whom even the Protestants have praised. Wherefore, the Legate having been consulted, answered, that an affair of this nature ought to be "referred to the Pope, in order to be regulated either in the general Council, that was going to be opened, or by some other proper method\*."

5.—*Articles agreed and not agreed upon in this Conference, and in what manner.*

The truth is, these conferences went on nevertheless ; and when the three Protestants were agreed with Pflugius and Gropper on any articles, they were called articles accorded, although Eckius all the while opposed them †. The Protestants desired the Emperor to authorize these articles

\* Sleid. lib. xiv. Act. coll. Ratisb. Argent. 1542. p. 199. Ibid. 132. Mel. lib. i. Ep. 24, 25. Act. Ratisb. Ibid. 136.

† Ibid. 153. Sleid. Ibid. 157.

in the mean time, while the rest were under debate. But this was opposed by the Catholics, who declared several times, they could not consent to the changing of any dogma, or rite, received in the Catholic Church. The Protestants on their side, who pressed the reception of the articles accorded, put their own explications on them, which were not agreed to, and made a list of "things omitted in the articles accorded\*." Melancthon, who digested these remarks, wrote to the Emperor in the name of all the Protestants, that the "articles accorded" should be received, "provided they were well understood;" that is, they themselves were sensible of their being conceived in ambiguous terms, and it was nothing but an imposition to press, as they did, the reception of them. Thus all the projects of accommodation vanished into smoke: the which I am pleased with remarking occasionally, that it may not be thought strange I should speak only, as it were, by-the-bye of so famous an action as the conference of Ratisbon.

\*

6.—*Another Conference.—The finishing stroke put to the Interim.—The little success of this Book.—1546.*

Another was held in the same city, and with as little success, in 1546†. The Emperor, nevertheless, ordered his book to be revised, and Pflugius, Bishop of Naumburg, Michael Helding, the titular Bishop of Sidon, and Islebius, a Protestant, put the finishing stroke to it. But he did but set a new example, how bad success these imperial decisions were used to have, in matters of religion.

#### 7.—*Bucer's new Confession of Faith.*

Whilst the Emperor was exerting himself to make his Interim be received in the city of Strasburg, Bucer published there a new confession of faith, in which this Church declares, that she always unchangeably retains her first confession of faith presented to Charles V. at Augsburg in 1530, and likewise receives the agreement made at Wittemberg with Luther, namely, that act which imported that even those who have not faith, and who abuse the sacrament, receive the proper substance of the body and blood of Jesus Christ‡. In this confession of faith, Bucer excludes nothing expressly but transubstantiation, and leaves whole and entire all that can establish the real and substantial presence.

\* Act. Ratisb. Resp. Princ. 78. Annotata, out omissa in artic. Concil. 82. Lib. Ep. 29. ad Cur. V.

† Sleid. lib. xx. p. 344.

‡ Hosp. An. 1548. p. 204.

8.—*Two contrary acts are received at Strasburg at the same time.*

The most remarkable thing in this is, that Bucer, who, in subscribing the Articles of Smalcald, at the same time, as hath appeared, had subscribed the Confession of Augsburg, still retained the Confession of Strasburg; that is, he authorized two acts which were made to destroy each other; for it may be remembered, that the Confession of Strasburg was made only, to avoid the subscribing that of Augsburg, and that those of the Confession of Augsburg would never admit for brethren, those of Strasburg, nor their associates\*. All this is now reconciled; that is, in the new Reformation it is lawful to change, but not lawful to acknowledge that you change. The Reformation, should it own this, would appear too human a work; and it is better to approve four or five contradictory acts, provided it be not acknowledged that they are so, than to own one's self wrong, especially in confessions of faith.

9.—*Bucer goes to England, where he dies, without being able to change anything in Peter Martyr's Articles.*

This was the last action that Bucer did in Germany. During the commotions occasioned by the Interim, he found a refuge in England among the new Protestants, who gathered strength under Edward. There he died in great esteem, yet not being able to alter anything in the Articles which Peter Martyr had established there: so that pure Zuinglianism was the religion then. But Bucer's notions will have their turn, and we shall see Peter Martyr's Articles changed under Elizabeth.

10.—*Osiander also abandons his Church of Nuremburg, and sets all Prussia in an uproar.*

The troubles, caused by the Interim, dispersed very many of the Reformers. The Protestants even were scandalized to see them thus forsake their Churches. To venture their lives for them, or for the Reformation, was what they were not accustomed to; and it has been an observation of old standing, that none of them laid down their lives for their flock; unless it were Cranmer, who yet did all he could to save his, by forswearing his religion, as long as swearing was to his purpose. The famous Osiander was one of the first that fled. On a sudden, he disappeared at Nuremburg, and left the

\* Sup. lib. iv. Sup. lib. iii.



Church which he had governed twenty-five years, and ever since the beginning of the Reformation. Prussia was the place he retreated to. Of all countries this was one of the most addicted to Lutheranism. It belonged to the Teutonic Order (1525); but the great master of it, Prince Albert of Brandenburg, conceived all at once a desire of marrying, of reforming, and making himself an hereditary sovereign. And thus did the whole country become Lutheran, and the doctor of Nuremburg soon excited there new disorders.

11.—*What sort of man Osiander was—his doctrine about Justification.*

Andrew Osiander had signalized himself among the Lutherans by a new opinion he had introduced concerning Justification\*. He would not have it to be by the imputation of Jesus Christ's justice, as all other Protestants maintained, but by the intimate union of God's substantial justice with our souls, grounded on that saying often repeated in Isaiah and Jeremy, "The Lord is our righteousness †." For, as, according to him, we live by God's substantial life and love, by the essential love he bears himself, so we are just by his essential justice communicated to us; to which, the substance of the word incarnate dwelling in us by faith, by the word, and the sacraments, is to be added. Ever since the time that the Confession of Augsburg was in hand, he had used his utmost endeavours to prevail with the whole party to embrace this prodigy of doctrine, and, to Luther's face, defended it with the greatest boldness. At the Assembly of Smalcald men were astonished at his rashness; yet, fearing lest new divisions might break out in the party, wherein he had distinguished himself by his great learning, they chose to bear with him. He, above all men, had the talent of diverting Luther; and Melancthon, at their return from the Conference of Marburg, held with the Sacramentarians, wrote to Camerarius ‡ that "Osiander had made Luther and all of them exceeding merry."

12.—*Osiander's profane spirit observed by Calvin.*

This he did by playing the droll, chiefly at table, when his wit abounded most; but in such profane jests, that I have a difficulty in repeating them. It is Calvin who informs us §,

\* Chyt. lib. xvii. Saxon. tit. Osiandrica. p. 444.

† Isa. xxiii. 6, 16, 33. Jer. xxiii. 6.

‡ Lib. iv. Ep. 88.

§ Cal. Ep. ad Mel. 146.

in a letter which he writes to Melancthon concerning this man, "That, as often as he found good wine at an entertainment, he praised it by applying it to those words which God uttered with respect to himself, 'I am that I am.'" And, again: "Here is the Son of the living God." Calvin had been present at the banquets in which he vented these blasphemies, at which he conceived an horror. Yet they passed off without any exception being taken to them. The same Calvin\* speaks of Osiander as of a "brutal man, a wild beast not to be tamed. As for him (said he), the very first time I saw him, I detested his profane spirit and infamous behaviour, and always looked upon him as the shame of the Protestant party." Yet he was one of the pillars of it: the Church of Nuremberg, one of the first of the sect, had placed him at the head of her pastors from the year 1522, and he is everywhere found at the conferences among the chief of the party; but Calvin is astonished "that they were able to bear with him so long, and cannot conceive, considering all his furies, how Melancthon could have lavished so much praise upon him.

13.—*Melancthon's opinion, and that of other Protestants, concerning Osiander.*

It will be thought, perchance, that Calvin used him thus harshly from a particular hatred of his own, for Osiander was the most violent enemy the Sacramentarians had, and he it was that carried the subject of the Real Presence to such extremity as to maintain that they ought to say of the Eucharistic bread, "this bread is God†." But the Lutherans entertained no better opinion of him; and Melancthon, who often found it served his turn to praise him, as Calvin reproaches him with doing to excess, writing to his friends‡, does nevertheless blame "his extreme arrogance, his ravings, his other excesses, and the monstrousness of his opinions." It was not Osiander's fault that he did not go to trouble England, where he hoped that the esteem in which his brother-in-law, Cranmer, was held, would give him credit: but Melancthon acquaints us§ that persons of authority and learning had represented the danger there was of bringing into that country a man who had spread in the Church so great a chaos of new opinions. Cranmer himself gave ear to

\* Cal. Ep. ad Mel. 146.

† Lib. ii. Ep. 240, 259, 447, &c.

‡ S. l. ii. n. 3.

§ Ibid.

reason on this head, and listened to Calvin\*, who spoke to him of the illusions whereby Osiander bewitched himself and others.

14.—*Osiander, puffed up with the Prince's favour, keeps within no bounds.*

He was no sooner arrived in Prussia than he set the University of Koningsberg† in a flame with his new doctrine of Justification. However eager always in its defence, yet he stood in fear, say my authors, “of Luther’s magnanimity,” and, during his life, never durst write anything on that subject‡. The magnanimous Luther feared him no less: in general, the Reformation, void of authority, feared nothing so much as new divisions, which she knew not how to terminate; and, lest they should irritate a man whose eloquence was formidable, he was left at liberty to utter what he pleased by word of mouth. In Prussia, finding himself free from the party’s yoke, and, what elated his heart, in great favour with the Prince, who had given him the first chair in his University, he gave himself free scope, and soon divided the whole country.

15.—*The dispute on Ceremonies, or things indifferent.*

Other disputes were enkindled at the same time in the other parts of Lutheranism. That which arose about Ceremonies, or things indifferent, was carried on with a great deal of acrimony§. Melancthon, supported by the Academies of Leipsic and Wittemburg, where he was all-powerful, would not have them rejected (1549). It had ever been his opinion that, in the exterior worship, the less was changed the better. For which reason, during the Interim, he made himself very easy about these indifferent practices, nor did believe, says he||, “that for a surplice, for some holy-days, or for the order of lessons,” they ought to draw a persecution on themselves. This doctrine was made criminal in him, and it was decided in the party that these indifferent things ought absolutely to be rejected, because the use made of them was contrary to the liberty of the Churches, and contained, said they, a kind of profession of Popery.

\* Calv. Ep. ad Cranm. Col. 134.

† Acad. Regiomontana.

‡ Chytr. lib. xvii. p. 445.

§ Sleid. lib. xxi. p. 365. xxii. p. 378.

|| Lib. i. Ep. 16. ad Phil. cant. An. 1525. Lib. i. Ep. 70. Lib. ii. P. p. 36. Concord. p. 514, 789.

16.—*Illyricus's jealousy and hidden designs against Melancthon.*

But Flaccus Illyricus, who started this question, had a deeper design. His aim was directed at Melancthon's ruin, whose disciple he had been, but of whom he was afterwards become so jealous as not to endure him\*. And now particular reasons urged him on more than ever: for, whereas Melancthon endeavoured then to undermine Luther's doctrine of the Real Presence, Illyricus and his friends carried it to such extremes as to maintain ubiquity. In fact, we see it decided by the greatest part of the Lutheran Churches, and the acts thereof are printed in the Book of Concord, which almost all the Lutherans in Germany have accepted. It shall be spoken of hereafter; and, to follow the order of time, I must speak at present of the Confession of Faith called Saxonic, and of that of Wirtemberg,† not Wittemburg in Saxony, but the capital city of the Duchy of Wirtemberg.

17.—*Saxonic Confession, and that of Wirtemberg.—Why made, and by what Authors.—1551, 1552.*

They were both made much about the same time, namely, in 1551 and 1552, in order to be presented to the Council of Trent, where the victorious Charles V. would have the Protestants make their appearance. The Saxonic Confession was drawn up by Melancthon, and, as we learn from Sleidan‡, by order of Maurice, the Elector, whom the Emperor had put in the place of John Frederick. All the doctors and all the pastors, solemnly convened at Leipsic, approved it with one voice; nor ought there to be anything more authentic than a confession of faith made by so renowned a person, in order to be presented in a general council§. And, truly, it was received not only throughout all the territories of the House of Saxony and of many other Princes, but also by the Churches of Pomerania and that of Strasburg, as appears by the subscriptions and declarations of those Churches. Brentius was the author of the Confession of Wirtemberg, next to Melancthon the most famous man of the whole party||. Melancthon's Confession was called by himself the repetition of that of Augsburg. Christopher, Duke of Wirtemberg, by whose authority the Confession of Wirtemberg was published, declares likewise that he confirms, and does but repeat,

\* Sleid. ante. † Synt. Gen. Part ii. p. 48, 98.

‡ Synt. Gen. Part ii. p. 94, et seq.

† Lib. xxii. || Ibid.

the Confession of Augsburg; but, in order to repeat it, there was no necessity of making another; and this word, *repeat*, only shews they were ashamed of producing so many new confessions of faith.

18.—*Article of the Eucharist in the Saxonian Confession.*

Accordingly, to begin with the Saxonian; the article of the Eucharist was there explained in terms very different from those employed at Augsburg\*. For, to say nothing of the long discourse of four or five pages which Melancthon substitutes in lieu of two or three lines of the tenth article of Augsburg†, which decided this matter; here is what was essential in it: “It is necessary (said he) to inform mankind that the sacraments are actions instituted by God, and that things are not sacraments except in the time of their use so established; nevertheless, in the established use of this communion, Jesus Christ is truly and substantially present, truly given to those who receive the body and blood of Jesus Christ; whereby Jesus Christ testifies that he is in them, and makes them his members.”

19.—*Changes which Melancthon made by the Saxonian Confession, in the Articles of that of Augsburg and Smalcald.*

Melancthon avoids saying what he had said at Augsburg, “That the body and blood are truly given with the bread and wine, and much more, what Luther had added at Smalcald, that the bread and wine are the true body and the true blood of Jesus Christ, the which are not only given and received by pious Christians, but also by the impious.” These important words, which Luther had chosen with so great care, in order to explain his doctrine, although signed by Melancthon at Smalcald, as hath appeared, were by Melancthon himself cut off from his Saxonian Confession. It seems he was no longer of opinion that the body of Jesus Christ was taken by the mouth together with the bread, nor received substantially by the impious, although he did not deny a substantial presence, in which Jesus Christ came to the faithful, not only by his virtue and spirit, but also in his own proper flesh and substance, divided, nevertheless, from bread and wine: for it seems, among the many novelties on this subject, this, too, was to shew itself, and, according to the prophecy of the

\* Cap. de Coena.

† Synt. Gen. Part ii. p. 72.

venerable Simeon, Jesus Christ, in this mystery, was to be "a mark set for contradictions\*" in these latter ages, as, with respect to his divinity and incarnation, he had been in the first ages of Christianity. \*

20.—*Article of the Eucharist in the Wirtemberg Confession.*

In this manner was the Confession of Augsburg and Luther's doctrine repeated in the Saxon Confession. The Confession of Wirtemberg† departs no less from that of Augsburg, nor from the Articles of Smalcald. It says, "That the true body and true blood are distributed in the Eucharist, and rejects those who say the bread and wine are signs of the body and blood of Jesus Christ absent. It adds, that it is in the power of God to annihilate the substance of bread, or to change it into his body; but that God uses not this power in the Supper, and true bread remains with the true presence of the body. It manifestly establishes concomitancy, by deciding that, although Jesus Christ be distributed whole and entire, as well in the bread as in the wine of the Eucharist, the use, nevertheless, of both parts ought to be universal." Thus it grants us two things; one, the possibility of transubstantiation, the other the certainty of concomitancy: but though it defends the reality so far as to admit concomitancy, it explains nevertheless these words, "This is my body," by those of Ezekiel, who says, "This is Jerusalem," shewing the representation of that city.

21.—*The confusion man falls into when he delivers himself over to his own conceits.*

Thus there is nothing but confusion when man departs from the straight path to follow his own ideas. As the abettors of the figurative sense receive some impression from the literal one, so the abettors of the literal sense are sometimes dazzled by the deceitful subtleties of that which is figurative. But it is not our business to examine here, whether or no, by torturing the different expressions of so many confessions of faith, some violent mode may be found out to bring them to a conformity of sense. It is enough for me to point out what difficulty those had in satisfying themselves with their own confessions of faith, who had forsaken the faith of the Church.

\* Luke ii. 34. *Positus in signum, cui contradicetur.*

† Conf. Wirt. C. de Euch. *Ibid.* p. 115.

22.—*God wills not Sin.*—*An article better explained in the Saxonick Confession, than it had been in that of Augsburg\*.*

The other articles of these confessions of faith are not less remarkable than that of the Eucharist.

The Saxonick Confession acknowledges that “the will is free; that God wills not sin, nor approves, nor co-operates to it; but that the free will of men and devils is the cause of their sin and fall.” Melancthon is here to be commended for correcting Luther and correcting himself, and for speaking more clearly than he had done in the Confession of Augsburg.

23.—*The co-operation of Free-will.*

I have heretofore observed, that at Augsburg, he did not own the exercise of free-will, except in the actions of civil life, and that afterwards he extended it even to Christian actions†. This he begins to discover more plainly to us in the Saxonick Confession; for, after explaining the nature of free-will, and the choice of the will, and that it suffices not alone for the works, which we call “supernatural,” he twice repeats, that “the will, after having received the Holy Ghost, remains not idle,” namely, that it is not without action; which seems to give to it, as the Council of Trent likewise does, a free action under the guidance of the Holy Ghost who moves it interiorly.

24.—*Melancthon's doctrine on the co-operation of Free-will.*

And what Melancthon gives us to understand in this confession of faith, he explains in his letters more distinctly; for he proceeds even to own the human will, in supernatural works, as “a joint agent;” *agens partiale*, according to the school language‡; as much as to say, that man acts with God, and of both there is made one total agent. Thus he explained himself at the Conference of Ratisbon in 1541, and though he well knew that this explication would be displeasing to his companions, yet he adhered to it, because, says he, the thing is true. Thus did he come back from the excesses he had learned from Luther, though Luther persisted in them to the very last. But he delivers himself

\* Conf. Wirt. C. de Euch. p. 53.

† Cap. de rem. pecc., de lib. arb., etc. Synt. Gen. part ii. p. 54, 60, 61, etc.

‡ Demipelagian, lib. iv. Ep. 240.

more at large on this subject, in a letter written to Calvin\*: "I had a friend, (says he,) who, reasoning on predestination, equally believed these two things,—that all happens among men as Providence ordains, and that there is a contingency nevertheless:" yet he owned he was not able to reconcile these points. "For my part, (proceeds he,) who hold that God is not the cause of sin, and wills not sin, I own this contingency in the infirmity of our judgment, to the end that the ignorant may confess that David fell of himself, and by his own will, into sin; and might have preserved the Holy Ghost he had within him, and that in this combat there is some action of the will to be acknowledged," which he confirms by a passage of St. Basil, who says, "Only have the will, and God will come unto you." Whereby Melancthon seemed to insinuate, not only that the will acts, but also begins; which St. Basil rejects in other places, and Melancthon does not appear to me ever to have rejected sufficiently, since we have before taken notice, how he had introduced a word into the Confession of Augsburg†, by which he seemed to intimate, there was not so much harm in saying that the will could begin, as that it could finish of itself the work of God.

25.—*The exercise of Free-will plainly owned by Melancthon in the operations of grace.*

Be that as it will, it is certain he owned the exercise of free-will in the operations of grace, since he so plainly owned that David could have preserved the Holy Ghost at the time he lost it, as he might have lost it at the time he preserved it: but although this was his sentiment, he durst not declare it distinctly in the Saxon Confession;—happy for him he could not insinuate it gently by these words,—"The will is not idle, nor without action."

The thing was, Luther had so dreadfully thunderstruck free-will, and bequeathed to his sect such an aversion to the exercise of it, that Melancthon durst not utter, but with fear and trembling, what he believed regarding it, and even his own confessions of faith were ambiguous.

26.—*His doctrine condemned by his Brethren.*

But all his precautions could not secure him from censure. Illyricus and his followers would never forgive him this short

\* Ep. Mel. inter Cal. Ep. p. 384.

† Conf. Aug. art. xviii. S. l. iii. n. 191. p. 20.



sentence which he had placed in the Saxonian Confession,—“The will is not idle, nor without action.” They condemned this expression in two synodical assemblies, together with the text of St. Basil, which, as we have seen, Melancthon made use of.

This condemnation is set down in the Book of Concord\*. All they did to save Melancthon's honour, was not to name him, but only to condemn his expressions under the general name of new authors, or papists, or scholastics. But whoever shall consider with what care the very expressions of Melancthon were culled out for condemnation, will plainly see that he was the person aimed at, and the sincere Lutherans own as much.

### 27.—*Confusion of the new Sects.*

Here is, in short, the nature of these new sects. Men suffer themselves to be prejudiced against certain doctrines, of which they take up false notions. Thus did Melancthon, at first, run into extremes with Luther against free-will, and would allow it no action in works supernatural. Convinced of his error, he leans to the opposite extreme, and so far from excluding the action of free-will, he proceeds to attribute to it even the beginning of supernatural actions. When a little inclined to return to truth, and to own that free-will hath its agency in the operations of grace, he stands condemned by his own people: such is the confusion and perplexity man falls into, by casting off the salutary yoke of Church authority.

### 28.—*Doctrine of the Lutherans, which contradicts itself.*

But although one part of the Lutherans will not receive these terms of Melancthon, the will is not without action in works of grace. I see not how they can deny the thing, since they all confess, unanimously, that man, under grace, may reject and lose it.

This is what they have asserted in the Confession of Augsburg; what they have repeated in the Apology; what they have anew decided and inculcated in the Book of Concord †; so that nothing among them is more certain. Whence it is plain they acknowledge with the Council of Trent a free-will, acting under the operation of grace, so as to be able to reject it; which thing it is proper to remark, on account of some of our Calvinists, who, for want of well understand-

\* Page 5, 82, 680.

† Ibid. p. 675, etc.

ing the state of the question, make that doctrine criminal in us, which they support, nevertheless, in their brethren the Lutherans.

29.—*A considerable article of the Saxonick Confession concerning the distinction of mortal and venial sins\*.*

There is also an article in the Saxonick Confession, so much the more deserving of notice, as it overthrows one of the foundations of the new Reformation, which will not own that the distinction betwixt sins, mortal and venial, is grounded on the nature of sin itself. But here the divines of Saxony confess with Melancthon, that there are two sorts of sin; "one which banishes the Holy Ghost from the heart; the other, which does not banish him." In order to explain the nature of these different sins, they observe two kinds of Christians; "one who repress concupiscence; the other, who obey it. In those who combat against it (proceed they) sin is not reigning; it is *venial*; it bereaves us not of the Holy Ghost; it subverts not the foundation, and is not against conscience." They add, "that such sort of sins are covered," *i. e.* they are not imputed "through God's mercy." Certain it is, according to this doctrine, that the distinction of *mortal* and *venial* sins consists, not only in God's pardoning some, and not pardoning others, as is commonly said in the pretended Reformation, but that it proceeds from the nature of the thing. Now, to condemn the doctrine of imputed justice, no more than this is requisite; since it is allowed for certain, notwithstanding the sins the just man falls into daily, that sin reigns not in him, but rather charity reigns in him, and consequently justice, which suffices to denominate him truly just, since a thing takes its denomination from what is prevailing therein. Whence it follows, that to explain "gratuitous justification," there is no necessity of saying, we are justified by imputation, but rather, that we are truly justified by a justice which is in us, yet proceeding from the gift of God.

30.—*Merit of Works in the Confession of Wirtemberg.*

Melancthon omitted, for what reason I know not, to insert in the Saxonick Confession, what he had inserted in the Augsburg Confession and Apology concerning the merit of good works†. But it must not be concluded from hence, that the Lutherans had rejected this doctrine, since, at the same time, a chapter is found in the Confession of Wirtemberg, where

\* Page 75.

† Conf. Wirt. c. de bonis operib. Ibid. p. 106.

it is said, "that good works ought necessarily to be practised, and through the gratuitous bounty of God they merit their corporal and spiritual rewards:" which, by the way, makes it appear, that the nature of merit perfectly agrees with grace. . .

31.—*The conference of Worms to reconcile both religions.—  
Division of the Lutherans.—1557.*

In 1557, a new assembly, by the appointment of Charles V., was held at Worms for settling religion. Pflugius, the author of the Interim, presided in it. Mr. Burnet, ever attentive to turn everything to the advantage of the new Reformation, gives a short account of it, in which he represents the Catholics as men, "who, unable to bear down those they call heretics with open force, divide them among themselves, and engage them into heats about lesser matters." But Melancthon's own testimony, in this case, will discover the true state of the affair\*. As soon as the Protestant doctors named for the conference were come to Worms, the ambassadors of their respective princes assembled them together to acquaint them, from the said princes, that, above all things, and before they conferred with the Catholics, they were "to agree among themselves, and, at the same time, to condemn four sorts of errors. 1. That of the Zuinglians. 2. That of Osiander about justification. 3. That proposition which affirms good works are necessary to salvation. 4. And lastly, the error of those who had received indifferent ceremonies." This last article expressly glanced at Melancthon, and it was Illyricus with his cabal that proposed it. Melancthon had been warned of his designs, and in his journey wrote to his friend Camerarius †, that, "at table, and over the bottle, certain preliminary articles were drawn, with the design of making him and Brentius sign them." With the last he was very much united, and represents Illyricus, or some one of that cabal, "as a fury that went from door to door to exasperate people." It was also believed in the party, that Melancthon was pretty favourable to the Zuinglians, and Brentius to Osiander. The same Melancthon appeared much inclined to the necessity of good works, and this whole enterprise visibly aimed at him and his friends. Hitherto, therefore, it was not the Catholics that laboured

\* Mel. lib. i. Ep. 70. Burn. part ii. lib. ii. p. 355. Lib. i. Ep. 70. ejusd. Ep. ad Albert. Hardenb. et ad Bulling. apud Hospin. An. 1557, 250.

† Lib. iv. 868. et seq.

to divide the Protestants. They were sufficiently divided of themselves; nor was it, as Mr. Burnet pretends, "about lesser matters;" since, except the question of indifferent ceremonies, all the rest, concerning the real presence, Osiander's monstrous justification, and the manner in which good works were to be judged necessary, were of the utmost consequence.

32.—*The Lutherans unanimously condemn the necessity of Good Works for Salvation\*.*

As to the first of these points, Melancthon agreed, that the "Zuinglians deserved to be condemned as well as the Papists." To the second, that Osiander was not less worthy of censure. To the third, that from this proposition, "good works are necessary for salvation," the last word should be cut off, so that good works, in spite of the Gospel, which denounces that, without them, we have no share in the kingdom of God, remain "necessary" it is true, but not "for salvation;" and whereas Mr. Burnet hath affirmed that the "Protestants always declared good works indispensably and absolutely necessary to salvation;" quite on the contrary, we find this equally rejected by Melancthon's enemies, and by himself,—namely, by both parties of the Protestants in Germany.

33.—*Osiander spared by the Lutherans.*

As for Osiander, Brentius did not fail to take his part, not by defending the doctrine imputed to him, but by maintaining that they had not comprehended this author's sense, though Osiander had so plainly expressed himself, that neither Melancthon nor anybody else doubted of it. It appeared, then, to the Lutherans, a very easy matter to agree all in the condemnations required by Illyricus and his friends; but Melancthon put a stop to it, who was ever apprehensive of raising new disturbances in the Reformation, which, by its great divisions, already seemed threatened with destruction.

34.—*The Divisions of the Lutherans break forth, which the Catholics endeavour to improve for their Salvation.*

These disputes of the Protestants soon reached the ears of the Catholics, for Illyricus and his friends raised great clamours, not only at Worms, but over all Germany. The Catholics

\* Loc. sup. cit. S. lib. vii. n. 108.

had resolved to press, in the conference, the necessity of submitting to the church's judgment, in order to put an end to disputes arising among Christians; and the contentions of Protestants very opportunely fell in with this design, they making it appear that they themselves, who spoke so much of the perspicuity of Scripture, and its full sufficiency to terminate all disputes, agreed so little among themselves, nor had hitherto found out the way of finishing the least debate. The weakness of the Reformation, so ready at starting difficulties, so bad at solving them, was visible to every eye. Then Illyricus and his friends, to show the Catholics they were not unprovided of means to repress others bred in the Protestant party, laid before the Catholic deputies a copy of condemnations they had drawn, but which was rejected by their companions; thus the division blazed abroad in a manner not to be concealed. The Catholics judged it to no purpose to continue on these conferences, where, indeed, everything was at a stand, and accordingly left the Illyricans to dispute with the Melancthonists, as St. Paul \* left the Pharisees to dispute with the Sadducees, drawing all the advantage he could from their notorious dissensions.

35.—*Osiander's triumph in Prussia.—The memorable conversion of Staphylus.*

In Prussia, something vigorous, and some resolute decision, was expected against Osiander, whose insolence was no longer to be borne with. He made it openly appear how little account he made of the Augsburg Confession, of Melancthon, its author, and of the merits even of Jesus Christ, which he did not so much as mention in the justification of sinners. Some divines of Koningsberg did what they could to oppose his doctrine, and among others, Frederick Staphylus, one of the most renowned professors in divinity of that university, who, for sixteen years together at Wittemberg, had heard Luther and Melancthon †; but finding they gained nothing by their learned works, and Osiander's eloquence prevailed universally, they had recourse to the authority of the Church of Wittemberg, and the rest of the Protestant Churches in Germany. When, instead of distinct and vigorous condemnations, which the weak faith of the people stood in need of, they beheld nothing came from those quarters but timorous

\* Acts xxiii. 6.

† Chyt. in Sax. lib. xvii. Tit. Osiand. p. 444, et seq. Ibid. 448.

writings, from which Oslander reaped advantage, they pitied the weakness of the party thus bereft of all authority against errors. Staphylus opened his eyes, and returned to the bosom of the Catholic Church.

36.—*A new form of the Lutherans in order to explain the Eucharist in the Assembly of Frankfort.—1558.*

The Lutherans assembled themselves at Frankfort the year after, in order to agree about a form relating to the Eucharist, as if, till then, they had done nothing. They began, according to custom, by saying, they did but repeat the confession of Augsburg\*. Notwithstanding, they added to it, “that Jesus Christ was given in the use of the Sacrament, truly, substantially, and in a vivifying manner; and that this Sacrament contained two things,—namely, the bread and the body; and that it is an invention of the Monks, unknown to all antiquity, to say, that the body is given us under the species of bread.”

Strange confusion! they did nothing, said they, but repeat the confession of Augsburg; yet this expression, condemned by them at Frankfort, viz., “this body is present under the species,” is found in one of the editions of that same Confession which they pretended to repeat, and even in that edition owned at Frankfort to be so genuine, that to this day, in the rituals used by the French church of that city, we read the tenth article of the Augsburg Confession, couched in these terms—“The body and blood are received under the species of bread and wine †.”

37.—*The question of Ubiquity made Melancthon turn towards the Sacramentarians.—1559.*

But the concern of most weight among the Lutherans at that time, was that of ubiquity, which Westphalus, James Andrew Smidelin, David Chythreus, and others, set up with all their might. Melancthon opposed two reasons against them, than which nothing could be more convincing: one, that this doctrine confounded the two natures of Jesus Christ, making him immense, not only according to his divinity, but his humanity likewise, and even with respect to his body; the other, that it destroyed the mystery of the Eucharist, by taking away everything that is peculiar to it, should Jesus Christ, as man, be no other way therein present than he is

\* Hosp. f. 264.

† Sous les espèces du pain et du vin.

in wood and stone. These two reasons made Melancthon look with horror on the doctrine of ubiquity, and the aversion he had to it made him insensibly begin to incline towards those who defended the figurative sense. He held a particular communication with them, above all with Calvin. But certain it is, he did not find in his sentiments what he desired.

38.—*The incompatibility of Melancthon's sentiments with those of Calvin.*

Calvin obstinately maintained \*, that a believer once regenerated could not lose grace; and Melancthon agreed with the Lutherans, that this doctrine was damnable and impious. Calvin could not endure the necessity of baptism, and Melancthon would never depart from it. Calvin condemned what Melancthon taught on the co-operation of free-will, and Melancthon did not believe he could recant.

It appears sufficiently they were no less at variance about predestination; and although Calvin repeated frequently that Melancthon in his heart could not help thinking as he did, yet he never could draw anything from him to that purpose.

39.—*Whether or no Melancthon was a Calvinist with respect to the Eucharist.*

As for what concerns the Supper, Calvin boasts everywhere that Melancthon was of his opinion; but as he does not produce one word of Melancthon's clearly to that purpose, but, on the contrary, taxes him in all his letters and books with having never explained himself sufficiently on that subject, methinks one may reasonably doubt of what he has advanced; and what seems to me to be most probable is this, that neither of these two authors thoroughly understood the other: Melancthon being imposed upon by the expressions of a proper substance, which Calvin everywhere affected, as we shall see; and Calvin, drawing to his own sense the words by which Melancthon separated the bread from the body of our Lord, yet without the design of derogating thereby from the substantial presence, which he owned in the faithful communicants.

If Peucer, Melancthon's son-in-law, may be believed, his father-in-law was a downright Calvinist. Peucer became one himself, and suffered greatly afterwards for his correspondence with Beza, in order to introduce Calvinism into

\* Lib. i. Ep. 70.

Saxony\*. He took a pride in following the sentiments of his father-in-law, and wrote books where he gives an account of what he had heard from him in private relating to this subject. But without impeaching Peucer's credit, it is no unlikely thing that he, in a matter they had so perplexed with equivocal expressions, might not have fully comprehended Melancthon's meaning; and for want of that, have adapted his words to his own preconceived opinions.

After all, to know what Melancthon thought one way or other, is to me of very small importance. Many Protestants in Germany, more interested in this cause than we are, have undertaken his defence; in whose behalf I shall only say, what candour and truth oblige me to, viz., that I have nowhere found in any of this author's writings, that Jesus Christ is not received, except by faith; which, howsoever, is the true characteristic of the figurative sense. Neither do I find that he has ever said, with those that maintain it, that the unworthy do not receive the true body and true blood; but, on the contrary, it appears to me that he persisted in what was determined on this subject in the Wittemberg agreement †.

40.—*Melancthon dares not speak.*

What we know for certain is, that through the fear Melancthon was in of increasing the scandalous divisions of the new Reformation, which he saw was quite void of all moderation, he scarce ventured to express himself but in terms so general, that each one might find in them whatever meaning he thought fit. The Sacramentarians did not suit him: the Lutherans ran all into ubiquity. Brentius, almost the only Lutheran he had maintained a perfect union with, went over to that side; this prodigy of doctrine spread insensibly through the whole sect. He would willingly have spoken, but knew not what to say; so great was the opposition he met with to what he believed was truth †. "Have I the power (said he) to unfold truth whole and entire in the country I am in, and would the court endure it?" To which he often added: "I will speak the truth when courts shall not prevent me."

It is true, it is the Sacramentarians that make him speak after this manner: but, besides that they produce his letters, which they pretend to have the originals of, one needs but

\* Peuc. narr. hist. de sent. Mel. It. hist. carcer. &c. † S. lib. iv. n. 23.

‡ Hosp. ad An. 1557. pp. 249, 250.



read those his friends have published, to see that these discourses, which pass for his, agree perfectly with that disposition which the implacable dissensions of the new Reformation had placed him in.

His son-in-law, who relates the facts with a great deal of simplicity, affirms he was so hated by the Ubiquitarians, that one time Chythræus, one of the most zealous of them, said, "They ought to make away with Melancthon, otherwise they should find in him a perpetual obstacle to their designs." He himself, in a letter he wrote to the Elector Palatine, which Peucer makes mention of\*, says, "That he would no longer dispute against men whose cruelties he did experience." And this was but a few months before his death. "How many times (says Peucer), and with how many sighs, hath he unfolded to me the reasons which hindered him from discovering to the world the bottom of his sentiments?" But what could constrain him in the court of Saxony, where he then was, and in the midst of Lutherans, but the court itself, and the violence of his companions?

#### 41.—*Melancthon's sad condition, and his Death.*

How deplorable a state, never to meet with peace, or truth, as he understood it! He had left the ancient Church, which had on her side succession, and all preceding ages. The Lutheran Church, which he and Luther had founded, and which he believed the only refuge of truth, embraced ubiquity, which he abhorred. The Sacramentarian churches, which, next to the Lutheran, he believed the most pure, were full of other errors he could not endure, and which, in all his confessions of faith, he had rejected. He was respected, as appeared, by the Church of Wittemberg; but the grievous restraints he lay under, and the measures he was bound to follow, prevented his speaking all he thought; and in this state he ended his miserable life in 1560.

#### 42.—*The Zuinglians condemned by the Lutherans, and the Catholics justified by this conduct.—1560.*

Illyricus and his companions triumphed upon his death; Ubiquity was established almost throughout all Lutheranism, and the Zuinglians were condemned by a Synod held at Jena, a town in Saxony†: till then, Melancthon had re-

\* Peuc. Hist. car. Ep. ad. Pal. ap. Hosp. 1559. 260. Peuc. Aulicus,

† Hosp. 1560. p. 269. 2. Def. cont. Westph.

strained them from pronouncing such a sentence. From the time it passed, nothing in all writings against the Zuinglians was spoken of, but the authority of the church, to which all were bound to yield without further dispute. The principal party of the new Reformation, the Lutherans, began to discover that nothing but church authority could curb men's minds and prevent divisions; and, indeed, we see Calvin\* never ceases to reproach them for laying greater stress on the name of the church than the very Papists did, and for going counter to the principles established by Luther. This was true, and the Lutherans, in their turn, were obliged to answer all the arguments which the Protestant party had opposed against the Catholic church and her council. They objected against the church, that she made herself judge in her own cause, and that the pope, with his bishops, were at one and the same time the accused, the accusers, and the judges. The Sacramentarians said as much of the Lutherans, by whom they stood condemned. The whole body of Protestants said to the church, that their pastors ought to take their place amongst the rest, in the council going to be held, and to judge on questions of faith; otherwise, it were pre-judging against them without a hearing. The Sacramentarians made the same reproach to the Lutherans, and maintained to them, that by taking on themselves the authority to condemn them without calling their pastors to the sitting, they began themselves to do that which they had called tyranny in the church of Rome†. It appeared evident that they must ultimately imitate the Catholic church, which alone knew the true method of judging questions of faith: nor did it appear less manifest, by the contradictions the Lutherans fell into upon following this method, that it did not belong to innovators, nor could subsist but in a body, which had practised it from the origin of Christianity.

43.—*Assembly of the Lutherans at Naumburg to agree about the Confession of Augsburg.*—1561.

It was resolved at this time to choose, among all the editions of the Augsburg Confession, that which should be deemed authentic‡. It was a surprising thing, that a confession which regulated the faith of all the Protestants in Germany and the whole North, and had given a name to the whole

\* Cal. Ep. p. 324, ad Ill. Germ. Prin. 2. Defens. cont. West. opusc. 286. Hosp. An. 1560. p. 269, et seq.

† Hosp. An. 1560. pp. 270, 871.

‡ Act. conv. Naum. ap. Hosp. 1561. p. 280, et seq.

party, should have been published so many ways, and with such considerable differences, at Wittemberg and elsewhere, under Luther and Melancthon's inspection, without any care taken to adjust these variations. At last, in 1561, thirty years after this confession was made, in order to silence the reproaches which were flung at Protestants, of not having as yet fixed a confession, they met at Naumburg, a city of Thuringia, and there selected an edition, but in vain, inasmuch as the other editions having been printed by public authority, they never could suppress them\*, nor hinder one from following one, others another, as we have elsewhere mentioned.

What is still more, the assembly of Naumburg, in choosing one edition, declared expressly, it was not thence to be concluded that they disapproved of all the rest, especially that which had been made at Wittemberg in 1540, under the inspection of Luther and Melancthon, which, besides, had been publicly made use of in the Lutheran schools, and in the conferences with Catholics.

Nay, it cannot even be decided which of these editions were preferred at Naumburg. It seems most probable to have been that which is printed with the consent of almost all the princes, and stands at the beginning of the book of Concord; but even that is not certain, since we have shewn four editions of the supper-article, equally owned in the same book †. Again, if the merit of good works was cut off from the Confession of Augsburg, we have found it remaining in the Apology; and that even is a proof of what was originally in the Confession, since it is certain that the Apology was made on no other account than to defend and explain it.

But the dissensions of the Protestants, on the sense of the Confession of Augsburg, were so far from being terminated at the assembly of Naumburg ‡, that on the contrary, Frederic the Elector Palatine, who was one of the members of it, believed, or would seem to believe, that he found in this Confession the Zuinglian doctrine he newly had embraced; so that he adhered to the Confession of Augsburg, and, not concerning himself about Luther, still remained a Zuinglian.

#### 44.—*Raillery of the Zuinglians.*

Thus, it seems, every thing was found in this Confession §. The jeering and malicious Zuinglians called it Pandora's box, whence issued forth good and evil; the apple of

\* S. l. iii.

† *Ibid.*

‡ Hosp. An. 1561. p. 281.

§ *Ibid.*

discord, among the goddesses; a shoe for every foot; a vast wide cloak which Satan might hide himself in, as well as Jesus Christ. These men had proverbs at their fingers' ends, and dealt them out not sparingly to ridicule the different senses that each one found in the Confession of Augsburg. Ubiquity was the only thing that could not be discovered in it; and yet this ubiquity became a dogma among the Lutherans, authentically inserted into the book of Concord.

45.—*Ubiquity established.*

Here is what we find in that part of the book which bears this title,—“An abridgment of articles controverted among the Divines of the Confession of Augsburg\*.” In the seventh chapter, entitled—Of the Lord's Supper:—“The right-hand of God is everywhere, and Jesus Christ is truly and effectually united to it according to his humanity.” And still more expressly in the eighth chapter, entitled—Of the Person of Jesus Christ,—wherein is explained what that Majesty is, which in the Scriptures is attributed to the word “incarnate:” there we read these words,—“Jesus Christ, not only as God, but also as man, knows all things; is able to do all things; is present to all creatures.” This is a strange doctrine. True it is, the Holy Soul of Jesus Christ can do all it will in the church, since it wills nothing but what the Divinity wills who governs it. True it is, this Holy Soul knows all that regards the world present, since all therein hath a relation to mankind, whereof Jesus Christ is the redeemer and judge, and the angels themselves, who are the ministers of our salvation, are subject to this power. True it is, Jesus Christ may render himself present where he pleases, even according to his humanity, and with respect to his body and blood; but that the soul of Jesus Christ knows, or can know, all that God knows, is attributing to a creature an infinite knowledge, or wisdom, and equalling it to God himself. To make the human nature of Jesus Christ be necessarily wherever God is, is giving it an immensity not suitable to it, and manifestly abusing the personal union; for it ought to be said by the same reason, that Jesus Christ, as man, is in all times, which would be too open an extravagancy, but, nevertheless, would follow as naturally from the personal union, according to the reasoning of the Lutherans, as the presence of Jesus Christ's humanity in all places.

\* Lib. Concor. p. 600.

46.—*Another declaration about Ubiquity, under the name of a repetition of the Confession of Augsburg.*

The same doctrine of ubiquity may be seen, but with more perplexity and a wider compass of words, in a part of this same book which bears this title\* :—“ A solid, easy, and clear Repetition of some Articles of the Augsburg Confession, which have been disputed on for some time by some Divines of this Confession, and are here decided and accorded by the rule and analogy of God’s word, and the brief form of our Christian doctrine.” Let who will expect from such a title the clearness and brevity it promises him ; for my part, I shall only observe two things on this word repetition† : the first, that although the doctrine of ubiquity, which is here established, be in no kind spoken of in the Augsburg Confession, this is called, nevertheless, “ a repetition of some articles of the Augsburg Confession.” They were afraid of making it appear that they were obliged to tack some new doctrine to it, and all the novelties they had breached were thus made to pass under the name of a repetition. The second, that it hath never been the luck of Protestants to have explained themselves aright the first time. They were always forced to come to repetitions, which, when all was said, were not a whit clearer than what went before.

47.—*The design of the Lutherans in setting up Ubiquity.*

To conceal no doctrine of the Lutherans of any importance in the book of Concord, I hold myself obliged to say, that they do not place ubiquity for the foundation of Jesus Christ’s Presence in the Supper : it is certain, on the contrary, that they make this Presence depend on the words of the institution only ; but they set up this ubiquity to stop the mouths of the Sacramentarians, who had ventured to say, that it was impossible for God to put Jesus Christ’s body in more than one place at once ; which appeared to them, not only contrary to the article of God’s Omnipotence, but also to the Majesty of Jesus Christ’s person.

48.—*Two memorable decisions of the Lutherans, on the co-operation of Free-will.*

We must now consider what the Lutherans say concerning the co-operation of the will with grace : so weighty a question in our controversies, that we cannot refuse it our attention.

\* Solida. plana, &c. Conc. p. 628.

† C. vii. de Cœna. p. 752, et seq. viii. de pers. Ch. p. 761, et seq. p. 782, et seq.

On this the Lutherans say two things, which will afford great light towards the finishing of our contests. I am going to propose them with as much order and clearness as I am able, and shall use my utmost endeavour to ease the reader's mind, which might be wearied with the subtilty of these questions.

49.—*Doctrine of the Lutherans, that we are without action in our conversion.*

The first thing the Lutherans do\* in order to explain the co-operation of the will with grace, is to distinguish the moment of conversion, from what ensues; and having taught, that man's co-operation hath no place in the conversion of a sinner, they add, that this co-operation ought only to be owned in the good works which we do afterwards.

I own, it is hard enough to comprehend what they would be at. For the co-operation, which they exclude from the moment of conversion, is explained in certain places after such a manner, as seems to exclude nothing †, but “the co-operation which is made by our own natural strength and of ourselves,” as St. Paul speaks. If it be so, we are agreed: but then we do not see what need there was of distinguishing betwixt the moment of conversion, and all that followed after, since man neither operates, nor co-operates through the whole sequel, any more than in the moment of conversion, but by the grace of God. Nothing, therefore, is more ridiculous than to say with the Lutherans ‡, that in the moment of conversion man acts no more than a stone or clay, since it cannot be denied, but in the moment of conversion he begins to repent, to believe, to hope, to love by a true action, which a log or stone can nowise do. And it is plain, that a man who repents, who believes, and loves perfectly, repents, believes, and loves with more force, but not in the main after another manner, than when he begins to repent, to believe, and to love: so that, in one and the other state, if the Holy Ghost operates, man co-operates with him, and subjects himself to his grace, by an act of the will.

50.—*The confusion and contradiction of the Lutheran doctrine.*

In effect, it seems that the Lutherans, in concluding for the co-operation of free-will, would exclude that only which is attributed to our own strength. “When Luther,” say they,

\* Con. pp. 582, 673, 680, 681, 692. † Pp. 656, 662, 668, 674, 678, 680, et seq.  
‡ Ibid. p. 662.

“ affirms that the will is purely passive, and in nowise acts in the conversion, his intention was not to say that no new motion was excited in our souls, and no new operation therein begun; but only to give to understand, that man can do nothing of himself, or by his own natural strength\*.”

This was setting out well; but what follows is not of a piece. For after saying, what is very true, “ That man’s conversion is an operation and gift of the Holy Ghost, not in any of its parts only, but in the whole, they conclude very preposterously, that the Holy Ghost acts in our understanding, our heart, and our will, as in a subject that suffers, man abiding without action, purely passive.”

This bad conclusion, which they draw from a true principle, makes it plain they do not understand themselves; for, after all, what seems to be their meaning is, that man can do nothing of himself, and that grace anticipates him in all, which, I say again, is incontestable. But if it follow from this principle, that we remain without action, this consequence reaches not only the moment of conversion, as the Lutherans pretend, but extends itself also, contrary to their notions, to the whole Christian life, since we can no more preserve grace by our own strength, than acquire it, and whatever state we are in, it anticipates us in everything.

*51.—Conclusion.—If we understand one another, there remains no dispute about co-operation.*

I know not, then, what the Lutherans mean when they say, it must not be believed, that “ man converted, co-operates with the Holy Ghost, as two horses concur to draw a cart †;” for that is a truth which no one disputes with them, since one of these horses receives not the strength he has from the other: whereas, we agree that man co-operating hath no strength which is not given him by the Holy Ghost; and that nothing is more true than what the Lutherans say in the same place ‡, viz., “ When you co-operate with grace, it is not by your own natural powers, but by new powers which the Holy Ghost bestows upon you.”

Thus, the least right understanding between us clears this point of all shadow of difficulty. When the Lutherans teach, that our will does not act in the beginning of conversion, they only mean to say, that God excites good motions in us, which, though in us, are not from ourselves: the thing is

\* Con., p. 680.

† Ibid. p. 674.

‡ Ibid.

unquestionable, and it is what is called exciting grace. If they will say, that the will, when consenting to grace, and, by this means, beginning to convert itself, acts not by its own natural strength, this again is a point avowed by Catholics. If they will say, it acts not at all, but is purely passive, they do not understand themselves, and, contrary to their own principles, destroy all action and co-operation, not only in the beginning of conversion, but also through the whole course of a Christian life.

52.—*The objection of Libertines, and the difficulty of weak Christians, concerning co-operation.*

The second thing which the Lutherans teach, concerning the co-operation of the will, deserves to be observed, because it discovers to us what a labyrinth man bewilders himself in when he forsakes his guide.

The book of Concord strives to clear the following objection raised by libertines on the foundation of Lutheran doctrine\*. “If it be true,” say they, “as is taught amongst you, that the will of man hath no part in the conversion of sinners, but the Holy Ghost does all therein, I have no occasion either to read or hear sermons, or frequent the Sacraments, but will wait till the Holy Ghost sends me his gifts.”

This same doctrine involved the faithful in great perplexities: for as they were taught, that as soon as ever the Holy Ghost acted in them, he alone wrought upon them in such a manner, that they had nothing at all to do; all those, who did not feel this ardent faith within them, but rather nothing, only misery and weakness, fell into these dismal thoughts, this dangerous doubtfulness—Am I of the number of God’s elect, and will God ever send me his Holy Spirit?

53.—*The Lutherans’ solution grounded on eight propositions, the four first containing general principles.*

In answer to these doubts of libertines and weak Christians, who deferred their conversion, there was no saying to them that they resisted the Holy Ghost, whose grace interiorly solicited them to yield themselves up to him; since they were told, on the contrary, that in these first moments of a sinner’s conversion, the Holy Ghost did all himself, and a man acted no more than a log of wood. Wherefore, they take another method to make sinners comprehend that it is their fault if

\* Con., p. 669.



they be not converted, and, in order to that, they lay down these positions :—

“ I\*. God wills that all men be converted, and attain to eternal salvation.

“ II. For that end he hath commanded the Gospel to be preached in public.

“ III. Preaching is the means whereby God gathers together from amongst mankind a Church, the duration whereof has no end.

“ IV. Preaching and hearing the Gospel are the instruments of the Holy Ghost, whereby he acts effectually in us, and converts us.”

Having laid down these four general positions touching the efficacy of preaching, they apply them to the conversion of a sinner, by four other more particular ones, viz.—

54.—*Four other propositions in order to apply the first.*

“ V†. Before ever a man is regenerated, he may read, or hear the Gospel outwardly; and in these exterior things he hath, in some manner, his free-will to assist at Church assemblies, and there to hear, or not to hear, the word of God.

“ VI. They add to this : that by this preaching, and by the attention given to it, God mollifies hearts; a little spark of faith is inkindled in them, whereby the promises of Jesus Christ are embraced, and the Holy Ghost, who works these good sentiments, is, by this means, sent into the hearts of men.

“ VII. They observe, that, although it be true that neither the preacher nor the hearer can do anything of themselves, and that it is necessary for the Holy Ghost to act in us, to the end we may believe the word; yet neither the preacher nor the hearer ought to have any doubt of the Holy Ghost's being present by his grace, when the word is denounced in its purity according to God's commandment, and men give ear to, and meditate seriously thereon.

“ VIII. Lastly, they conclude that, in truth, this presence and these gifts of the Holy Ghost do not always make themselves be felt, yet, nevertheless, it ought to be held for certain that the word hearkened to is the instrument of the Holy Ghost, whereby he displays his efficacy in the hearts of men.”

55.—*The resolution of the Lutherans grounded on the eight preceding propositions, is downright Demipelagian.*

By this way, therefore, the whole difficulty, according to them, is clearly solved,\* as well in regard to libertines as weak Christians. In regard to libertines, because by the first, second, third, fourth, sixth, and seventh propositions, preaching, attentively given ear to, operates grace. Now, by the fifth, it is laid down that man is free to hear preaching; he is, therefore, free to give to himself that, by which grace is given him, and so libertines are content. And for weak Christians, who although attentive to the word, know not whether they be in grace, inasmuch as they do not feel it; there is a remedy for their doubt from the eighth proposition, which teaches them that it is not lawful to doubt but the grace of the Holy Ghost, though not felt, does accompany attention to the word: so that there remains no difficulty, according to the Lutheran principles, and neither the libertine nor weak Christian have anything to complain of; since, for their conversion, all, in short, depends on attention to the word, the which itself depends on the free-will.

56.—*A proof of the Lutherans' Demipelagianism.*

And that it may not be doubted what attention it is they speak of, I observe they speak of attention,\* inasmuch as it precedes the grace of the Holy Ghost: they speak of attention, applied by the free-will to hear or not to hear; they speak of attention, whereby one gives ear externally to the Gospel, whereby one assists at Church assemblies,† where the virtue of the Holy Ghost displays itself, whereby an attentive ear is given to the word, which is his organ. It is this free-attention to which the Lutherans annex divine grace; and they are excessive in everything, since they will have it on one hand, when the Holy Ghost begins to move us, that we do not act at all; on the other, that this operation of the Holy Ghost, which converts us without any co-operation on our side, is attracted necessarily by an act of our will, in which the Holy Ghost has no part, and wherein our liberty acts purely by its natural strength.

57.—*Semipelagianism of the Lutherans.—An example proposed by Calixtus†.*

This is the current doctrine of the Lutherans, and the most

\* Con., p. 671.

† Calixt. judic. n. 32, 33, 34.

learned of all of them, that have written in our days, has explained it by this comparison. He supposes, all mankind plunged into a deep lake, on the surface of which God has provided a salutary oil to swim, which by its virtue alone will deliver all these wretches, provided they will use the natural strength that is left them to draw near to this oil, and swallow but some drops of it. This oil is the word announced by preachers. Men of themselves may apply their attention to it; but as soon as they approach by their natural strength, in order to listen thereto, of itself, without their further intermeddling, it diffuses a virtue in their hearts which heals them.

58.—*The confusion of the new Sects passing from one extremity to the other.*

Thus all the vain scruples, which made the Lutherans, under pretext of honouring God, at first destroy free-will, and afterwards grow fearful at least of allowing too much to it, end at last in giving to it so great power, that to its action, and the most natural exercise of it, all is annexed. This it is to walk without rule, the rule of tradition once forsaken: they think to avoid the error of Pelagians, but, winding about, they return to it, another way, and the compass they take brings them back to Demipelagianism.

59.—*The Calvinists come into the Semipelagianism of the Lutherans.*

This Demipelagianism of the Lutherans, by little and little, spreads even to Calvinism, from the inclination that party hath of uniting itself with the Lutherans; in whose favour they have begun to say already, that Demipelagianism does not damn, that is, there is no harm in attributing to free-will the beginning of salvation\*.

60.—*A difficulty in the book of Concord, concerning the certainty of Salvation.*

I find, moreover, another thing in the book of Concord†, which, were it not well understood, might cause a great confusion in the Lutheran doctrine. It is there said, that the faithful, in the midst of their weaknesses and combats, “ought by no means to doubt either of the justice which is

\* Jur. Syst. de l'Ég. lib. ii. ch. iii. pp. 249, 253.

† Con., p. 585.

imputed to them by faith, or of their eternal salvation."• Whereby it might seem that Lutherans admit the certainty of their salvation as well as Calvinists. But this would be too visible a contradiction in their doctrine, since, to believe the certainty of salvation, in every one of the faithful, as the Calvinists believe, they ought also to believe, with them, the inamissibility of justice, which, as hath been seen, the Lutheran doctrine expressly rejects.

61.—*A solution from the doctrine of Doctor John Andrew Gerard*

To adjust this contrariety, the Lutheran Doctors answer two things: one, that by the doubt of salvation, which they exclude from the faithful soul, they understood nothing but the anxiety, agitation, and trouble, which we exclude as well as they\*; the other, that the certainty they admit in all the just, is not an absolute certainty, but conditional, and supposes that the faithful soul does not depart from God by voluntary wickedness. The matter is thus explained by Doctor John Andrew Gerard, who has published lately an entire body of controversy; the meaning of which is, that, in the Lutheran doctrine, the believer may rest fully assured that God on his side will never be wanting to him, if he be not first wanting to God—a thing not to be doubted of. To give the just more certainty, is too evidently contradicting that doctrine which teaches us that, be we never so just, we may fall from justice, and lose the spirit of adoption; a point as little questioned by Lutherans as Catholics.

62.—*A brief Account of the book of Concord.*

Since the book of Concord has been compiled, I take it the Lutherans in body have never made any new decision of faith. The parts of which this book is composed are from different authors and of different dates; and the Lutherans' design was to give us in this collection what is most authentic amongst them. The book came out in 1579, after the famous assemblies held at Torg and Berg in 1576 and 1577. This last place, if I am not mistaken, was a monastery near Magdeburg. I shall not relate in what manner this book was subscribed in Germany, nor the tricks and force which, as is reported, were put on those who received it, nor the oppo-

\* Conf. Cath. 1679, Lib. ii. Part iii. Art. 22. c. 2. Thesi. iii. n. 2, 3, 4, and Art. xxiii. c. 5. Thesi. unic. n. 6. pp. 1426 et 1499.

sitions of some princes and cities who refused to sign it. Hospinian\* has written a long history of it, which appears well enough grounded as to the chief of its facts. Let the Lutherans who are concerned therein, contradict it. The particular decisions, which relate to the Supper and Ubiquity, were made near the time of Melancthon's death, viz. about the years 1558, 1559, 1560, and 1561.

63.—*The troubles in France begin.—Confession of Faith drawn by Calvin.*

These years are famous amongst us for the beginnings of our disturbances in France. In the year 1559, our pretended Reformists drew up a confession of faith, which they presented to Charles IX. in 1561, at the Conference of Poissy†. This was one of Calvin's productions, whom I have often already spoken of; and the reflections I must make on this confession of faith, oblige me to set forth more thoroughly the conduct and doctrine of this its author.

\* Hosp. Concord. discors. imp. 1607.

† Bez. Hist. Ecc. l. iv. p. 520.

## BOOK IX.

In the Year 1561, Calvin's Doctrine and Character.

A brief Summary.—Protestants begin to appear in France.—Calvin is their head.—His notions concerning Justification, wherein he reasons more consequently than the Lutherans; but, grounding himself upon false principles, falls into more manifest difficulties.—Three absurdities by him added to the Lutheran doctrine.—The certainty of salvation, inamissibility of justice.—Infant justification independently of Baptism.—Contradictions on this third point.—In respect to the Eucharist, he equally condemns Luther and Zuinglius, and aims at a medium between both.—He proves the necessity of admitting the Real Presence, beyond what he does in fact admit.—Strong expressions for maintaining it.—Other expressions which destroy it.—The pre-eminence of Catholic doctrine.—Those who impugn it are forced to speak our language and assume our principles.—Three different Confessions of the Calvinists to satisfy three different sorts of people, the Lutherans, the Zuinglians, and themselves.—Calvin's pride and passion.—His genius compared with that of Luther.—The reason why he did not appear at the Conference of Poissy.—There Beza presents the Protestants' Confession of Faith: they tack to it a new and long explication of their doctrine about the Eucharist.—The Catholics express themselves intelligibly and in few words.—What happened with relation to the Augsburg Confession.—Calvin's sentiments.

1.—*Calvin's genius.—He subtilizes more than Luther.*

CALVIN's genius possibly might not have been so well adapted as Luther's was to excite people, and inflame their minds: but after these commotions were once set on foot, he raised himself in many countries, in France especially, above even Luther himself, and became the head of a party, which yields but little to that of Luther.

By the penetration of his wit, and the boldness of his decisions, he refined upon, and outstript all his contemporary builders of new churches, and new-reformed the but new Reformation.

2.—*Two capital points of the Reformation.*—*Calvin's refinements on both of them.*

The two points they laid the main stresses upon, were Justification and the Eucharist.

As for justification, Calvin looking upon it as the common foundation of Protestancy, adhered to it at least equally with Luther, but grafted on it three important articles.

3.—*Three things added by Calvin to imputed justice.*—*First, the certainty of salvation.*

In the first place, that certainty which Luther owned for justification only, was by Calvin extended to eternal salvation; that is to say, whereas Luther required no more of the faithful than to believe with an infallible certainty that they were justified; Calvin, besides this certainty of justification, required the like of their eternal predestination: insomuch that a perfect Calvinist can no more doubt of his being saved, than a perfect Lutheran of his being justified\*.

4.—*A memorable Confession of Faith made by Frederick III., Elector Palatine.*

So that, were a Calvinist to make his particular confession of faith, he would put in this article, "I am assured of my salvation." We have an example of it. In the Collection of Geneva stands the confession of Prince Frederic III., Count Palatine, and Elector of the Empire. This Prince explaining his creed, after setting forth how he believes in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, when he comes to explain how he believes the Catholic Church, says, "That he believes that God never ceases gathering it together, by his word and Holy Ghost out of the mass of all mankind; and that he believes he is of that number, and ever shall be a living member of it †." He adds, he believes "That God being appeased by the satisfaction of Jesus Christ will not remember any of his sins, nor all the wickedness with which I shall (says he) go on combating through the whole course

\* Sup. l. iii. n. 38. Instit. l. 3. 2. n. 16. &c. 24. c. Antid. Con. Trid. in Sess. vi. cap. 13, 14. opusc. p. 185.

† Synt. Gen. part ii. pp. 149, 156.

of my life ; but that he will gratuitously give me the justice of Jesus Christ, insomuch that *I have no reason to apprehend the judgments of God.* Lastly, I know most certainly (continues he) that I shall be saved, and shall appear with a cheerful countenance before the tribunal of Jesus Christ." There spoke a true Calvinist, and these are the true sentiments inspired by Calvin's doctrine, which this Prince had embraced.

5.—*The second Dogma by Calvin added to imputed justice, viz. That it never can be lost.*

Thence followed a second dogma, that whereas Luther allowed that a justified believer might fall from grace, as we have observed in the Ausburg Confession, Calvin maintains, on the contrary, that grace once received can never be lost : so that, whoever is justified and receives the Holy Ghost is justified, and receives the Holy Ghost for ever. For which reason the aforesaid Palatine placed amongst the articles of faith, that "he was a living and perpetual member of the church." This is the dogma called the inamissibility of justice ; namely, that doctrine by which it is believed that justice once received never can be lost. This word hath such a sanction from its universal use on this subject, that to avoid multiplying words we must accustom our ears to it.

6.—*The third Dogma of Calvin : viz. That Baptism is not necessary to salvation.*

There was also a third dogma, which Calvin established as a corollary from imputed justice, viz. that baptism could not be necessary to salvation, as the Lutherans maintain.

7.—*Calvin's reasons drawn from Luther's principles ; and first with respect to the certainty of Salvation.*

Calvin was of opinion that the Lutherans could not reject these tenets, without destroying their own principles. They require of the believer to be absolutely assured of his justification, as soon as he asks it, and to trust in the divine goodness, because, according to them, neither his prayer nor trust can admit of the least doubt. Now, prayer and trust regard salvation no less than justification and forgiveness of sins ; for we pray for our salvation, and hope to obtain it as much, as we pray for the forgiveness of sins, and hope to obtain it : therefore we are as much assured of the one as of the other.



8.—*With respect to the inamissibility of justice.*

If, then, we believe, that we cannot miss of salvation, we must also believe we cannot fall from grace, and must reject the Lutherans who teach the contrary.

9.—*Against the necessity of Baptism.*

Again, if we are justified by faith alone, Baptism is neither necessary in fact nor desire. For which reason Calvin will not admit that it works in us forgiveness of sins, or infusion of grace, but is a seal only, and token, that we have received them.

10.—*The consequence from this Doctrine, that the Children of the Faithful are born in Grace.*

It is certain, that whosoever says these things ought also to say that infants enjoy grace independently of baptism. Nor did Calvin make any difficulty of owning it. This made him broach that novelty, viz., that the children of the faithful were born in the Covenant, that is, in that sanctity, which baptism did no more than seal in them; an unheard-of doctrine in the church, but necessary for Calvin, in order to support his principles. "

11.—*A passage by which Calvin upholds this new Dogma.*

The foundation of this doctrine, according to him, is in that promise made to Abraham, I will be "thy God, and the God of thy seed after thee." Calvin maintained\* that the new alliance, no less efficacious than the old, ought, for this reason, to pass like that from father to son, and be transmitted the same way; whence he concluded that, the substance of baptism, that is, its grace and covenant, "appertaining to infants, the sign of it could not be refused them; to wit, the Sacrament of baptism;" a doctrine by him held so certain, that he inserted it into his Catechism in the same terms I have now worded it, and in full as strong, into the form of administering baptism.

12.—*Why Calvin is looked upon as the Author of the three precedent Dogmata.*

When I name Calvin as the author of these three tenets, I do not mean to say he was the first that ever taught them;

\* Inst. iv. xv. n. 22, xvi. 3, &c. 9. Gen. xvii. 7. Dom. 50.

for the Anabaptists, and others, too, had maintained them<sup>o</sup> before, either in the whole, or in part; but I only say he gave them a new turn, and showed better than any one else the conformity they have with imputed justice.

13.—*Supposing these principles, Calvin reasoned better than Luther, but went further astray.*

For my part, I cannot help thinking that, in these three articles, Calvin argued more consequently than Luther; but withal, run himself into greater difficulties, as must necessarily happen to those who reason on false principles.

14.—*Difficulties attending the certainty of Salvation.*

If, in Luther's doctrine, a great difficulty result from man's being assured of his justification, there is a much greater one, and which exposes human weakness to a more dangerous temptation, in being assured of his Salvation.

15.—*Difficulties attending Calvin's inamissibility of justice.*

Nay, by saying the Holy Ghost and justice can no more be lost than faith, you oblige the faithful, once justified, and persuaded of their justification, to believe, that no crime, be it ever so great, can cause them to fall from this grace.

In fact, Calvin maintained \*, that, "upon losing the fear of God, faith, which justifies us, is not lost." The terms he made use of were indeed extraordinary: for he said, faith "was overwhelmed, buried, smothered; that the possession of it was lost, that is to say, the feeling and knowledge of it." But after all this he added, "it was not extinct."

An uncommon subtilty is requisite, to reconcile all these words of Calvin; but the truth is, willing as he was to maintain his tenet, he could not but allow something to that horror in man, of owning justifying faith in a soul that has lost the fear of God, and fallen into the worst of crimes.

16.—*Difficulty of that doctrine which teaches that Children are born in Grace.*

If to these three points you join also that doctrine which teaches that the children of the faithful bring grace with them into the world at their birth, what a horror must this raise! it following necessarily from thence, that<sup>o</sup> the whole posterity of every true believer is predestinated! The

\* Ant. Conc. Trid. in Sess. 6. c. 16. opusc. p. 288.

demonstration is obvious, according to Calvin's principles. Whosoever is born of a believer, is born in the covenant, and consequently, in grace; whosoever has once had grace, can never lose it; if he has it not only for himself, but also necessarily transmits it to his whole posterity, we have then grace extended to infinite generations. If so much as one true believer be found in a whole lineage, all the descendants of this person are predestinated. If so much as one be found to die a reprobate, it must be concluded that all his ancestors were damned.

17.—*Luther not less to be condemned for establishing these principles, than Calvin for drawing these consequences.*

But the horrid consequences of Calvin's doctrine condemn no less the Lutherans than the Calvinists; and if these last are not to be excused for running themselves into such dreadful straits, the former are not less blameworthy for laying down the principles, whence such consequences so clearly follow.

18.—*Whether these three Dogmata are to be found in the Confessions of Faith.*

Notwithstanding that the Calvinists have embraced these three dogmata, as a ground-work of the Reformation, the respect they have for the Lutherans, if I am not mistaken, has been the cause that, in their confessions of faith\*, they rather insinuated than expressly established the two first tenets, namely, the certainty of salvation, and the inmissibility of justice. An authentic declaration of them was nowhere made, properly speaking, till in the Synod of Dort; it shall appear in its own place. As for the dogma, which owns, in the children of the faithful, grace inseparable from their birth, we find it in the Catechism which I have quoted verbatim, and in the form of administering baptism.

19.—*Two dogmata of the Calvinists relating to Children, little conformable to their principles.*

However, I will not aver that Calvin and the Calvinists are very steadfast in this last tenet. For although they say on the one hand, that the children of the faithful are born in the covenant, and the seal of grace, which is baptism, is not due

\* Conf. de Fr. Art. 18—22. Cat. Dim. 18—20. Cat. Dim. 50. Forme du Bapt. 5. v. 11.

to them, but because the thing itself, namely, grace and regeneration, is acquired to them by their being happily born of faithful parents; it appears on the other hand, they will not allow that the children of the faithful are always regenerated when they receive baptism, and this for two reasons: the first, because, according to their maxims, the seal of baptism hath not its effect with regard to the predestinated; the second, because the seal of baptism works not always a present effect, even with regard to the predestinated, since such a person may have been baptized in his infancy who was not regenerated till old age.

20.—*Agreement with those of Geneva.*—1554.

These two doctrinal points are taught by Calvin in several places\*, but particularly in the agreement he made in 1554, between the church of Geneva and that of Zurich. This agreement contains the doctrine of both these churches; and being received by both, it has the full authority of a confession of faith, insomuch that the two aforesaid points of doctrine being there expressly taught, they may be reckoned among the articles of faith of the Calvinian church.

21.—*Contradictions in the Calvinist doctrine.*

It is then plain, this church teaches two things that are contradictory. The first, that the children of the faithful are certainly born in the covenant and in grace, which implies a necessary obligation of giving them baptism: the second, that it is not certain they are born in the covenant or in grace, since no one knows whether he be of the number of the predestinated.

22.—*Another contradiction.*

There is besides a great inconsistency in saying, on the one side, that Baptism, of itself, is a certain sign of grace, and on the other, that many of those who receive it without putting any obstacle on their part to the grace it offers them (as in the case of infants), yet receive from it no effect. But leaving to Calvinists the trouble of reconciling their own jarring tenets, I rest satisfied with relating what I find in their confessions of faith.

\* Con. Tigur. et Genev. Art. 17, 20. opusc. Cal. p. 754. H. sp. An. 1554.

23.—*Calvin's refinement on the other point of the Reformation, which is that of the Eucharist.*

Hitherto Calvin soared above the Lutherans, but fell withal much lower than they had done. On the subject of the Eucharist, he not only raised himself above them, but also above the Zuinglians, and, by the same sentence, condemned both parties, which, for so long a time, had divided the whole Reformation.

24.—*Calvin's Treatise in order to shew that, after fifteen years disputing, the Lutherans and Zuinglians had not understood one another.*

They had disputed for fifteen years successively on the article of the Real Presence without ever being able to agree, whatever could be done to reconcile them, when Calvin\*, then but young, made himself umpire, and decided that they had not understood each other, and that the heads of both parties were in the wrong; Luther, for too much pressing the corporeal Presence: Zuinglius and Ocolampadius, for not having sufficiently expressed that the thing itself, *i. e.*, the Body and Blood, were joined to the sign; a certain Presence of Jesus Christ in the Supper, which they had not sufficiently comprehended, being to be acknowledged.

25.—*Calvin, already known by his Institutions, makes himself more considerable by his Treatise on the Supper.*

This work of Calvin's was printed in French in 1540, and afterwards translated into Latin by the author himself. He had already gained a great repute by his Institutions, which he published, for the first time, in 1534, and which after that he made frequent editions of, with considerable additions, being extremely particular in pleasing himself, as he says in his prefaces. But men's eyes were more turned upon him, when they saw one, so little advanced in age, undertake to condemn the Chiefs of both parties of the Reformation, and the whole world was big with expectation of the novelty he was going to produce.

26.—*Calvin's doctrine about the Eucharist almost forgotten by his followers.*

This is, indeed, one of the most memorable points of the new

\* Tract. de Cœn. Dom. opusc. p. 1.

Reform, and deserves the more to be considered, the more it seems forgotten by the Calvinists now-a-days, although it makes one of the most essential parts of their confession of faith.

27.—*Calvin is not content with receiving a sign in the Supper.*

If Calvin had only said, that the signs in the Eucharist are not empty, or that the union we there have with Jesus Christ is effective and real, and not imaginary, this would be nothing: we have seen that Zuinglius and Oecolampadius, whom Calvin was not quite satisfied with, had said altogether as much as that in their writings. The graces we receive by the Eucharist, and the merits of Jesus Christ applied to us therein, suffice to make us understand, that, in this Sacrament, the signs are not empty, and none ever hath denied but the fruit we gather from it is very real.

28.—*Not even an efficacious sign.*

The difficulty then lay, not in discovering to us how grace, united to the sacrament, became an efficacious sign, and full of virtue, but in shewing how the Body and Blood were effectually communicated to us in this Sacrament: for this was the thing peculiar to this Sacrament, and what all Christians were accustomed to look for in it, by virtue of the words of the institution.

29.—*Nor the virtue and merit of Jesus Christ.*

To say that, together with the figure, the virtue and merit of Jesus Christ were in it received by faith, was what had been so fully said by Zuinglius and Oecolampadius, that Calvin could have found nothing wanting in their doctrine, had he not required something more than this.

30.—*Calvin's doctrine partakes something of that of Bucer and the articles of Wittemberg.*

Bucer, whom he acknowledged, in some measure, for his master, by confessing, as he had done at the Wittemberg agreement, a Substantial Presence common to all communicants, worthy and unworthy, thereby established a Real Presence independent of faith, and had endeavoured to come up to the idea of reality, with which the words of our Saviour naturally fill the mind. But Calvin thought he said too much\*; and although he approved of producing to the Lu-

\* Ep. ad Illust. Princ. Germ. p. 324.

therans the articles of Wittenberg, in order to shew that the quarrel relating to the Eucharist was concluded by them, yet he did not, in his heart, abide by this decision. Wherefore, he borrowed something from Bucer and this agreement, and modelling it after his own fashion, endeavoured to strike out a new system peculiar to himself.

31.—*The state of the question resumed.—The sentiments of the Catholics on these words, “This is my Body.”*

To understand the principle of it, it will be necessary to trace back in a few words the state of the question, and not fear repeating something of what has been already said on this subject. The matter in question was to know the sense of these words, “This is my Body, this is my Blood.” Catholics maintained, the design of our Saviour was thereby to give us his Body and Blood to eat, as, in the old law, the flesh of the victims, sacrificed for the people, was given to them.

As this manducation was to the ancients a sign that the victim was theirs, and that they partook of the sacrifice; so the Body and Blood of our Saviour, sacrificed for us, being given us to take by the mouth with the Sacrament, are to us a sign that they are ours, and that it was for us the Son of God made a sacrifice of them on the cross.

To the end that this pledge of the love of Jesus Christ might be certain and efficacious, it was requisite we should not only have the merits, the spirit, and the virtue, but also the proper substance of the sacrificed victim, and that it should be as truly given us to eat, as the flesh of the victims had been given in the Jewish dispensation.

Thus were these words understood, “This is my Body given for you, this is my Blood shed for you\*,” viz. This is as truly my Body, as it is true this Body was given for you; and as truly my Blood, as it is true this Blood was shed for you. By the same reason, it was understood that the substance of this flesh and blood was given to us nowhere but in the Eucharist, since Jesus Christ said nowhere else “This is my Body, this is my Blood.”

Now, we receive Jesus Christ many ways through the whole course of our lives, by his grace, by his illuminations, by his Holy Spirit, by his Omnipotent virtue; but this singular manner of receiving him, in the proper and true substance of his Body and Blood, was peculiar to the Eucharist.

Thus was the Eucharist looked upon as a new miracle,

\* Matt. xxvi. 26, 28; Luke xxii. 29; 1 Cor. xi. 24.

which confirmed to us all the others which God hath wrought for our salvation. A human body, whole and entire, given in so many places, to so many people, under the species of bread, was enough to startle every mind, and we have already seen, that the Fathers made use of the most surprising effects of the Divine Omnipotence, to explain this by.

32.—*What Faith does in this mystery.—The sentiment of Catholics concerning these words, “Do this in remembrance of me.”*

Little would have availed so great a miracle wrought in our behalf, had not God afforded us the means of reaping advantage from it, and this we could not hope for, but by faith.

This mystery was, nevertheless, like all the rest, independent of faith. Believe or not believe it, Jesus Christ took flesh, Jesus Christ died, and offered himself a sacrifice for us; and by the same reason, whether we believe it or no, Jesus Christ does give us the substance of his Body to be eaten in the Eucharist; for it was requisite he should, by that, confirm to us that it was for us he took it, and for us he sacrificed it: the tokens of the divine love, in themselves, are independent of our faith; our faith is only requisite to receive the benefit of them.

At the same time that we receive this precious earnest, certifying to us that Jesus Christ sacrificed is wholly ours, we must apply our minds to this inestimable testimony of the divine love. And as the ancients, eating the sacrificed victim, were to eat it as sacrificed, and remember the oblation, which had been made to God, in sacrifice for them; those likewise who, at the holy table, receive the substance of the body and blood of the lamb immaculate, must receive it as sacrificed, and call to mind that the Son of God had made a sacrifice of it to his Father, for the salvation, not only of the whole world in general, but also of each one of the faithful in particular; for which reason, when he said, “This is my body, this is my blood \*!” he subjoined immediately after, “This do in remembrance of me;” that is, as the sequel makes appear, in remembrance of me sacrificed for you, and of that immense charity which made me lay down my life for your redemption, conformably to the saying of St. Paul, “ye shall shew the Lord’s death until he come †.”

We must therefore be very careful not to receive only the sacred body of our Saviour into our bodies: we must also

\* Luke xxii. 19; 1 Cor. xi. 24, 25.

† 1 Cor. xi. 26.



‘unite ourselves to it in mind, and remember that he gives us his body, to the end that we may have a certain pledge that this sacred victim is wholly ours. But whilst we stir up this pious reflection in our minds, we ought to enter into the sentiments of an affectionate acknowledgment to our Saviour; and this is ‘the only means of perfectly enjoying this inestimable pledge of our<sup>s</sup> salvation.

33.—*In what manner the possessing of Christ’s body is spiritual and permanent.*

And although the actual reception of this body and blood be not allowed us but in certain moments, namely, in communion, our thankfulness is not confined to so short a time; and the having received this sacred pledge at certain moments, is enough to perpetuate the spiritual enjoyment of so great a good through all the moments of our lives. For though the actual reception of the body and blood be but momentary, yet the right we have to receive it is perpetual; like to that sacred right one has over another by the bond of marriage. Thus the mind and body unite themselves to enjoy their Saviour, and the adorable substance of his body and blood; but as the union of bodies is the foundation, that of minds is the perfection of so great a work. Whoever, therefore, does not unite himself in mind to Jesus Christ, whose sacred body he receives, enjoys not as he ought so great a gift: like to those brutal and treacherous spouses who unite bodies without uniting hearts.

34.—*The body and mind must be united to Jesus Christ.*

Jesus Christ wishes to find in us that love with which he abounds at his approach. When he finds it not, the union of bodies is not less real; but, instead of being fruitful, it is odious and insulting to the Son of God. Those who draw near to his body without this lively faith, are “the crowd that press him;” those that have this faith are the sick woman “that touches him\*.” All touch him, rigorously speaking; but those who touch him without faith, press and importune him: those who, not content with touching him, look upon this touch of his flesh as an earnest of that virtue which goes out of him unto those who love him, touch him truly, because they touch alike his heart and body.

This it is which makes the difference between those who

\* Mark v. 30, 31. Luke viii. 45, 46.

communicate, discerning, or not discerning, the body of the Lord; receiving, with the body and blood, the grace which accompanies them naturally, or rendering themselves guilty of the sacrilegious attempt to profane them. By this means, Jesus Christ, exercises on all that almightiness given to him in heaven and on earth, applying to himself, to some as a Saviour, to others as a rigorous Judge.

35.—*The precise state of the question laid down from the precedent doctrine.*

This is what was necessary to be re-considered concerning the mystery of the Eucharist, in order to understand what I have now to say; and it is plain, the state of the question is, to know, on the one hand, whether the gift which Jesus Christ bestows upon us in the Eucharist of his body and blood be a mystery, like the rest, independent of faith in its substance, and only requiring faith to profit by it; or, whether the whole mystery consist in the union we have with Jesus Christ by faith alone, without anything else intervening on his part but spiritual promises, figured by the Sacrament, and announced by the word. By the first of these sentiments, the real and substantial presence is established; by the second, it is denied that Jesus Christ is in any way united to us, except in figure in the Sacrament, and in spirit by faith.

36.—*Calvin seeks to reconcile Luther and Zuinglius.*

We have seen that Luther, whatever design he might have to reject the Substantial Presence, had from the words of our Saviour so strong an impression of it, that he never could give it up. We have seen that Zuinglius and Œcolampadius, disheartened at the impenetrable loftiness of a mystery so far raised above our senses, could never enter into it. Calvin, urged on the one side with the impression of reality, and on the other with the difficulties which thwart our senses, seeks a middle way, difficult enough to make agree in all its parts.

37.—*How strongly Calvin speaks of the reality.*

In the first place, he admits\* that we really partake of the true body and blood of Jesus Christ; and this he expressed with such energy, that the Lutherans almost believed he sided with them: for he repeats a hundred and a hundred times,

\* Instit. lib. iv. c. 17. n. 17, &c. Diluc. Expos. Adm. cont. Westp. int. opusc. &c.

that " Truth must be given us, together with the signs, that *under these signs* we truly receive the body and blood of Jesus Christ; that the flesh of Jesus Christ is *distributed* in the Sacrament; that it penetrates us; that we are partakers, not only of the spirit of Jesus Christ, but also of his flesh; that we have the proper substance, and are made partakers of it; that Jesus Christ unites himself to us whole and entire, and for that end unites himself to us in body and mind; that we must not doubt but we receive his proper body; and if there be one in the world that confesses this truth sincerely, he is the man."

38.—*One must be united to the body of Jesus Christ more than by virtue and thought.*

He not only acknowledges, in the Supper, " The virtue of the body and blood, but will have the substance joined to it;" and declares\*, when he speaks of the manner of receiving Jesus Christ in the Supper, he means not to speak of the parts you there have: " In his merits, in his virtue, in his efficacy, in the fruit of his death, in his power." Calvin rejects all these ideas, and complains of the Lutherans, who, says he, reproaching him that he gave nothing to the faithful but a share in the merits of Jesus Christ, " darken the communion which he requires we should have with him." He carries his thought so far, that he excludes even as insufficient all the union that may be had with Jesus Christ, not only by the imagination, but also by the thought, or by the sole apprehension of the mind. " We are (says he) united to Jesus Christ, not by fancy and imagination, or by thought, or the sole apprehension of the mind, but really, and in effect, by a true and substantial union."

39.—*A new effect of Faith, according to Calvin.*

Yet he still says we are united to him only by faith, which but little agrees with his other expressions; but the thing is, from a notion as odd as it is novel, he will not have that which is united to us by faith, be united to us barely by thought; as if faith were anything else than a thought or an act of our minds, divine indeed and supernatural, which the Heavenly Father alone can inspire, but still a thought.

\* Tr. de Cœn. Domini. 1540. Int. opusc. Inst. iv. xvi. 18, &c. &c. Diluc. Exp. opusc. 846. Ibid. Brev. Admon. de Cœnâ Domini int. Ep. p. 594.

40.—*Calvin requires the proper substance.*

There is no knowing what all these expressions of Calvin mean\*, if they do not signify that the flesh of Jesus Christ is in us, not only by its virtue, but in itself, and by its proper substance; nor are these strong expressions only to be found in Calvin's books, but also in his Catechisms, and the confession of faith which he gave to his disciples, which shews how literally they are to be understood.

41.—*He will have us to receive the body and blood of Jesus Christ otherwise than the ancient Hebrews could do it.*

Zuinglius and Œcolampadius had often objected to Catholics and Lutherans that we received the body and blood of Jesus Christ as the ancient Hebrews received them in the desert; whence it followed that we receive them not in substance, their substance not existing then, but in spirit only. But Calvin † cannot suffer this reasoning, and owning that our fathers received Jesus Christ in the desert, he maintains they did not receive him like us, since we now have "the substance of his flesh, and our manducation is substantial, which that of the ancients could not be."

42.—*If we understand Calvin's expressions naturally, we must believe that the reception of the body and blood is independent of faith.*

Secondly, he teaches that this body once offered for us ‡, "Is given to us in the Supper to ascertain to us that we have part in his sacrifice," and in the reconciliation it brings with it; which, naturally speaking, is as much as to say, we must distinguish what is on God's side from what is on ours, and that it is not our faith which renders Jesus Christ present to us in the Eucharist, but that Jesus Christ, otherwise present as a sacred pledge of divine love, serves as a support to our faith. For, as when we say, the Son of God made himself man to certify to us that he loved our nature, we own his incarnation as independent of our faith, and, withal, as means given us whereby to support it: in like manner, to teach that Jesus Christ gives us his body and blood in this mystery, to ascertain to us that we have part in the sacrifice he made of them, in truth is owning that the body and blood are given

\* Dim. 51, 52, 53. Conf. xxxvi. † 2. Def. cont. Westph. p. 779.

‡ Cat. Dim. 52.

us, not because we believe, but to the end that our faith, being excited by so great a present, may rest more assured of the divine love, which by such an earnest we are made certain of. Hereby, then, it appears manifestly, that the gift of the body and blood is independent of faith in the sacrament; and Calvin's doctrine leads us to this conclusion by another way.

43.—*According to Calvin's expressions, the true body must be in the Sacrament.*

For he says in the third place\*, and repeats it frequently that "the Holy Supper is composed of two things, or, that there are two things in this Sacrament, the material bread and the wine which we behold with our eyes, and Jesus Christ, wherewith our souls are nourished interiorly." We have seen these words in the Wittenberg agreement. Luther and the Lutherans had taken them from a famous passage of St. Irenæus, wherein it is said that the "Eucharist is composed of a celestial and a terrestrial thing;" namely, as they explained it, as well of the substance of bread as that of the body. This explanation of theirs was disputed by the Catholics; and, without entering here into this controversy against the Lutherans, if to them this explanation seemed contrary to Catholic transubstantiation, it manifestly overthrew the Zuinglian figure, and at least established Luther's consubstantiation: for to say we have in the Sacrament, namely, in the sign itself, the thing terrestrial together with the celestial, that is, according to the Lutherans, sense, the material bread with the very body of Jesus Christ, is manifestly placing both substances together; but to say that the sacrament is composed of bread, which we see before our eyes, and of Jesus Christ, who is in the highest heavens, at the right hand of his Father, would be an expression completely extravagant. They must therefore say that both substances are indeed in the sacrament, and that the figure is there joined with the thing itself.

44.—*Another expression of Calvin's, that the body is under the sign of the bread, as the Holy Ghost under that of the dove.*

It is to this that expression tends which we find in Calvin, "that under the sign of the bread we take the body, and

\* Inst. lib. iv. c. 17. n. 11, 14. Catech. Dim. 53. Sup. lib. n. 23. Lib. iv. c. 34.

under the sign of the wine we take the blood, distinctly one from the other, to the end we may enjoy Jesus Christ whole and entire." And the thing here most remarkable is, that Calvin says "the body of Jesus Christ is under the bread, as the Holy Ghost is under the doye;" which necessarily imports a substantial presence, nobody doubting but the Holy Ghost was substantially present under the form of the dove, as, in a particular manner, God ever was when he appeared under some figure.

The words he makes use of are precise: "We do not pretend (says he) that a symbolical body is received; as it was not a symbolical spirit which appeared in the baptism of our Lord: the Holy Ghost was then truly and substantially present; but he rendered himself present by a visible symbol, and was seen in the baptism of Jesus Christ, because he truly appeared under the symbol, and under the external form of the dove."

If the body of Jesus Christ is as present to us under the bread as the Holy Ghost was present under the form of a dove, I know not what more can be desired for a real and substantial presence. And Calvin says all these things in a work, wherein he purposes to explain more clearly than ever how Jesus Christ is received, since he says them after having long disputed with the Lutherans on this subject in a book which bears this title, "A clear Exposition of the manner how we partake of the body of our Lord."

45.—*Another expression of Calvin's, which makes Jesus Christ present under the bread, as God was in the ark.*

In the same book he says †, "Jesus Christ is present in the sacrament, as God was present in the ark, where (says he) he rendered himself truly present; and not only in figure, but in his proper substance." Thus, when this mystery is very clearly and very plainly to be spoken of, expressions are naturally employed, which lead the mind to the Real Presence.

46.—*Calvin says he only disputes the manner, but admits the thing as much as we.*

And it is for this reason, in the fourth place, that Calvin says here †, and everywhere else, that he disputes not of the

\* Inst. iv. c. 17. n. 16, 17. Diluc. Exp. sanæ doct. opusc. p. 839. Ibid. p. 844.

† Ibid.

‡ Inst. et Opusc. p. 777, et seq. pp. 839, 844, etc.

thing, but only of the manner. "I dispute not (says he) about the presence, nor the substantial manducation, but about the manner both of the one and the other." He repeats, a hundred times over, that he agrees to the thing, and only questions which way it is accomplished. All his disciples speak the same language, and even to this day our reformed are angry when we tell them the body of Jesus Christ, according to their faith, is not as substantially with them, as, according to ours, it is with us; which shews that it is a dictate of the spirit of Christianity to make Jesus Christ as present in the Eucharist as possible, and that his words naturally guide us to what is most substantial.

47.—*Calvin admits an ineffable and miraculous presence of the body.*

Thence it comes, fifthly, that Calvin admits of a presence that is wholly miraculous and divine\*. He is not like the Swiss, who are angry when you speak to them of a miracle in the Supper: on the contrary, he is vexed when you tell him there is none. He is continually repeating that the mystery of the Eucharist surpasses the senses; that it is an incomprehensible work of the divine power; a secret impenetrable to the mind of man; that words are wanting to express his thoughts; and his thoughts, though greatly transcending his expressions, fall far beneath the summit of this unutterable mystery: "insomuch (says he) that he rather experiences what this union is, than understands it:" which shews he feels, or thinks he feels, the effects, but the cause is above his reach. Accordingly, he inserts in the Confession of Faith†, "that this mystery, by its loftiness, surpasses the measure of our senses, and the whole order of nature; and, forasmuch as it is celestial, cannot be apprehended, that is, comprehended, but by faith." And labouring to explain, in the Catechism‡, how it is possible that "Jesus Christ should make us partakers of his proper substance, considering that his body is in heaven, and we on earth, he answers, "This is done by the incomprehensible virtue of his spirit, which, indeed, conjoins things separated by distance of place."

48.—*A reflection on these words of Calvin.*

A philosopher would easily comprehend that the divine power is not confined within the limits of place: the meanest

\* Inst. iv. 17, 32.

† Art. 36.

‡ Dim. 53.

capacities understand how they may be united in spirit and in thought, to what is most distant from them ; and Calvin, leading us by his expressions to a more miraculous union, either speaks without meaning, or excludes the union by faith alone.

49.—*Calvin admits a Presence which is proper and peculiar to the Supper.*

Accordingly, we see, sixthly, that he admits\* a participation in the Eucharist which is neither in baptism nor preaching, since he says in the Catechism, “ That, although Jesus Christ be therein truly communicated to us, nevertheless, it is but in part, and not fully ;” which shews that he is otherwise given to us in the Supper than by faith, since faith, being as lively and perfect in baptism and preaching, he would be as fully given to us then as in the Eucharist.

50.—*The sequel of Calvin’s expressions.*

What he adds, in order to explain this fulness, is yet stronger, for there it is he says what has been already cited, that “ Jesus Christ gives us his body and blood, to ascertain to us that we receive the fruit thereof.” Here then is that fulness which we receive in the Eucharist, and not in baptism or preaching : whence it follows, that faith alone does not give us the body and blood of our Saviour ; but that this body and blood being given to us after a special manner in the Eucharist, ascertain to us, to wit, give us a certain faith, that we have part in the sacrifice which was made of them.

51.—*The Communion of the unworthy, how real, according to Calvin.*

Lastly, what Calvin lets fall, speaking even of the unworthy, makes appear how far a miraculous presence, independent of faith, is to be believed in this Sacrament : for, although what he most inculcates is †, that the unworthy not having faith, Jesus Christ is ready to come to them, but does not come in effect, the force of truth, nevertheless, obliges him to say, that “ He is truly offered and given to all those who are seated at the holy table, although he be not received with fruit, but by the faithful only,” which is the very way of speaking that we employ.

In order then to understand the truth of the mystery which

\* Dim. 52.

† Inst. iv. 17. 10. Opusc. de Cœnâ Domini. 1540.



Jesus Christ works in the Eucharist, it must be believed that his proper body is therein truly offered and given, even to the unworthy, and is also received, although not received with fruit: which cannot be true, if it be not also true, that what is given is in this Sacrament is the proper body of the Son of God, independently of faith.

52.—*Continuation of Calvin's expressions concerning the Communion of the unworthy.*

Calvin confirms this again in another place, where he writes thus\*: "In this consists the integrity of the Sacrament, which the whole world cannot violate, to wit, that the flesh and blood of Jesus Christ are as truly given to the unworthy as to the faithful and elect." Whence it follows, that what is given them is the flesh and blood of the Son of God independently of faith, since it is certain, according to Calvin, that they have not faith, or at least do not exercise it in this state.

Thus have Catholics reason to say, that what makes the sacred gift, which we receive in the Eucharist, be the body and blood of Jesus Christ, is not the faith we have in his word, but the word alone by its all-powerful energy: inso-much that faith adds nothing to the truth of the body and blood, but only makes them profitable to us; and nothing is more true than this saying of St. Augustine †, that the Eucharist is not less "the body of our Lord to Judas, than to the rest of the Apostles."

53.—*A comparison of Calvin, which upholds the truth of the Body's being received by the unworthy.*

The comparison which Calvin makes use of in the same place still more strengthens the reality: for, after having said of the body and blood, what we have just seen, "That they are not less given to the unworthy than to the worthy," he adds, this happens alike as with rain, "which, falling on a rock, runs off without penetrating: in like manner (says he) the impious repel the grace of God, and hinder its penetrating into them †." Observe, he here speaks of the body and blood, which, by consequence, must be given to the unworthy, as really as rain falls upon a rock. As to the substance of the rain, it falls no less on rocks and barren places, than on those

\* Inst. *ibid.* n. 33.

† Aug. Serm. xi. de verb. Dom.

‡ Inst. lib. iv. c. 17. n. 33. 2. Def. opusc. p. 781.

where it fructifies; and so, according to this comparison, Jesus Christ must be no less substantially present to the obdurate than to the faithful who receive his Sacrament, though only in these it fructifies. The same Calvin\* tells us again with St. Augustine, that the unworthy who partake of his Sacrament, are those troublesome people who press him in the Gospel, and the faithful, who receive him worthily, are that pious woman which touches him. If we consider the body only, all touch him alike: but there is reason to say, those who touch him with faith alone touch him truly, because they only touch him fruitfully. Can one speak in this manner, without owning Jesus Christ is most really present both to the one and the other, and that these words, "this is my body," have always infallibly the effect expressed by them?

54.—*Calvin speaks inconsequently.*

I am well aware that when Calvin speaks thus strongly of the body being given to the impious as truly as to saints †, he, nevertheless, distinguishes betwixt giving and receiving; and that, in the same place, where he says, the flesh of Jesus Christ "is as truly given to the unworthy as to the elect," he hath also said that it is not received, except by the elect alone; but this is an abuse of words. For, if he means that Jesus Christ is not received by the unworthy in the same sense that St. John has said in the Gospel, "He came unto his own, and his own received him not ‡," that is, believed not in him, he is in the right. But as those who received not Jesus Christ after this manner, did not hinder, by their infidelity, his coming as truly to them as to the rest; nor did they hinder "the word made flesh to dwell among us §," from being truly received, with regard to his personal presence, in the midst of the world, nay, even in the midst of the world that knew him not and crucified him: in like manner must it be said, to speak consequently, that these words, "this is my body," render him not less present to the unworthy, who are guilty of his body and blood, than to the worthy who approach them with faith; and barely with respect to the corporeal presence, he is equally received by both.

\* Diluc. Exp. opusc. p. 848.  
‡ John i. 11.

† Inst. lib. iv. c. 17, n. 33.  
§ Ibid. •

55.—*Calvin explains, as we do, these words, The flesh profiteth nothing.*

I shall here observe one word of Calvin's, which vindicates us from a reproach he and his followers are continually laying at our door. How often do they object to us these words, "The flesh profiteth nothing"? and yet Calvin explains them thus\*, "The flesh profiteth nothing, of itself alone, but it profiteth together with the Spirit." This is exactly what we say, and what ought to be concluded from these words: not that Jesus Christ does not give us the proper substance of his flesh independently of our faith, for he has given it, even according to Calvin, to the unworthy; but, that it profiteth nothing to receive his flesh, if it be not received together with his spirit. And if his spirit be not always received together with his flesh, this is not because it is not always there, for Jesus Christ comes to us full of spirit and grace; but because, in order to receive that spirit which he brings, ours must be opened by a lively faith.

56.—*An expression of Calvin's, that the unworthy, according to us, receive only the carcass of Jesus Christ.*

It is not, therefore, a body without a soul, or, as Calvin speaks, a "carcass," which we make the unworthy receive, when they receive the sacred flesh of Jesus Christ without profiting; no more than it is a carcass and a body without soul and spirit, which Jesus Christ gives them, even in the sentiments of Calvin himself †. It is but a vain exaggeration to call that body a carcass, which is known to be animated; for Jesus Christ, risen from the dead, dies now no more; he hath life in him, and not only that life which makes the body live, but that life also which enlivens the soul. Jesus Christ, wherever he comes, carries with him life and grace. He brought with, and in him, his whole virtue with respect to the crowd, that thronged about him; but "this virtue went not forth," but in behalf of that woman who touched him with faith. So, when Jesus Christ gives himself to the unworthy, he comes to them with the same virtue and spirit which he sheds on the faithful; but this virtue and spirit act only on those who believe; and, on all these points, Calvin must speak the same things we do, to speak consequently.

\* Diluc. Exp. opusc. p. 859.

† Inst. iv. xvii. n. 33. Ep. ad Mart. Schal. p. 247.

57.—*Calvin weakens his own expressions.*

But, it is very true, he does not speak them. True, that, although he says we are partakers of the proper substance of the body and blood of Jesus Christ, he will have this substance only united to us by faith; and after all, in spite of these great words of Proper Substance, his design is, to own nothing else in the Eucharist but a presence of virtue.

It is true, likewise, that after he had said \*, we are partakers of the "proper substance" of Jesus Christ, he refuses to say, "he is really and substantially present;" as if the participation were not of like nature with the presence, and the proper substance of a thing could ever be received when it is present only by its virtue.

58.—*He eludes the miracle which he owns in the Supper.*

By the same artifice he shifts off that great miracle which he himself is sensible he is obliged to own in the Eucharist; it is, said he, an incomprehensible secret, a miracle surpassing all sense and understanding of man. And what is this secret, this miracle? Calvin thinks he has expressed it in these words †: "Is it reason which teaches us, that the soul, immortal and spiritual by its creation, is enlivened by the flesh of Jesus Christ, and that so powerful a virtue flows from Heaven on the earth?" But he deludes us and himself too. The singular miracle which the holy Fathers, and, after them, all Christians ever believed in the Eucharist, does not regard that virtue precisely which the flesh of Jesus Christ derives from the incarnation. The miracle consists in the verifying of these words, "this is my body," when nothing but mere bread appears to the eye, and in the giving the same body, at the same time, to so many different persons. It was in order to explain these incomprehensible wonders, that the Fathers alleged all the other miracles of the divine power, the changing of water into wine, and all the other changes, even that great change which of nothing made all things. But Calvin's miracle is not of this nature, not even a miracle that is peculiar to the sacrament of the Eucharist, nor a sequel from these words, "this is my body." It is a miracle which is wrought in the Eucharist and out of the Eucharist, and which, to speak the truth, is what essentially flows from the very mystery of the incarnation.

\* 2 Defens. opusc. p. 775.

† Diluc. Exp. opusc. 845.

59.—*Calvin is sensible of the insufficiency of his Doctrine to explain the miracle of the Eucharist:*

Calvin himself was aware that some other miracle was to be sought in the Eucharist. He has expressed as much in several places of his works, but particularly in the Catechism \*: “How comes it to pass (says he) that Jesus Christ makes us partakers of the proper substance of his body, considering his body is in Heaven, and we on earth.” In this consists the miracle of the Eucharist. What does Calvin answer to this, and what do all Calvinists answer with him? “That the incomprehensible virtue of the Holy Ghost, indeed, conjoins things separated by distance of place.” Does he mean to speak like a Catholic, and say, the Holy Ghost can everywhere render present what he has a mind to give in substance? I understand him, and acknowledge the true miracle of the Eucharist. Would he say that things separated, and remaining separated as far as Heaven is from earth, are, nevertheless, united, substance to substance? This is no miracle of the Almighty, but a chimerical and contradictory proposition, which nobody can understand.

60.—*The Calvinists did not so much admit a miracle in the Eucharist, as they were sensible one ought to be admitted.*

But in reality, to speak the truth, neither Calvin nor the Calvinists do admit of any miracle in the Eucharist. A presence by faith, and a presence by virtue, is not miraculous; the sun has as much virtue, and produces as great effects, at as great a distance. If, therefore, Jesus Christ be only present in virtue, there can be no miracle in the Eucharist; for which reason the Swiss, men naturally sincere, who have no other use for words than to speak just as they think, would never hear it mentioned. Calvin, in this more penetrating, very well saw with all the Fathers and all the faithful, that, in these words, “this is my body,” there was as clear a mark of omnipotence, as in these, “let there be light.” To answer this idea, it was necessary, at least, to sound high the name of a miracle; but, in the main, nobody was less disposed than Calvin to believe one in the Eucharist; otherwise, why does he continually upbraid us that we confound the laws of nature, that a body cannot be in several places, nor be given us whole and entire under the form of a morsel of bread? Is not this reasoning derived from phi-

\* Dim. 53.

losophy? Undoubtedly; and, nevertheless, Calvin, who all along employs it, declares in many places\*, "that he will not make use of natural, nor philosophical reasons, of which he makes no account," but of Scripture only. And why? because, on one hand, he cannot divest himself of them, nor so far raise himself above man as to despise them; and, on the other hand, he is very sensible that receiving them in matters of religion, is not only destroying the mystery of the Eucharist, but all the mysteries of Christianity at once.

61.—*The perplexities and contradictions of Calvin in the defence of the figurative sense.*

The same confusion appears when these words, "This is my Body," are to be explained. All his books, all his sermons, all his discourses, are full of the figurative interpretation, and the figure metonymy, which puts the sign for the thing. This is the way of speaking, which he calls "sacramental," which he will have the Apostles beforehand well accustomed to, when Jesus Christ instituted the Supper. The Rock was Christ, the Lamb is the Passover, Circumcision is the Covenant, "This is my Body," according to him, are all the same ways of speaking; and this is what you find in every page.

Whether or no he were fully satisfied with this, the following passage will make appear †. It is taken out of a book entitled, "A clear Explanation," already by me quoted, and which was written against Heshusius, a Lutheran minister. "Behold (says Calvin) how this hog makes us speak. In this phrase, *This is my Body*, there is a figure like to this;" Circumcision is the Covenant, the Rock was Christ, the Lamb is the Passover. "The Forger imagined he was prattling at table, and spending his wit among his guests. Never will such fooleries be found in our writings; but, in plain words, this is what we say, *viz.* when we talk of Sacraments, a certain and particular way of speaking, usual in Scripture, must be followed. Thus, without escaping under the covert of a figure, we think it enough to say, what would be clear to the whole world, did not these beasts obscure even the sun himself, that the figure metonymy must here be owned, whereby the name of the thing is given to the sign."

62.—*What it was that puzzled him.*

Had Heshusius fallen into such a contradiction, Calvin would certainly have told him in plain terms he was drunk; but

\* Diluc. Exp. opusc. p. 858.

† Ibid. p. 861.

Calvin was sober, I must own, and when he confounds himself, it is because he does not find in his own expositions what can please him. He disowns here what he says through every page; he rejects that figure with contempt which he is forced to betake himself to again the same moment; in a word, he can stand to nothing he says, and is ashamed of his own doctrine.

63.—*He saw further into the difficulty than the rest of the Sacramentarians.—How he endeavoured to clear it.*

It must be owned, nevertheless, that he was more exact than the rest of the Sacramentarians, and besides the superiority of his wit, the dispute which had been so long on foot, had given him leisure more fully to digest this matter. For he does not stand so much upon allegories and parables,—I am the door, I am the vine,—nor on other expressions of the like nature, which always carry their own expositions with them so clear and manifest, that a child even could not be mistaken\*. And besides, if because Jesus Christ made use of allegories and parables, every thing was to be understood in that sense; he plainly saw that would be nothing but filling the whole gospel with confusion.

To remedy this, Calvin† bethought himself of these forms of expression which he calls “sacramental,” wherein the sign is put for the thing; and, by admitting them in the Eucharist, which, beyond doubt, is a sacrament, he believes he has found a certain means of establishing in it a figure, without bringing the same into a precedent for other matters.

64.—*The examples which he drew from Scripture.—That of Circumcision, which confutes instead of serving him.*

He also brought more apposite examples from scripture than any of the Protestant writers before him. The chief difficulty lay in finding out a sign of institution, wherein, at the institution itself, the name of the thing is immediately given to the sign without preparing the mind for it, and this with the proper word by which this sign is instituted. The question was, whether any such example could be found in scripture. Catholics maintained there could not; and Calvin thought to convince them by this text of Genesis, in which Almighty God, speaking of circumcision which he instituted, named it the Covenant:—“My covenant,” says he, “shall

\* Admon. ult. ad Westph. opusc. p. 812.

† 2 Def. opusc. p. 781, etc.; pp. 812, 813, 818, etc. .

be in your flesh\*." But he was plainly mistaken, since Almighty God, before he had said, "my Covenant shall be in your flesh," had said already, "it shall be a sign of the covenant." The sign was therefore instituted before the name of the thing was given to it, and the mind, by this exordium, prepared to the understanding of what ensued: from whence it follows, that our Saviour should have prepared the minds of the apostles, in order to take the sign for the thing, had he designed to have given this sense to these words,—“This is my Body—this is my Blood;” but having not done this, it is to be believed he intended to leave the words in their natural and obvious sense. Calvin owns as much himself, since, by saying that the apostles ought already to have been accustomed to these sacramental ways of speaking, he owns it would have been incongruous to employ such, had they not been accustomed to them. As it then manifestly appears they could not be accustomed to give the name of a thing to the sign of institution, without being forewarned, and there being no example of this nature in the Old or New Testament, from Calvin's own principles, it must be concluded against Calvin, that Jesus Christ ought not to have spoken in this sense, and had he done it, his apostles would not have understood him.

65.—*Another example which makes nothing to the question, viz. that the Church is also called the Body of Jesus Christ.*

And, indeed, the truth is, although he placed his chief strength in these ways of speaking, by him called sacramental, and in all intricacies, ever guided himself by this clue, he is so little satisfied therewith, that he says in other places, that the scriptures naming the Church the Body of our Lord, is the chief support of his doctrine. To make this his chief defence, shows him, indeed, conscious of his weakness. Is the Church the sign of our Lord's body, as Calvin makes the bread to be †? By no means; she is his body, as he is her head, by that so common a way of speaking, by which a whole nation, and the prince who governs them, are represented as a kind of natural body, which hath its head and members. What can then be the reason, that after Calvin had laid his main stress on these sacramental ways of speaking, he depends still more on a manner of speaking, which is absolutely of another kind: unless it be, that to support a

\* Gen. xvii. 13. Ibid. 11.

† Inst. iv. 17.



figure of which he stands in need, he calls to his assistance all the figurative ways of speech, of what nature soever they be, what little coherence soever they may have ?

66.—*Calvin makes new efforts to preserve the idea of the Reality.*

The rest of his doctrine gives him no less pain, and the violent expressions he makes use of plainly discover it. We have seen how he will have the flesh of Jesus Christ to penetrate us by its substance. I have taken notice that, notwithstanding all these great words, he means no more by them, than that it penetrates us by its virtue; but this manner of speaking appearing weak to him, in order to mix the substance therewith, he makes us receive in the Eucharist\*, as it were, “an extract of the Flesh of Jesus Christ, upon condition, however, that it remain in Heaven, and from its substance life flow down upon us;” as if we received the quintessence and the choicest part of his flesh, the rest abiding in Heaven. I will not say he believed it so; but only, that the grounds of doctrine not being able to supply him wherewith to answer the idea of reality he was so full of, he supplied this defect by far-fetched, unheard-of, and extravagant expressions.\*

67.—*He cannot answer the idea of Reality, which our Saviour's institution impresses on the mind.*

That I may not here dissemble any part of Calvin's doctrine, concerning the communication which we have with Jesus Christ, I am obliged to say, he seems in some places to make Jesus Christ as present in Baptism as in the Supper; for, in general, he distinguishes three things in the sacrament besides the sign†—“the signification, which consists in the promises; the matter or the substance, which is Jesus Christ, with his death and resurrection; and the effect, namely, sanctification, life eternal, and all the graces which Jesus Christ brings to us.” Calvin acknowledges all these things, as well in the Sacrament of Baptism, as in that of the Supper; and he teaches of Baptism in particular, that‡ “the Blood of Jesus Christ is not less present to wash souls, than the water to wash bodies; and, according to St. Paul, we are indeed there clothed with Jesus Christ, and our clothing does not less encompass, than our nourishment penetrates us.” Hereby,

\* Diluc. Expos. opusc. p. 864.

† Inst. lib. iv. c. xvii. n. 11.

‡ Diluc. Exp. opusc. p. 864.

then, he openly declares that Jesus Christ is as present in Baptism, as in the Supper; and the consequence from his doctrine, I own, naturally leads him to it; for, after all, he neither admits of any other presence in the Supper than by faith, nor of any faith in the Supper but what is in Baptism; consequently, I am far from pretending he admits in it any other presence in effect. What I pretend to show is, the perplexity he is cast into by these words, "This is my Body." For either he must confound all mysteries, or he must be able to give a reason why Jesus Christ spoke nowhere else but in the Supper with this energy. If his body and blood be as present, and as really received everywhere else, there was no reason to choose these emphatic words for the Eucharist rather than for baptism; and the eternal wisdom would have spoken in vain. This very thing will be the everlasting and inevitable confusion of those who defend the figurative sense. On one side, the necessity of allowing something particular to the Eucharist with respect to the presence of the Body; and on the other, the impossibility of doing this, according to their principles, will always involve them in perplexities from which they can never disengage themselves; and to extricate himself was what made Calvin use so many strong expressions relating to the Eucharist, which he never durst apply to baptism, though there was the same reason for doing it, according to his principles.

68.—*The Calvinists in the main have abandoned Calvin.—How he is explained in the book called the Preservative.*

His expressions are so violent, and the turns he here gives to his doctrine are so strained, that his disciples have been forced to abandon him in the main, nor can I but observe in this place a notorious variation in the Calvinian doctrine; inasmuch as the Calvinists now-a-days, under pretext of interpreting Calvin's words, reduce them to nothing at all. To receive the "proper substance of Jesus Christ" is, according to them\*, nothing else but receiving him "by his virtue, by his efficacy, by his merit," the very things which Calvin had rejected as insufficient. All that we can hope from these great words, "the proper substance" of Jesus Christ received in the Supper, is only this†, viz. that what we there receive, is not the substance of another: but, as for his substance it is no more received, than the substance of the sun is received by the eye when enlightened by its rays: the mean-

\* Preserv. p. 195.

† Ibid. p. 196.

ing of which is, that they are indeed quite strangers now to that proper substance so much inculcated by Calvin. If they defend it, it is only from a point of honour, and lest they should seem too openly to recant; and if Calvin, who abetted it with so much force in his books, had not also inserted it in the Catechisms and Confession of Faith, it would have long since been quite abandoned.

69.—*A sequel of the explanations given to Calvin's words.*

The same may be said of those words of Calvin and of the Catechism, viz. that Jesus Christ is received fully in the Eucharist, but in preaching and baptism "in part\*." This, naturally understood, implies, that the Eucharist hath something particular in it, which baptism and preaching have not: no such thing; it means now no more, than three are more than two; that, after having received grace by baptism and instruction by the word, when to all this God adds the Eucharist, grace increases, and is strengthened, and we possess Jesus Christ more perfectly. Thus, all the perfection of the Eucharist is its coming in the last place; and although, in instituting it, Jesus Christ made use of such particular terms, it hath nothing particular notwithstanding, nothing more than baptism, unless, perhaps, a new sign; and Calvin's talking so big of the proper substance was all to no manner of purpose.

By this means, the explanations now given to Calvin's words, and to those of the Catechism and Confession of Faith, under the pretext of interpretation, are a real variation in doctrine, and a proof that the illusions, by which Calvin endeavoured to blind mankind, in order to keep up a notion of reality, could not long subsist.

70.—*Whether there be nothing in these passages of Calvin, but bare defects of expression.*

To cover this manifestly weak side of the sect, it is true, the Calvinists answer †, that from these expressions we reproach them with, at most nothing can be concluded but that, perchance, the terms employed by them in explaining their doctrine at the beginning might not be quite so proper. But to answer in this manner, is affecting that they did not see the difficulty. • What ought to be concluded from these expressions of Calvin and the Calvinists is, that the words of our Saviour had, at first, do what they would, made such an im-

\* Dim. 52. Preserv. p. 197.

† Preserv. Ibid. p. 194.

pression of reality on their minds, as they never could come up to by words, and which, afterwards, forced them upon expressions, which, having no sense in their belief, give testimony to ours; which is not only imposing on themselves by an erroneous way of speaking, but confessing an error in the thing itself, and, even in their confession of faith, bearing the stamp of their own conviction.

71.—*Calvin said more than he meant.*

For instance, when he is forced to say, on one side, that the proper substance of the body and blood of our Lord is received; and on the other, that they are only received by their virtue, as the sun is received by its rays, this is confounding himself and uttering contradictions.

Then again, when he is forced to say on one side, that the proper substance of the body and blood of Jesus Christ is as much received, in the Calvinian supper as in that of the Catholics, and that there is no difference but in the manner; and on the other side, that the body and blood of Jesus Christ are as far distant from the faithful as Heaven is from earth, and that a Real and Substantial Presence is, after all, one and the same thing with an absence, at so prodigious a distance; this is a prodigy unheard of in human language, and such expressions only serve to make us see they would feign have it in their power to say, what, according to their own principles, they cannot say in reason.

72.—*Why Heretics are obliged to imitate the language of the Church.*

And, that I may shew once for all, not to come back to it again, the consequence of these expressions of Calvin and the first Calvinists; let us reflect, that never as yet could any heretics be found, that did not affect to speak like the Church. The Arians and Socinians say, as well as we, that Jesus Christ is God, but improperly, and by representation, because he acts in the name of God, and by God's authority. The Nestorians make no difficulty of saying, that the Son of God and the Son of Mary are but the same person; but just as an ambassador is the same person with the Prince he represents. Shall we say that they hold the same principles as the Catholic Church, and only differ in the way of expressing their thoughts? On the contrary, it will be said, they speak like her without thinking like her, because falsehood is forced at least to mimic truth. With relation to proper substance

and such like expressions in the works of Calvin and the Calvinists, the case is just the same.

73.—*The triumph of Truth.*

Here we may observe the conspicuous triumph of Catholic verity, inasmuch as the literal sense of the words of Jesus Christ, which we defend, after forcing Luther to maintain it, however contrary to his inclinations, as hath been seen, hath also forced Calvin, who denies it, to confess nevertheless so many things, which make for, and establish it in an invincible manner.

74.—*A passage in Calvin for a Real Presence, independent of Faith.*

Before I quit this subject, I must observe one passage in Calvin\*, which affording great room for speculation, I question whether I shall be able to dive to the bottom of it. It concerns the Lutherans, who, without destroying the bread, inclose the body in it. “If (says he), what they pretend, be only this, that, whilst the bread is presented in the mystery, the body is also presented at the same time, because truth is inseparable from its sign, this is what I shall not much oppose.”

Here is, then, a thing which he neither altogether approves nor disapproves. It is a middle opinion, betwixt his own and that of the generality of the Lutherans: an opinion establishing the body inseparable from the sign; by consequence, independently of faith, since it is certain, that, without it, the sign may be received: and what is this else, but the opinion, which I have attributed to Bucer and Melancthon, whereby they admit a Real Presence, even in the communion of the unworthy, and without the assistance of faith; requiring this Presence to accompany the sign as to time, but not to be confined to, or contained in it, as to place? This is what Calvin will not much oppose; that is, he does not much disapprove of a Real Presence inseparable from the sacrament, and independent of faith.

75.—*Ceremonies rejected by Calvin.*

I have endeavoured to make known the doctrine of this second Patriarch of the new Reformation, and persuade myself I have discovered what it was that gave him so much authority in that party. It appeared he had new ideas about imputed justice, which was the ground-work of the Reformation, and

\* Inst. iv. p. 17, n. 16.

about the Eucharist which had divided them for so long a time; but there was still a third point, which greatly enhanced his credit among those who valued themselves for men of wit. It was his boldness in rejecting ceremonies much beyond whatever the Lutherans had done\*, for they had made it a law to themselves, to retain those which were not manifestly contrary to their new tenets. But on this head Calvin was inexorable. He condemned Melancthon, who, in his opinion, thought ceremonies of too little a concern; and if the worship, introduced by him, appeared to some too naked, even this had a new charm for the men of taste and spirit, who thought thereby to raise themselves above their senses, and soar beyond the vulgar. And because the Apostles had written little on ceremonies, which they were satisfied with establishing by practice, or often left to the disposal of each Church, the Calvinists boasted, above all the Reformers, that they adhered with greatest purity to the letter of Scripture, which in England and Scotland gave them the name of Puritans.

76.—*What opinion the other Protestants had of the Calvinists.*

By this means Calvin refined upon, and outstripped the first authors of the new Reformation. The party which bore his name was hated extremely by all the other Protestants, who looked upon them as the most haughty, restless, and seditious of any that had appeared as yet. There is no need of alleging what has, in several places, been written of them by James I., King of England and Scotland. He makes, nevertheless, an exception in favour of Puritans of other countries, thinking it enough to publish, from his own experience, that he knew none more dangerous, or greater enemies to the regal power, than those he had met with in his own kingdoms. Calvin made much progress in France; and this great kingdom, by the attempts of his followers, saw itself on the very brink of ruin: so that he was in France much like what Luther was in Germany; and Wittemberg, which gave the new Gospel its first birth, was rivalled by Geneva, where ruled this head of the second party of the new Reformation.

\* Ep. ad Mel. p. 120, etc.

77.—*Calvin's pride.*

How much smitten he was with this glory we shall perceive by a few words he wrote to Melancthon\*. “I own myself (says he) much your inferior; yet am nowise ignorant to what a degree God has raised me on this theatre, nor can our friendship be violated without injuring the Church.” To see himself, as it were, exposed upon a grand theatre, and the eyes of all Europe turned upon him; to see himself advanced to the foremost rank by his eloquence; to be conscious of the name he had acquired, and an authority revered by such a party, made Calvin no longer able to contain himself; to him this was too alluring a charm, and it is the same charm that has made all heresiarchs.

78.—*His boasting.*

It was from a sense of this secret pleasure that, in his answer to Balduinus †, his great adversary, he thus expressed himself: “He tells me, with reproach, that I have no children, and that God has snatched away the son he had bestowed upon me. Ought I to be thus reproached? I, who have so many thousands of children throughout all Christendom!” To which he adds, “To all France is known my irreproachable faith, my integrity, my patience, my watchfulness, my moderation, and my assiduous labours for the service of the Church; things that, from my early youth, stand proved by so many illustrious tokens. With the support of such a conscience, to be able to hold my station to the very end of life, is enough for me.”

79.—*The difference between Luther and Calvin.*

He had so much extolled the holy ostentation and magnanimity of Luther, that he was not easy till he had followed the example; although, to avoid the ridicule which Luther fell into, he particularly set up for the character of modesty, as one who had a mind to have it in his power to brag, that “he was without pride, and feared nothing so much as boasting ‡:” so that the difference betwixt Luther and Calvin's ostentation is, that Luther, who was hurried away by the impetuosity of his temper, ever thoughtless of moderation or restraint, praised himself as it were in transport: but the self-commendations Calvin fell into, in spite of all the laws

\* Ep. Calv. p. 195.

† Resp. ad Bald. int. opusc. Calv. p. 370.

‡ 2 Def. ad Westp. opusc. 788.

of modesty which he had set to himself, burst from the centre of his heart, and violently broke through all barriers. How pleasing was he in his own eyes, when he commends so much\* “His own frugality, his incessant labours, his constancy in dangers, his watchfulness to comply with his charge, his indefatigable application to extend the kingdom of Christ Jesus, his integrity in defending the doctrine of piety, and the serious occupation of his whole life in the meditation of heavenly things.” Nothing Luther ever said came up to this, nor did the sallies of unbridled passion ever make him say so much as Calvin utters of himself in cold blood.

80.—*How Calvin boasted of his eloquence.*

Nothing delighted him more than the glory of writing well ; and Westphalus, a Lutheran, having called him a declaimer, “Do what he will (says he) nobody will ever give him credit, and the whole world is fully satisfied how well I know to press an argument, how distinct is that conciseness with which I write †.”

This is giving to himself, in three words, the whole glory that the art of eloquence can bestow on man. Here is, at least, a commendation which Luther never arrogated to himself ; for though he was one of the sprightliest orators of his age, so far from making it appear that he valued himself for eloquence, he took a pleasure in saying he was a poor monk, bred up in schools and obscurity, unacquainted with the art of speaking. But Calvin, wounded in this tender part, flies out, and, at the expense of modesty, cannot forbear saying that nobody delivers his thoughts more distinctly, or argues more strongly than himself.

81.—*Calvin's eloquence.*

Let us then allow him this glory, since he is so fond of it, of having written as well as any of that age ; nay, if he desires it, let us even set him above Luther : for, although Luther had something more original and lively, Calvin, inferior in genius, seems to carry it by dint of study. Luther triumphed in speaking ; but Calvin's pen was more correct, especially in Latin ; and his style, which was more serious, was also much more coherent and more chastened. They both spoke their native language in perfection ; the vehemence of both was extraordinary ; both gained many disciples and admirers

\* 2 Def. cont. Westph. opusc. 842.

† 2 Def. 791.



by their talents; elated with their success, they both despised the Fathers; both were impatient of contradiction, nor did their eloquence ever flow more copiously than when fraught with contumelies.

82.—*His temper as violent, but sourer than Luther's.*

Whoever blushed at those which Luther's arrogance drew from his pen, will not be less confounded at the excesses of Calvin: his adversaries are always knaves, fools, rogues, drunkards, furies, madmen, beasts, bulls, asses, dogs, swine; and Calvin's fine style is polluted with this filth through every page. Be they Catholics or Lutherans, it is all one to him, he spares none. Westphalus's school is to him a stinking hog-sty. The Lutherans' supper is almost always called a supper of Cyclopes, "at which a barbarity may be seen becoming Scythians\*;" if he is used to say that the devil drives on Papists, he repeats a hundred times† he has bewitched the "Lutherans, and that he cannot comprehend why he, above all others, is assaulted by them, unless it be that Satan, whose vile slaves they are, so much the more urges them on against him, as he sees his labours more useful to the Church than theirs."

The individuals whom he treats thus were the chief and most renowned among the Lutherans. Amidst these invectives he still boasts of his sweetness‡; and after having stuffed his book with all that can be imagined, not only most bitter, but also most atrocious, he thinks he comes well off by saying§, "That he was so remote from any gall, when he penned these injurious taunts, that he himself, upon reading his work over again, stood quite astonished that so much harsh language could have ever been uttered by him, and his heart still void of bitterness. It was (says he) the heinousness of the subject which alone furnished him with all these abusive words, which stood ready to bolt from him. After all, he is not displeased that these stupid creatures have, at last, smarted under the lash, and hopes this may help to mend them." Yet he does not refuse to own he has said something more than he would have done, and that the remedy applied by him was a little too violent. But, after this modest confession, he indulges his passion more than ever, and in the very same breath that he interrogates, "Dog, dost thou understand me? Madman, dost thou comprehend me? Dost thou take me right, great beast? (he adds) that

\* Opusc. p. 799. Ibid. pp. 803, 837.

‡ 2 Def. in Westph.

† Diluc. Expos. Ibid. p. 839.

§ Ult. Adm. p. 795.

he is well pleased that the contumelies men load him with are not retaliated \*." Luther's passion, compared with this, was meekness itself; and, should a comparison be instituted between them, there is not a man who had not rather stand the brunt of the impetuous and insolent fury of the one, than of the profound and bitter malice of the other, who brags of being cool in the disgorging of such a flow of rancour upon all that come in his way.

83.—*The contempt he has for the Fathers.*

Both of them, after their attacks on mortal men, turned their malice against heaven, by openly despising the authority of the holy Fathers. Every body knows how often Calvin had trampled on their decisions, what a pleasure he took in taking them to task like school-boys, in giving them their lessons, and the outrageous manner whereby he thought to elude their unanimous consent, by saying, for instance †, "that these good men followed, without discretion, a custom that prevailed without reason, and which was but a little while in getting into vogue."

84.—*The Fathers make themselves respected by Protestants in spite of them.*

The subject he then had in hand was prayer for the dead. All his writings are full of the like discourses. But, in spite of heretical pride, the authority of the Fathers and ecclesiastical antiquity lies weighty on their minds. For all Calvin's avowed contempt of the Fathers, he cites them, nevertheless, as witnesses, whose authority it is not lawful to reject, when, after quoting them, he writes these words ‡: "What will they say to the ancient Church? will they damn the ancient Church? or, will they banish St. Augustine out of the Church?" The very same might be retorted on him, regarding the subject of prayer for the dead, and in the rest; where it is certain, and often by his own confession, that he hath the Fathers against him. But without entering into this particular dispute, I am satisfied with having observed that our Reformists are often constrained by the force of truth, to respect the sentiments of the Fathers more than their doctrine and inclination carries them to.

\* Opusc. 838.

† Tr. de Ref. Eccl.

‡ 2 Def. opusc. 777. Admon. ul. 836. Ibid.

85.—*Whether Calvin ever varied in his doctrine.*

Those who have seen the endless variations of Luther may inquire whether Calvin fell into the same fault. To which I shall answer, that, besides a more coherent way of thinking, he had the advantage of writing a long time after the beginning of the pretended Reformation; so that matters having been already much discussed, and doctors having had leisure to digest them, Calvin's doctrine seems more uniform than that of Luther. But, however, we shall see hereafter (whether from a policy usual to the heads of new sects to mend and perfect their own work, or, by a necessity common to those who fall into error) that Calvin also varied very much, not only in his own particular writings, but also in the public acts, which he drew in the name of all his followers, or which he inspired them with. And even to go no further, upon considering only what I have already related of his doctrine, we may have seen that it abounds with contradictions, that he follows not his own principles, and, with great words, says just nothing.

86.—*Variations in the Acts of the Calvinists.—The agreement of Geneva compared with the Catechism and the Confession of France.—1554.*

And if we make never so little reflection on those acts which he framed, or which the Calvinists, with his approbation, published in five or six years' time\*, neither he nor they can in any way clear themselves of the guilt of having expounded their faith with a criminal dissimulation. In 1554, we have seen a solemn agreement made between those of Geneva and Zurich; it was drawn by Calvin, and the common faith of these two churches is there set forth. Concerning the Supper, no more is said there than that these words, "This is my body," must not be taken precisely in a literal sense, but figuratively; so that the name of the body and blood is by metonymy given to the bread and wine which signify them; and that if Jesus Christ nourishes us by the food of his body, and the drink of his blood, this is done by faith and the virtue of the Holy Ghost, without any transfusion or other mixture of substance, but because we have life by his body once sacrificed, and his blood once shed for us." If, in this "agreement," we find nothing mentioned either of the proper "substance" of the body and blood received

\* Opusc. Cal. 752. Hosp. An. 1554. Art. xxii. xxiii.

in the Supper, or of the incomprehensible miracles of this Sacrament, or such like things as have been remarked in the Catechism and the Confession of Faith of the French Calvinists, the reason is obvious. Namely, because the Swiss, as hath appeared, and those of Zurich, having been instructed by Zuinglius, would never come into the notion of any miracle in the Supper; and satisfied with a virtual presence, knew not the meaning of that communication of proper substance, which Calvin and the Calvinists kept such a stir about: in order, therefore, to come to an agreement, these things were necessarily to be suppressed, and such a confession of faith as the Swiss could accept was to be presented to them.

87.—*A third Confession of Faith sent into Germany.—1557.*

To these two confessions of faith drawn by Calvin, one for France, the other to please the Swiss, a third also during his life was added in favour of the German Protestants. Beza and Farel, deputed by the reformed churches of France and that of Geneva in 1557, carried it to Worms, where the Princes and States of the Augsburg Confession were assembled. The design was to engage them to intercede, in the Calvinists' behalf, with Henry II., who, treading in the steps of Francis I., his father, did his utmost to depress them. The expressions of "proper substance," readily laid aside when the Swiss were treated with, were not forgotten now; nay, so many other things were added, and so much said, that, how all this can be reconcileable with the doctrine of a figurative sense is past my skill to discover. For it is there said\*, "That not only the benefits of Jesus Christ are received in the Supper, but even his proper flesh and substance; that the body of the Son of God is not there proposed to us in figure only and by signification symbolically or typically as a memorial of Jesus Christ absent, but that he is truly and certainly rendered present with the symbols, which are not mere signs. And if (said they) we add, that the manner whereby this body is given to us is symbolical and sacramental, this is not because it is only figurative, but by reason that, under the species of things visible, God offers to us, gives to us, and, with the symbols, renders present to us, that which is there signified to us; and this we say, to the end it may appear that in the Supper we retain the proper body and the

\* Hosp. ad. 1557. f. 252.

proper blood of Jesus Christ ; and, if any dispute still remain, it concerns nothing but the manner."

Till now, we had never heard the Calvinists say that the Supper was not to be looked upon as a memorial of Jesus Christ absent : we had never heard them say, that in order to give us, not his benefits, but his substance and his proper flesh, he rendered it truly present to us under the species ; nor that in the Supper was to be confessed a presence of the proper body and the proper blood ; and were we not acquainted with the equivocations of the Sacramentarians, we could not but take them for as zealous defenders of the Real Presence as the Lutherans themselves. To hear them talk, one might reasonably doubt if any difference betwixt theirs and the Lutheran doctrine still remained. " If (said they) any dispute still remain, it concerns not the thing itself, but the manner of the presence only ;" so that the presence they acknowledge in the Supper must, in reality, be as real and as substantial as that which the Lutherans confess.

"And, in fact, when afterwards they treat on the manner of this presence, they reject nothing in this manner but what the Lutherans reject : they reject the natural or local manner of uniting himself to us ; and nobody says that Jesus Christ is united to us in the natural and ordinary way, or that he is in the sacrament, or in the faithful, as bodies are in their place—for he is there certainly in a more elevated manner. They reject the effusion of the human nature of Jesus Christ ; to wit, Ubiquity, which the Lutherans rejected likewise, and which, as yet, had not so highly gained the ascendant. They reject a gross mixture of the substance of Jesus Christ together with ours, which nobody did admit, for nothing can be less gross, and further remote from vulgar mixtures, than the union of our Lord's body with ours, which is no less avowed by Lutherans than by Catholics. But what they, above all things, reject utterly, is that gross and diabolical Transubstantiation, without saying so much as a word of the Lutheran Consubstantiation, which, as we shall see, they did not think in their hearts a whit less diabolical or less carnal. But it behoved them to be silent on that head, for fear of offending the Lutherans, whose assistance they were then imploring. And, finally, they concluded quite short, by saying that the presence which they acknowledge, is brought about in a spiritual manner, and supported by the incomprehensible virtue of the Holy Ghost ;—words

which the Lutherans themselves employed, as well as Catholics, in order to exclude, together with a presence in figure, even a presence in virtue, which has nothing in it that is miraculous or beyond comprehension.

88.—*Another Confession of Faith made by those in Prison, in order to be sent to the Protestants.*

Such was the Confession of Faith which the Calvinists of France sent to the Protestants of Germany. Those who were imprisoned in France on the score of religion, joined to it their particular declaration, in which they expressly receive the Confession of Augsburg in all its articles, excepting only that of the Eucharist; adding, nevertheless, what is not less strong than the Augsburg Confession, that the Supper is not a sign of Jesus Christ absent; then, turn themselves immediately against the Papists, and their change of substance and adoration, without speaking so much as a word against the particular doctrine of Lutheranism.

This was the cause that induced the Lutherans, with the joint consent of all their divines, to judge that this declaration sent from France was conformable, in every point, to the Confession of Augsburg, notwithstanding what was there said concerning the tenth article; because, in the main, it said more on the Real Presence than this article had done.

The article of Augsburg expressed “that, with the bread and wine, the body and blood were truly present and truly distributed to those who took the Supper.” These say, “that the proper flesh, and the proper substance of Jesus Christ, is truly present, and truly given with the symbols, and under the visible species,” and the rest nothing less precise than what has been related; insomuch, that if it be asked which more strongly express the Substantial Presence, the Lutherans who believe it, or the Calvinists who disbelieve it, the last will certainly have the preference.

89.—*All the other articles of the Augsburg Confession are owned by the Calvinists.*

As for the other articles of the Confession of Augsburg, they stood confirmed by the sole exception of this article of the Supper; that is to say, the Calvinists, even those who were detained in prison for their religion's sake, professed, contrary to their belief, the necessity of baptism, the amissibility of justice, the uncertainty of predestination, the merit of good works, and prayer for the dead; all points which we

have read in express terms in the Augsburg Confession; and in this manner did the martyrs of the new Reformation destroy, by their equivocations, or express denial, that faith for which they died.

90.—*Reflections on these three Confessions of Faith.*

Thus have we clearly seen three different languages of our Calvinists in three different Confessions of Faith. By that which they made for themselves, they appeared anxious to please themselves: to content the Zuinglians, they lopped off something from it; and, in case of need, they knew what to add to make the Lutherans their friends.

91.—*The Conference of Poissy.—How undertaken.—Calvin comes not to it, but leaves the affair to Beza.—1561.*

We shall now hear the Calvinists explain their doctrine, not among one another, or to the Zuinglians or Lutherans, but to the Catholics. This happened in 1561, in the minority of Charles IX., at the famous conference of Poissy, where, by the orders of Queen Catherine de Medicis, his mother and regent of the kingdom, the prelates were assembled, in order to confer with the ministers about reforming those abuses which gave a pretext to heresy\*.

As in France people grew weary of the long delays of a general council, so often promised by the popes, and of the frequent interruptions of that which was at length convened by them at Trent, the queen, deceived by some prelates of suspected doctrine, whose sentiments were backed by the Lord Chancellor de l'Hôpital, a great personage, and very zealous for his country, believed too easily, that in so universal a commotion she might of herself take care of France apart, without the authority of the Holy See and council. She was made to believe that a conference would reconcile men's minds, and that the disputes which divided them would more surely be determined by an agreement than by a decision, which could not fail of displeasing one or the other side. The cardinal Charles of Lorraine, Archbishop of Rheims, who, having governed all under Francis II., with his brother Francis, Duke of Guise, had always maintained himself in great repute, a great genius, a great statesman, of a sparkling and winning eloquence, learned even for a man of his quality and employments, hoped to signalize himself in public, and withal to please the court, by entering into

\* Hosp. ad An. 1561. Bez. Hist. Eccl. l. iv. La Poplin. l. vii. Thuan. l. xxviii.

the queen's design. By this means the assembly of Poissy was set on foot. The Calvinists deputed thither the ablest men they had, excepting Calvin, whom they would not shew, whether from fear of exposing to the public hatred the head of so odious a party, or he himself believed it safer for his honour to send his disciples, he remaining at Geneva where he ruled, and underhand managed the assembly, than to engage in person.

It is likewise true, that the weakness of his health, and the violence of his headstrong temper, rendered him less able to maintain a conference, than Theodore Beza, who was of a more robust constitution, and had more command of himself: Beza, then, was the man that most appeared, or rather, who alone appeared in this assembly. He was looked upon as the principal disciple, and the intimate friend of Calvin, who had chosen him for a coadjutor in his ministry and labours at Geneva, which seemed the metropolis of his Reformation. Calvin dispatched his instructions to him, and Beza returned him a full account of all transactions, as appears from both their letters.

92.—*Matters treated of in the Conference, and the opening of it.*

Two points of doctrine only, properly speaking, were debated in this assembly: one relating to the Church; the other to the Supper. There lay the stress of the whole affair, because the article of the Church was looked upon by Catholics as a general principle, which subverted the very foundation of all new Churches; and among the particular articles disputed on, none appeared so essential as that of the Supper. The Cardinal of Lorraine urged the opening of the Conference, though the main body of the prelates, especially the Cardinal de Tournon, Archbishop of Lyons, who presided over them in quality of the oldest Cardinal, had an extreme repugnance to it. They apprehended, and with reason too, lest the subtilities of the ministers, their dangerous eloquence heightened with an air of piety, never wanting to the most perverse of heretics, and more than all this, lest the charms of novelty might impose on courtiers, before whom they were to speak, but chiefly on the King and Queen, both susceptible, he by reason of his tender age, she from natural curiosity, of any impressions, rather bad than good, considering the wretched disposition of human nature, and the temper which then prevailed at court. But the Cardinal of



'Lorraine, supported by Montluc, Bishop of Valence, carried the point, and so the conference began.

93.—*The harangue of the Cardinal of Lorraine.—The Calvinists' Confession of Faith presented to the King in the Assembly.—Beza speaks, and says more than makes for him concerning the absence of Jesus Christ in the Supper.*

There is no need of my giving an account, either of the admirable harangue made by the Cardinal of Lorraine, and its merited applause, or of the honour which Beza acquired by offering to answer at the moment to the Cardinal's premeditated discourse \* ; but it is of some importance to remember, that, in this august assembly, the ministers presented publicly to the King, in the name of all their Churches, their joint Confession of Faith, drawn under Henry II., in their first synod held at Paris, as above mentioned. Beza, who presented it, made at the same time, by a long discourse, the defence of it, when, notwithstanding all his address, he fell into a great self-contradiction. He, who a few days before, being accused by the Cardinal of Lorraine in the presence of Queen Catherine and the whole court, of having written in one of his books, that Jesus Christ was no more in the Supper than in the mire, *Non magis in Cœni quam in Cæno*, had rejected this proposition as impious and detested by the whole party, advanced the equivalent to it, at the Conference, even in the face of all France. For, being on the subject of the Eucharist, in the heat of his discourse, he said, that with respect to place, and the presence of Jesus Christ considered according to his human nature, his body was as far distant from the Supper as the highest Heavens are from earth. The whole assembly was in a commotion at these words †. They remembered with what a horror he had spoken of that proposition, which as much excluded Jesus Christ from the Supper, as from the mire. He now falls into it again, when nobody urges him. The murmur from all sides made it appear how much men were struck with so strange a novelty. Beza himself, under confusion for having said so much, did not cease thereafter to importune the Queen, by frequent and reiterated requests, to obtain the liberty of explaining himself, on the plea that, being pressed by time, he had not had the leisure of making his thought rightly understood before the King. 'But so many words are not required to utter what a man believes. And, indeed, one may venture to say,

\* Ep. Bez ad. Calv. inter. Ep. Calv. p. 330.

† Thuan. xxviii. 48.

that what disturbed Beza was not any deficiency in expounding his tenets, but, rather, what gave him and his friends so much anxiety, was, that by laying open in too distinct terms the bottom of the party's doctrine on the real absence of Jesus Christ, he had made it but too visibly appear, that the great words of Proper Substance and the like, which they employed to keep up some notion of reality, were nothing but mere sham.

94.—*Another explanation of the Supper-article full of perplexed words.*

From harangues they soon proceeded to particular conferences, chiefly on the Supper, wherein the Bishop of Valence, and Duval, Bishop of Sees, to whom a smattering of erudition, not to mention other motives, gave a secret propensity towards Calvinism, were set on nothing else, together with the ministers, but to find out some ambiguous formulary which both sides, in some measure, might rest satisfied with, without diving to the bottom of the question.

The strong expressions, which we have seen in the Confession of Faith then presented, were pretty well adapted to this scheme; but the ministers must needs make further additions which ought not to be omitted. This will appear surprising; for, as they ought to have done their best fully to explain their doctrine in the confession of faith, which they but just presented to so solemn an assembly, it seems that, when questioned concerning their belief, they should have nothing else to do than refer themselves to so authentic an act; but this is what they did not do; and behold here in what manner they proposed their doctrine by common consent. "We confess the presence of the body and blood of Jesus Christ in the holy Supper, where he truly gives us the substance of his body and blood by the operation of his Holy Spirit, and that we receive and eat, spiritually and by faith, this same true body, which was sacrificed for us; to the end we might be bone of his bone, and flesh of his flesh, and be enlivened, and receive all that is profitable to our salvation; and by reason that faith, supported by God's promise, makes present the things received, and takes really and in fact the true natural body of our Lord, by virtue of the Holy Ghost; in this sense, we do believe and confess the presence of the proper body and the proper blood of Jesus Christ in the Supper." Here are still those great phrases, those pompous expressions, and those long discourses for the

purpose of saying nothing. But after all this verbosity, they were not yet satisfied with their exposition, but soon after subjoined, "That the distance of place could be no hindrance to our partaking of the body and blood of Jesus Christ, by reason that our Lord's Supper is a heavenly thing, and although we on earth receive with our mouths the bread and wine as the true signs of the body and blood, our souls, which are nourished therewith, being raised up to Heaven by faith, and the efficacy of the Holy Ghost, enjoy present the body and blood of Jesus Christ; and in that manner the body and blood are truly united to the bread and wine, but in a sacramental way, to wit, not according to place, or the natural position of bodies, but inasmuch as they efficaciously signify, that God gives this body and this blood to those who faithfully partake of the signs themselves, and that by faith they truly do receive them." How many words, only to express, that the signs of the body and blood, received with faith, do, by this faith inspired from God, unite us to the body and blood which are in heaven! No more than this had been requisite to explain themselves distinctly; and this substantial enjoyment of the body truly and really present, and the rest of that strain, are to no other purpose than to raise a mist of confused ideas, instead of dispelling, by setting things in a clear light, which, in an explanation of faith, we are obliged to do. But, in this simplicity, which we demand of them, Christians would not have found what they desired, namely, the true presence of Jesus Christ in both his natures; and, deprived of this presence, would have perceived, as it were, a certain void, which, for want of the thing itself, the ministers endeavoured to fill up with this multiplicity of sounding, yet insignificant expressions.

95.—*The reflections of Catholics on these indeterminate and pompous discourses.*

The Catholics, at a loss to know the meaning of all this monstrous language, could only perceive from it that Beza's great design, by all these phrases, was to supply what he was conscious was too hollow and defective in the Calvinian Supper. The whole force of them lay in these words, "Faith makes present the things promised." But this discourse appeared very indeterminate to Catholics. By this means, said they, judgment and the general resurrection, the glory of the blessed, as well as the fire of the damned, will be equally present to us with the body of Jesus Christ in the

Holy Eucharist; and if this presence, by faith, makes us receive the very substance of things, nothing hinders the happy souls that are in heaven from receiving, actually and before the general resurrection, the proper substance of their bodies as truly as we are here made to receive, by faith, the proper substance of the body of Jesus Christ. For, if faith renders things so truly present, as thereby to possess the substance of them, how much more the beatific vision! But in order to unite to us the proper substance of the body and blood, what avails this lifting up our souls to heaven by faith? Can a moral elevation, and in affection only, bring about such unions? In this manner, what substance is there that cannot be embraced? What does the efficacy of the Holy Ghost work here? The Holy Ghost inspires faith, but faith thus inspired, be it never so strong, unites itself no more to the substance of things than other thoughts, than other affections of the mind. What can be the meaning of those indefinite words, "We receive from Jesus Christ what is profitable to us," without declaring what this is? if these words of our Saviour, "Flesh profiteth nothing," are, as the Ministers will have it, to be understood of the true flesh of Jesus Christ considered as to its substance, to what purpose so much noise about what they pretend affords no profit? why is there kept so great a work about the substance of the flesh and blood received so really? why not reject, concluded Catholics, these empty words, and, in proposing their faith, at least lay cant aside, and speak intelligibly?

96.—*Peter Martyr's opinion concerning the equivocations of the Ministers.*

Peter Martyr, a native of Florence, and one of the most famous Ministers that were in this assembly, was of this mind, and frequently declared that, for his part, he knew no meaning this word *substance* had; yet endeavoured to explain it the best way he could, not to give offence to Calvin and his companions.

97.—*What the Dr. Depense added to the Ministers' expressions, in order to make them pass the better.*

Claude Depense, a Parisian Doctor, a man of good sense, and learned for a time when matters had not so well been canvassed and cleared up, as they have since been by so much disputation, was among those who were to labour with the

Ministers to reconcile the article of the Supper. Being sincere, and of a mild temper, he was judged proper for this design : but, for all his mildness, he could not bear with the doctrine of the Calvinists ; but thought those insupportable who made the work of God, namely, the presence of the body of Jesus Christ, to depend not on the word and promise of him who gave it, but on their faith who were to receive it : accordingly he disapproved their article from the first proposition, and before all the additions which they since made to it. For his part, therefore, to render our communion, with the substance of the body, independent of the faith of men, and annexed only to the efficacy and operation of the word of God, letting pass the first words as far as those where the Ministers say, “ That faith makes things present,” he substituted these words in lieu thereof, namely, “ And because the word and promise of God makes present the things promised, and by the efficacy of this word we do really and in fact receive the true natural body of our Lord, in this sense we confess and acknowledge in the Supper the presence of his proper body and proper blood.” Thus he owned a real and substantial presence independently of faith, and in virtue of the sole words of our Lord ; whereby he thought to determine the ambiguous and unsettled sense of those terms which the Ministers made use of.

98.—*The decision of the Prelates, delivering very plainly and in few words the whole Catholic doctrine.*

The Prelates approved nothing of all this, and pursuant to the opinions of the Doctors, whom they had brought along with them, declared the article of the Ministers heretical, captious, and insufficient : heretical, because it denied the substantial, and properly so called, presence ; captious, because, in denying it, it seemed to favour the thing ; insufficient, because it concealed and dissembled the ministry of priests, the force of the sacramental words, and the change of substance, the natural effect thereof\*. On their side they opposed to the Ministers a declaration of their faith, as full and as precise as that of the Calvinists was imperfect and perplexed. Beza relates it in these terms :—“ We believe and confess, that in the holy sacrament of the altar, the true body and blood of Jesus Christ is really and substantially under the species of bread and wine, by the virtue and power of the

\* Bez. Hist. Ecc. l. iv. p. 611—614. La Poplin, l. vii.

divine word pronounced by the priest, the sole minister ordained for this effect, according to the institution and commandment of our Lord Jesus Christ\*." Here is nothing captious or equivocal, and Beza owns this was all that "could be drawn at that time from the clergy, in order to allay the troubles of religion, the prelates having made themselves judges, instead of conferring amicably." I desire no other testimony than this of Beza, to shew that the Bishops did their duty in fairly explaining their faith, avoiding great words which impose on men by their sound, and signify nothing distinctly, and by refusing to enter into any composition in what relates to faith. Such plain dealing as this suited not the Ministers, and so this great assembly broke up without any manner of success. God baffled the policy and pride of those who thought by their eloquence, little arts, and weak contrivances, to quench, in its first fury, so great a conflagration.

99.—*The vain discourses of the Bishop of Valence, concerning the reformation of manners.*

The reformation of discipline succeeded but little better. Fine speeches were uttered, fine proposals made, but to little or no effect. The Bishop of Valence discoursed admirably, as his custom was, against abuses, and on the duties and charge of Bishops, chiefly on that of residence, which he observed the least of any. But, to make amends, he was quite silent as to celibacy, and the exact observance of it, though, by the Fathers, it was always insisted on as the brightest ornament of the ecclesiastical order. He had not feared to violate it by a clandestine marriage, in spite of the canons; nay, a Protestant historian, who, notwithstanding he sets him off for one "of the wisest and greatest men of that age through the whole sequel of his life†," reveals to us his passion, his avarice, and the shameful disorders of his life, the noise of which reached as far as Ireland, in the most scandalous manner imaginable. Yet he declaimed loudly against vice, and convinced mankind that he was one of those admirable reformers who could correct and reprove every thing in their neighbour, provided you leave them but alone to their own corrupted inclinations.

\* Hist. Eccl. l. iv. p. 611—614.

† V. S. lib. vii. n. 7.

100.—*The Tenth Article of the Augsburg Confession is proposed to the Calvinists, but they refuse to sign it.*

As for the Calvinists, it was a triumph to them to have been so much as heard in such an assembly. But this imaginary triumph was but short, for the Cardinal of Lorraine had a long while conceived a design to propose to them the signing of the Tenth Article of the Augsburg Confession: should they sign it, this would be embracing the Reality, which all those of that confession so strenuously defended; should they refuse it, this would be condemning Luther and his followers in an essential point, who were unquestionably the first authors of the new Reformation, and its main support. In order to make the division of all these Reformers more manifest all over France, the Cardinal had taken his measures beforehand, and agreed with the Lutherans of Germany to send him three or four of their ablest doctors, who, appearing at Poissy under pretext of making up their whole differences at once, should there undertake the Calvinists. Thus these new doctors, all of them giving out the Scripture for so mighty clear, would have been seen urging one another with its authority, yet never able to come to the least agreement. The Lutheran doctors arrived too late; but the Cardinal nevertheless failed not to make his proposal. Beza and his companions, resolved not to sign the Tenth Article, as proposed, thought to escape by inquiring of the Catholics, in return, whether they were willing to subscribe the rest; by which means they should all, in everything, agree, except the Tenth Article of the Supper alone, a subtle, but frivolous evasion\*. For after all, the Catholics had no manner of reason to concern themselves with Luther's authority, nor the Confession of Augsburg, nor the defenders of it, all which the Calvinists could not be too tender of, for fear of condemning the Reformation in its very source. However that may be, this was all the Cardinal obtained; and content with making it appear to all France, that this party of Reformers, who outwardly appeared so terrible, were yet inwardly so weak by their own divisions, he suffered the assembly to break up. But Anthony of Bourbon, King of Navarre and first Prince of the blood, very favourable, till then, to the new party, which he was only acquainted with under the appellation of Lutherans, undeceived himself; and instead of that piety, which he had before believed in them, began, from that time,

\* Ep. Bez. ad Calv. inter Cal. Ep. pp. 346, 347.

to be convinced there was nothing in it but bitter zeal and prodigious infatuation.

101.—*The Confession of Augsburg received by the Calvinists in all other points, yet through policy only.*

Yet it was no small advantage to the Catholic cause, to have obliged the Calvinists, in such an assembly, to receive anew the Confession of Augsburg, with exclusion only of the article of Supper; since, as we have seen, they renounced by this means so many important points of their own doctrine. Beza, nevertheless, spoke out, and made a solemn declaration of it, with the consent of all his colleagues. But whatsoever policy, and the desire of supporting themselves as much as possible by the Confession of Augsburg, might have extorted from them on this occasion, as in many others, their thoughts and words did not agree; nor can this be doubted of, when the instruction, which, even during the Conference, they received from Calvin\*, is looked into. “You (says he) that assist at the Conference, ought to be upon your guard, lest in maintaining your own just right, you appear stubborn, and so cause the whole blame of the rupture to be cast on you. The Confession of Augsburg, you are sensible, is the torch which your furies employ to light up that fire which has set all France in a combustion; but you ought to look narrowly into the reason which makes them press you so much to receive it, considering that its suppleness has ever been displeasing to men of good sense, and that Melancthon, its author, often repented of having drawn it up: and lastly, that in many places it is adapted to the practice in Germany; besides that its obscure and defective brevity has this evil in it, of omitting sundry articles of the greatest moment.”

It then plainly appears, that it was not the sole article of the Supper, but, in general, the whole Confession of Augsburg which displeased him. This only article, nevertheless, was excepted against; though when Germany was concerned, it was often found proper to waive even this exception.

102.—*How many different parts were played by Calvin and the Calvinists with respect to the Confession of Augsburg.*

This is what appears by another letter of the same Calvin, written also during the Conference, whereby we may perceive how many different parts he played at the same time.

\* Ep. p. 342.



It was, I say, at this very time, and in the year 1561, that he wrote a letter to the Princes of Germany in behalf of those of Strasburg; at the beginning of which he makes them say \*, “That they are of the number of those who receive the Confession of Augsburg throughout, even in the article of the Supper;” and he adds, “that the Queen of England (Elizabeth), although she approves of the Confession of Augsburg, rejects nevertheless the carnal ways of speaking of Heshusius, and others,” who could not endure either Calvin, or Beza, or Peter Martyr, or Melancthon himself, whom, with respect to the Supper, they accused of relaxation.

103.—*A like dissimulation in the Elector Frederick III.*

The same behaviour may be seen in the Confession of Faith of the Elector Frederick III., Count Palatine, reported in the collection of Geneva: a confession wholly Calvinistical, and as inimical to the Real Presence as any ever was; since this Prince there declares, that Jesus Christ is not in the Supper “in any manner, either visible, or invisible, comprehensible, or incomprehensible, but in Heaven only †.” Nevertheless, his son and successor, John Casimir, in the preface which he places before this Confession, says expressly, “that his father never did depart from the Confession of Augsburg, nor even from the Apology which was joined to it:” it is that of Melancthon, which we have seen to be so distinct and full for the Real Presence; and, if the son should not meet with credit, the father himself, in the body of his Confession, declares the self-same thing, in the self-same terms.

104.—*Calvin’s shifting address with regard to the Tenth Article of the Augsburg Confession.*

It was therefore a method pretty much in vogue, even amongst the Calvinists, to approve purely and simply the Confession of Augsburg when Germany was concerned, either out of a certain respect for Luther, the common father of the whole pretended Reformation; or because that confession only had been tolerated in Germany by the States of the empire; and even out of the empire itself had obtained so great an authority, that Calvin and the Calvinists ‡ durst not own, without great deference and precaution, that they departed from it; seeing that, in the exception even of the sole article of the Supper, which they often made, they rather chose the

\* Ep. p. 324.

† Syn. Gen. part ii. pp. 141, 142.

‡ Ep. p. 319. 2. Def. Ult. Adm. ad Westp.

subterfuge of diversity of editions, and difference of sense put upon this article, than absolutely to reject it.

And accordingly, Calvin, who makes so free with the Confession of Augsburg, when he speaks in confidence to his friends, everywhere else shews an outward respect for it, even in regard to the article of the Supper, owning he receives it when rightly explained\*, and in the same manner Melancthon, the author thereof, did himself understand it. But there is nothing more frivolous than this evasion; for, although this Confession was penned by Melancthon, he did not expound therein his own particular doctrine, but that of Luther and the whole party, whose secretary and interpreter he was, as he himself often declares.

And allowing that in a public act the private sentiments of that person who drew it up might be referred to, it ought, however, to be considered, not what Melancthon's notions were afterwards, but what they and those of all his sect were at that time; there being no reason to doubt but he endeavoured to explain naturally what they all believed: so much the more, as we have seen that he as sincerely rejected the figurative sense at that time, as Luther himself; which he never openly approved, notwithstanding the various shifts and inconstancy he afterwards was subject to. It is not, therefore, upright and just dealing to appeal to Melancthon's judgment in this matter; and for all Calvin's continual boasts of speaking his real sentiments without the least dissimulation, yet it is plainly seen that his design was to flatter the Lutherans. Nay, so palpable became this flattery, that at length they were ashamed of it even in the party; and this was the reason that, in the acts we have just considered, especially in the Conference of Poissy, they resolved to accept the article of the Supper, but that only; not at all concerned that by their approbation of all the rest, they passed sentence against their own Confession of Faith, which they had but a little before presented to Charles IX.

\* Ep. p. 319. 2. Def. Ult. Adm. ad Westp.

---



# INDEX

TO•

## VOLUME THE FIRST.

CONTAINING WHATEVER OCCURS OF IMPORTANCE UNDER THE  
SOME HEADS IN THE SECOND VOLUME.

- Absolution*, Sacramental, owned by the Lutherans, 121—and by the English under Henry VIII., 275.
- Abstinence* from flesh retained in England, 304—the Church of Rome justified by the English in her abstinence from flesh, *ib.*
- Adoration*, the Protestants cannot endure the adoration rendered to Jesus Christ in the Eucharist, 218—Luther's doctrine implies adoration, 221—the adoration of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist suppressed in England under Edward VI., 305—*Vide* Vol. II.
- Aerius*. The Lutherans' contradictory sentiments on the doctrine of Aerius against prayer for the dead, 127.
- Ailly* (*Cardinal Peter D'*), his opinions concerning the Reformation of the Church, 19, 21.
- Albert*, of Brandebourg, Great Master of the Teutonic Order, turns Lutheran, and why, 326.
- Amisibility* of justice owned in the Confession of Augsburg, 114—received in 1557, by the Calvinists of France, 395—*Vide* Vol. II.
- Amsdorf* (*Nicholas*), ordained Bishop of Naumburg by Luther, 39.
- Anabaptists*, the, preach without mission or miracles, 39—they instil into people the spirit of rebellion, 56—they rise in arms with unparalleled fury, 57—they are condemned in the Confession of Augsburg with respect to three considerable articles, 114.
- Anne Boleyn*, mistress of Henry VIII. King of England, favours Lutheranism, 62, 257—Henry VIII. marries her, 261—she upholds with all her power Thomas Cromwell and Cranmer in their designs, 264—her immodest and licentious behaviour, 265—her infamous death, 266, 268—her daughter Elizabeth declared illegitimate, 266.
- Anne of Cleves*, Henry VIII., King of England, marries her, 273—she is repudiated, 274.
- Anthony of Bourbon*, King of Navarre, disabused of the good opinion he had of the Protestant party, 404.
- Apology*, the, for the Augsburg Confession, made by Melancthon, 91—approved by the whole party, *ib.*—altered by the Lutherans, 93.
- Augustin* (St.), his doctrine on justifying grace approved by the Lutherans, 121—rejected by Melancthon, 193.
- Augustin* (St.), the Monk sent by St. Gregory to convert the English, 301.

*Augsburg*, Diet of, where the Confessions of Faith are presented to Charles V., 89—the Augsburg Confession of Faith, how drawn up by Melancthon, 90, 120—this is held in the greatest repute of all the Protestant Confessions of Faith, 91—the tenth Article of the Augsburg Confession relating to the Supper expressed four different ways, *ib.*—which of these four is the original, 93—a word in the Augsburg Confession, which tended to Demipelagianism, 103—strange doctrine of the Augsburg Confession concerning the love of God, 119—what is said about the Mass in the Confession of Augsburg, 124—the Zuinglians' jests upon the Confession of Augsburg, 344—owned defective, 183, 346—corrected, 339—and nevertheless from a point of honour always approved, 194, 339—the different editions not to be reconciled, 344, *et seq.*—the Calvinists receive the Confession of Augsburg in 1557, with the exception only of the tenth article, 394—whch they refuse to sign at Poissy, 404—what Calvin said concerning the Confession of Augsburg, 405—the dissimulation of the Elector Frederick III., with respect to the Confession of Augsburg, 406—Calvin's shifting address with regard to the tenth Article of the Confession of Augsburg, *ib.*

*Authority of the Church*—*Vide Church.*

*Baptism*, error of the Zuinglians on baptism, 67—infant baptism by the Lutherans believed necessary to salvation, 104—the necessity of baptism taught in the Confession of Augsburg, 114—this necessity denied by Calvin, 340—Calvin teaches that baptism is not necessary to salvation, 358—Calvin's contradictions upon infant baptism, 361—the necessity of baptism received in 1557 by the Calvinists of France, 395.

*Basil*, the Confession of Faith of those of Basil, 148—another Confession of those of Basil, and the precedent one softened, 150—the equivocation of this Confession of Faith, 151.

*Bernard* (St.), his desire of the Reformation of Church-discipline, 18—St. Bernard, ill-cited by Protestants for the necessity of reforming the Church, 20—St. Bernard placed by Luther in the list of Saints, 124.

*Bernardin Ochin*, called into England to begin the Reformation there, 299.

*Beza* maintains that the sense which Catholics give to the words of the institution is more supportable than that of the Lutherans, 77—he is deputed by the Protestant Churches of France to the assembly of Worms and Geneva, 393—he is present at the Conference of Poissy, 397—he harangues there, and lets fall more than he intended to have said with relation to the absence of Jesus Christ in the Supper, 398—*Vide Vol. II.*

*Bishops*, authority of Bishops despised by Protestants, 174—Melancthon is for owning Bishops, 188—all the Bishops in England subscribe the decisions of Henry VIII., 271—the Bishops of England take out new commissions from Edward VI., 295—the Bishops of England have no share in matters of religion and faith, 298.

*Bohemians*, their separation condemned by Luther, 33—the buffooneries of Luther, 45, 228.

*Brag* of Calvin, 389.

*Brentius*, a famous Protestant, favours Osiander, 337.

*Bucer* gives a figurative sense to the words of the institution, 70—he was present at the Conference of Marburg, 87—he draws up the Strasburg Confession of Faith, 90—his character, *ib.*—his fruitfulness in equivocations, *ib.* 96—his doctrine on the merit of good works, 118—he undertakes the defence of the prayers of the Church, and shews in what

sense the merits of Saints are useful to us, 119—he is dispatched by the Landgrave of Hesse, to have an interview with Luther and Zuinglius, 137—his transactions with Luther, 140—his equivocating shifts in order to reconcile the parties, 141—the agreement by him proposed, no more than verbal, 142—his equivocations on the words Sacrament and Mystery, 145—he plays with words, 146—he owns that the unworthy receive the body of Jesus Christ really, 118, 226—he grants six Articles to Luther concerning the Supper, 152—he deceives Luther, and evades the terms of agreement, 153—his equivocations owned by Calvin, 155—those even of Zurich make a jest of them, 157—explication of the doctrine, and the return of the towns from his belief to that of the Real Presence, 159—he satisfies the Lutherans in the assembly of Smalcald, 164—Bucer's testimony concerning the hypocrisy of the Protestants, 178—he is sent to Luther by the Landgrave to obtain leave for this Prince to marry a second wife, his first still living, 205—he makes a new Confession of Faith, 216—his perplexities with relation to the communion of the impious, 217—his doctrine about the Eucharist not hearkened to in England, 220—he is present at the Conference of Ratisbon, 323—he makes a new Confession of Faith, *ib.*—he dies in England without having been able to change anything in the articles of Peter Martyr, 325.

*Burnet* (Mr.), a new piece published by Mr. Burnet about Luther's sentiment touching a reconciliation with the Zuinglians, 229—he owns that the Reformation began in England by a man equally rejected by both parties, 254—Mr. Burnet's magnificent words concerning the English Reformation, 253—the heroes of Mr. Burnet's history even by his own testimony are not always very virtuous men, 255—what he relates of Montluc, Bishop of Valence, 256—what he says of Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, 257—what he says of the oath Cranmer took at his Consecration, 259—what he says of the cruelties and excesses of Henry VIII., 262—the praises he gives to Queen Catherine, the lawful wife of Henry VIII., 265—what he says of the disorderly behaviour of Anne Boleyn, *ib.*—he comes off lamely in his excuse of Cranmer's cowardice, 267—how he excuses the Protestants of England for subscribing the decisions of Henry VIII., who approved the principal points of the Catholic doctrine, 271—his vain artifices to excuse the hypocrisy of Thomas Cromwell, 273—he is ashamed of that sentence which annulled the marriage of Henry VIII. with Anne of Cleves, 274—he owns that scarce anything was changed in the Offices and Rituals of the Church under Henry VIII., 276—what he says of Cranmer's resisting the Six Articles of Henry VIII., *ib.*—he is confounded at Cranmer's doctrine about the power of the Ministers of the Church, 277—he laments his seeing in England the ecclesiastical power in the hands of seculars, 278—he sets down two points of Reformation under Henry VIII., 288—a proof, from Mr. Burnet, of the snares laid for the weak and simple by the pretended perspicuity of Scripture, 289—Mr. Burnet's confession of the belief of the Greek Church, 300—he vindicates us in the observance of Saints-days and abstinence from flesh, 304—his vain efforts to justify Cranmer in little things, without saying a word of great ones, 308—he ill compares Cranmer's twice abjuring his faith to the denial of St. Peter, 311—he badly excuses the Reformers, 313—the fallacy in the examples alleged by him, *ib.*—his facts far from being certain, *ib.*—his imposition with regard to Fra-Paolo, 314—his error concerning the Pallium, 316—his gross error concerning Celibacy and the Roman Pontifical, 317—*Vide* Vol. II.

*Calumnies of Protestants against the Church on the point of Justification*, 103—other calumnies on the merit of good works, 105—three other calumnies against the Invocation of Saints, and concerning Images, 129.

*Calvin*, his esteem for Luther, 5, 23—what Galvin writes to Melancthon upon the strange division of Protestants, 85—his sentiments on equivocations in matters of faith, 154—what he writes to Bullinger and Melancthon about the tyranny of Luther, 180—what he says of the adoration of the blessed Sacrament retained by Luther, 224—he favours Henry VIII. in his divorce, 284—he rejects the ceremonies of the Church, *ib.*—what he says of Osiander's profane temper, 322—the incompatibility of his sentiments with those of Melancthon, 174—he draws up a Confession of Faith, 354—his genius; his refinements surpass those of Luther, 355—he adds to imputed justice the certainty of Salvation, 356—he teaches that justice cannot be lost, 357—he teaches that Baptism is not necessary to salvation, *ib.*—he maintains that the children of the faithful are born in grace, 358—Calvin's principles but supposed; he argued better than Luther, but swerved wider from truth, 359—two tenets of Calvin's, concerning children, not suiting with his principles, *ib.*—his agreement with those of Geneva and Zurich, 361—the contradictions of his doctrine upon Infant Baptism, *ib.*—his refinements upon the Eucharist, 362—he shews that, after fifteen years' disputing, the Lutherans and Zuinglians had not understood one another on this point, *ib.*—Calvin, already known on account of his Institutions, makes himself more so by his Treatise on the Supper, *ib.*—his doctrine on the Eucharist almost forgotten by his followers, *ib.*—he is not satisfied with receiving a sign only in the Supper, 363—not even an efficacious sign, nor the virtue and merit of Jesus Christ, *ib.*—his doctrine partakes somewhat of that of Bucer's and of the Articles of Wirtemberg, *ib.*—he endeavours to reconcile Luther and Zuinglius, 367—with what force he speaks of the Reality, *ib.*—a new effect of Faith, according to Calvin, 368—he will have the proper substance, and that we receive the body and blood of Jesus Christ otherwise than did the ancient Hebrews, 369—according to his expressions it must be believed that the reception of the body of Jesus Christ is independent of Faith, *ib.*—and that the true body is in the Sacrament, 370—he maintains that the body is under the sign of bread, as the Holy Ghost under the dove, *ib.*—he makes Jesus Christ present in the bread as God was in the ark, 371—he says he disputes but of the manner, and admits the thing as much as we, *ib.*—he admits a presence of the body which is miraculous and ineffable, 372—he admits a presence that is proper and peculiar to the 'Supper, 373—the communion of the unworthy, how real, according to Calvin, *ib.*—a comparison by him made use of to enforce the truth of the body's being received by the unworthy, 374—he speaks inconsequently, 375—he explains as we do that saying, "that flesh profiteth nothing," 376—he weakens his own expressions, and eludes the miracle which he owns in the Supper, 377—he is sensible of the insufficiency of his doctrine to explain the miracle of the Eucharist, 378—his perplexities and contradictions in the defence of the figurative sense, 379—the cause of his perplexity, *ib.*—he saw further into the difficulty than the rest of the Sacramentarians: how he endeavours to solve it, 380—the examples which he drew from Scripture: that of Circumcision convicts instead of helping him, *ib.*—another example nothing to the purpose, viz. that the Church is called the body of Jesus Christ, 381—he makes new efforts

- to save the notion of reality impressed by the Institution of Jesus Christ, 382—how his doctrine is explained in the book entitled “*Du Préservatif*,” &c. 383—he would make one understand more than he really meant to say, 385—a passage of Calvin's for a Real Presence independent of Faith, 386—he rejects ceremonies, *ib.*—his pride and boastings, 388—the difference between Calvin and Luther, *ib.*—how he bragged of his eloquence, 389—he has as much violence and more acrimony than Luther, 390—the contempt he passes on the Fathers, 391—whether he has varied in his doctrine, 392—why he was not in person at the Conference of Poissy, 396—the instruction he sends to the Ministers during the Conference, 405—what he says of the Confession of Augsburg, *ib.*—his special caution with regard to the tenth Article of the Augsburg Confession, 406—*Vide* Vol. II.
- Calvinists* (The) give in to the Semipelagianism of the Lutherans, 352—they have two tenets concerning children not conformable with their principles, 359—the present Calvinists have abandoned the doctrine of Calvin about the Supper, 383—they were more sensible that a miracle ought to be admitted in the Eucharist than they did indeed admit one, 378—what opinion other Protestants had of the Calvinists, 387—Variations in the Acts of Calvinists, 392—they send a Confession of Faith into Germany, which is not consistent with the figurative sense, 393—they send thither another Confession of Faith, in which they deliver themselves more strongly in favour of the Real Presence than the Lutherans themselves, 395—they own all the Articles of the Augsburg Confession except the tenth, *ib.*—they depute the ablest men among them to the Conference of Poissy, 397—there they present their Confession of Faith to Charles IX., 398—their explanation of the Supper Article, full of intricate words, 399—they refuse to sign the tenth Article of the Augsburg Confession, 404—which they receive throughout in all other points, but only out of policy, 405—how many different parts they at that time played with respect to the Confession of Augsburg, *ib.*
- Camerarius*, Melancthon's friend, does not approve the preparations for war made by the Princes of Germany, 140.
- Capito*, Minister of Strasburg, his confession of the insolence of his Reformed brethren, and the injury done to the Church by their rejecting the Pope, 172, 173.
- Carlostadius* attacks the reality, 53—his character, *ib.*—the sense he gave to the words of the Institution, *ib.*—the origin of his contests with Luther, *ib.*—he pulls down images, and sets up communion under both kinds, 54—he is driven from Wittenberg, 55—he unites himself with the Anabaptists, 56—he tumultuates the people of Orlemond, *ib.*—he drinks with Luther, and promises him to write against the Real Presence, 57—he marries, 58—he is reconciled to Luther, 70.
- Catherine*, Queen of England, divorced by Henry VIII. against all laws, 257, 261—death of this Princess; a comparison between her and Anne Boleyn, 265—she maintains to death the truth of her marriage and the dignity of a Queen, 266.
- Catherine Howard*, mistress to Henry VIII., 273—this Prince first marries, then puts her to death, 274.
- Catherine Medicis* causes the Conference of Poissy to be held, 396.
- Catholics* (The), by the Confession of Sacramentarians themselves, understand the words of the Eucharistic Institution better than the Lutherans, 70—even by the Confession of a whole Synod, 77—their sense in this point is the most natural, 80—they alone have a consist-



- ent doctrine, 227—they are justified by the divisions of the Protestants, 154—the sentiment of Catholics on these words, "This is my body," 364—and on these words, "Do this in remembrance of me," 365—their reflections on the indeterminate and pompous expressions of the Calvinists concerning the subject of the Eucharist, 400.
- Celibacy*, despised by the pretended Reformers, 69—three parts in four of the Ecclesiastics in England renounced it under Edward VI., 307.
- Ceremonies* of the Church confirmed by Henry VIII., King of England, 269—rejected by Calvin, 303 and 386—disputes among the Lutherans about Ceremonies, 328.
- Certainty* of Justification according to Luther, 24—this certainty is the capital dogma of Luther, and the master-piece of the Reformation, 115—the difficulty it labours under, *ib.*—what certainty is admitted in Justification by the Catholic Church, 117—the difficulty with respect to the certainty of salvation in the opinion of the Lutherans, 352—certainty of salvation taught by Calvin, 356—difficulties attending the certainty of salvation, 359—*Vide* Vol. II.
- Charles V.* assembles the Diet of Augsburg in 1530, where the Confessions of Faith are presented to him, 89—he causes the Confession of Augsburg to be refuted, 91—he makes a defensive league with all the Catholic States against the Protestants, 137—his victory over the Protestants, 322—he causes the book of the Interim to be made, and is blamed for it at Rome, 323—he makes a Conference be held at Worms in order to reconcile both Religions, 336.
- Charles du Moulin*, a famous Civilian; what he says of a deliberation of the Faculty of Paris upon the divorce of Henry VIII., 288.
- Children* of the Faithful born in grace, according to Calvin, 359—difficulties of this doctrine, 360—two tenets of Calvinists concerning Children not consistent with their principles, *ib.*
- Church*, authority of the Church rejected by Luther, 37—what Melancthon says of the promises made to the Church, 183, 197—the Lutherans, at the time of the Augsburg Confession, durst not reject the authority of the Church of Rome, 130, 133—remarkable words of Luther confessing the true Church in the Romish Communion, 131—perpetual assistance promised to the Church and confessed by Melancthon, 183, 197—the authority of the Church absolutely necessary in matters of Faith, 196—Melancthon owns it, *ib.* and 197—all Protestants own it, and are forced to practise what they called tyranny, 343—the dreadful consequences of the subversion of Church authority foreseen and experienced by Melancthon and the rest of the Reformers, 172, 183, 196—authority of the Church overthrown in the Reformation, 172—sacrificed to the Secular Power, 173—Calvin condemns, but cannot hinder it, 174—the Church enslaved by the English Reformation and Cranmer Archbishop of Canterbury, 277—the Dogma of Henry VIII. concerning the authority of the Church, 279—a manifest contradiction in the English Doctrine upon the authority of the Church given to Kings, 280—the consent of the whole Church can declare itself other ways than by General Councils, 292—the Reformation founded on the ruin of Church authority, 295—how the Church is the body of Jesus Christ, 381—why Heretics are forced to imitate the language of the Church, 385—that point relating to the Church treated of in the Conference of Poissy, 397—*Vide* Vol. I.
- Chytræus (David)*, an Ubiquitarian, 339—his hatred against Melancthon, 342.
- Clement VII.*, his sentence against Henry VIII., King of England, 262—

- it appertains not to Faith to examine the conduct and proceedings of Clement VII., 282—remarks upon the conformity of the sentiment of Protestants with the sentence of Clement VII., 285—reasons for the decision of Clement VII., 287.
- Communion* under both kinds set up by Carlostadius, 54—Luther holds Communion under both kinds for an indifferent thing, 55—what the Lutherans say of it in the Apology of the Augsburg Confession, 132—what Luther says in excuse for the whole Church on the subject of Communion under one kind, 133—by the Protestants' own confession, the question of the necessity of both kinds depends on the Real Presence, 275—*Vide* Vol. II.
- Concomitancy* retained by Henry VIII., King of England, 275—established in the Wittemberg Confession of Faith, 331.
- Concord*, a brief account of the Book of Concord made by the Lutherans, 353.
- Conference* of Luther with the Devil, 148.
- Confession*, with the necessity of the numeration of sins retained by the Lutherans, 122—and by the English, 275.
- Confession* of Faith, a remarkable one of the Elector Frederick III., 356—the Confession of Faith of the French Calvinists compared with the agreement of Geneva, 392—in 1557, it is sent to the assembly of Worms, 393—another Confession of Faith of the French Calvinists, drawn in order to be sent to the Protestants, 395.
- Confession* of Faith of Augsburg, *vide* Augsburg.
- Confession* of Faith of Bucer, *vide* Bucer.
- Confession* of Faith of Calvin, *vide* Calvin.
- Confession* of Faith of Saxony, *vide* Saxony.
- Confession* of Faith of Strasburg, *vide* Strasburg.
- Confession* of Faith of Wirtemberg, *vide* Wirtemberg.
- Confirmation*, reduced in England to a bare Catechism, 303.
- Confusion* of new Sects, 334, 352.
- Consubstantiation* taught by Luther, with many variations, 50—*Vide* Vol. II.
- Contarenius*, Cardinal Legate of the Pope at Ratisbon, 323—what he there says of the book of the Interim, *ib.*
- Continency*, perpetual, judged impossible by Luther, 45, 123.
- Contrition*, according to Luther, makes men greater hypocrites, 31.
- Council*. The body of the Lutherans, in the Confession of Augsburg, submit themselves to the judgment of a General Council, 134—*Vide* Vol. II.
- Cranmer (Thomas)* is the hero of Mr. Burnet's History, 255—how he came into favour with Henry VIII. and Anne Boleyn, *ib.*—Cranmer sent to Rome on account of the divorce of the King of England, 258—he conceals his belief, *ib.*—is there made the Pope's Penitentiary; he marries in private, though a priest, *ib.*—he is nominated Archbishop of Canterbury, and receives the Pope's Bulls, though a married man and a Lutheran, *ib.*—his consecration and his hypocrisy, 259—a reflection on Cranmer's pretended moderation in accepting the Archbishopric of Canterbury, 260—Cranmer proceeds to the divorce, and in the sentence takes upon him the quality of Legate of the Holy See, 261—his visitations made by the authority of the King are followed by a deprecation of the goods of Monasteries, 265—he annuls Henry VIII.'s and Anne Boleyn's marriage, 266—he subscribes the articles of Henry VIII., 271—he confirms the Church's Faith which he condemned in his heart, 272—the prostitution of Cranmer's conscience; he breaks the marriage

- with Anne of Cleves; the magnificent terms of this unjust sentence, 274—hypocrisy of Cranmer, who subscribes everything that is desired of him in point of religion, 275—his behaviour with respect to the Six Articles of Henry VIII., 276—Cranmer's shameful notions concerning the Ecclesiastical Authority which he sacrifices to the Crown, 277—his Doctrine about the Authority of the Church in time of persecution, 278—Cranmer's flatteries, the cause of the Reformation in England, 281—he is the first to subject himself to the shameful yoke which Edward VI. imposes on the Bishops, 295—he, with the Duke of Somerset, begins the Reformation in England, 299—in his Reformation he inverts all order, 304—he signs the Admiral's death, though condemned without a hearing, 308—he spirits up rebellion against Queen Mary, 309—he is deposed and cast into prison for treason and heresy, 309—he is declared a heretic, and for what article, 310—Cranmer's false answer before his Judges, he is condemned pursuant to his own principles, *ib.*—whether it be true that he was no further compliant to Henry VIII. than his conscience permitted him, 312.
- Cromwell (Thomas)* made Vicar-General in spirituals by Henry VIII., 255—in his visitation he enjoins every Priest to say Mass every day, 264—he subscribes the decisions of Henry VIII., 271—he confirms the Faith of the Church which he rejected in his heart, 272—he is condemned to death as a heretic and a traitor, 273—his hypocrisy, *ib.*
- Cross*, use of, retained in England, 270, 303.
- Crucifix*. Luther praises God for that the Crucifix is, by the Church of Rome, put into the hands of dying people, 132—Luther's picture before his works represents him on his knees before a Crucifix, *ib.*
- Czenger*, a city in Poland; the Zuinglians there hold a Synod, where they declare that our Doctrine upon the Eucharist is more supportable than that of the Lutherans, 79.
- D'Ailly*—*Vide* Ailly, D'.
- Decision* of the Prelates assembled at Poissy, who explain very plainly, and in few words, the whole Catholic Doctrine concerning the Eucharist, 402.
- Depense (Claude)*, what this Doctor added to the expressions of the Ministers to make them more allowable, 401.
- Diet* of Augsburg—*Vide* Augsburg.
- Difference* between invented Doctrine, and Doctrine received by tradition, 80.
- Discipline*, Ecclesiastical, entirely despised by Protestants, 172.
- Divisions* among these pretended Gospellers, 53, 336—they overthrow all the foundations of the Reformation, 85—*Vide* Church Reformation.
- Dominicans* preferred to the Augustinians by Leo X., in publishing Indulgences, 23.
- Drink ye all of this* (text of), not so clear as Protestants imagine, 289.
- Echius*, present at the Conference of Ratisbon; there rejects the book of the Interim, 323.
- Edward VI.*, son of Henry VIII., succeeds him, 294—his guardian is a Zuinglian, 295—under him commissions revocable at will are given to the Bishops, *ib.*—he invades the whole Episcopal authority, *ib.*—he assumes an absolute authority over the word of God and preaching, 298—he abrogates the Six Articles published by Henry VIII., 299—how he was prejudiced from his childhood against Images, 305—Zuinglianism takes deep root in England under Edward VI., 325.

- Edward Seymour*, guardian to Edward VI., 295—undertakes the English Reformation, *ib.*—his pride, violence, and crimes, 308.
- Elevation of the Eucharist* taken away by Carlostadius, 53—retained by Luther in despite of Carlostadius, 55, 125—destroyed and judged at the same time irreprehensible by Luther, 213, 214, 223.
- Elizabeth*, daughter of Anne Boleyn, is declared illegitimate by Cranmer's sentence, 267.
- England*. Beginning of the pretended Reformation of England, 252—the Reformation of England begun by Henry VIII., who was equally rejected by both sides, 254—what instruments Henry VIII. makes use of to set up the Reformation in England, 255—all the Bishops subscribed Henry VIII.'s decisions, 271—nothing is changed in England in the Missals and Office-books of the Church under Henry VIII., 276—the true cause of the English Reformation, 281—two points of Reformation in England, according to Mr. Burnet, how groundless, 288—the Church of England acted by a schismatical principle, when she believed she might regulate her Faith independently of all the rest of the Church, 290—whether the Church of England therein followed the ancient Church, *ib.*—whether she had reason to believe that it was too difficult a matter to consult the Faith of the whole Church, 291—all kind of novelties creep into England in spite of all the severities of Henry VIII., and why, 292—they argued from false principles when they rejected the Pope's Supremacy in England, 293—the foundation of the English Reformation laid upon the ruin of Ecclesiastical authority, 295—the Bishops of England have no share in matters of Religion, 297—the Reformation begun in England by Peter Martyr and Bernardin Ochin, 299—the Reformers in England repent themselves of having said, that in the Reformation of the Liturgy they had acted with the assistance of the Holy Ghost, 300—England discards the Mass which she had heard from her first conversion to Christianity, 301—England vindicates us in the observance of the festivals of Saints and abstinence from flesh, 303—three parts in four of the English Clergy renounce celibacy under Edward VI., 307—Zuinglianism strengthens itself in England under Edward VI., 299—*Vide* Vol. I.
- Equivocations* in matters of Faith, agreeable to the spirit of the new Reformation, 151—equivocations of the Sacramentarians with relation to the Eucharist, 143, 151—of the Calvinists upon the same subject, 399—Peter Martyr's sentiments concerning these equivocations, 401.
- Erasmus* objects to Luther the unanimous consent of the Fathers in behalf of Free-will, 44—what he says of the fierce and threatening air of the new Protestants, 47—Erasmus's letter to Melanethon upon Luther's passionate transports, 52—dispute between Erasmus and Luther about Free-will, 61—what he writes concerning Ecolampadius and marriage of these Reformers, 69—what he says to Protestants about their disputes of the true sense of Scripture, 85—Erasmus's testimony concerning the disordinate behaviour of the pretended Reformists, 177.
- Eucharist*, what Luther thought of it, 48—what was always the Church's Faith concerning it, 49—how the names of Bread and Wine may be applied to the Eucharist after Consecration, two rules taken from Scripture, 81—why the word Substance is made use of in the Eucharist, 100—how the oblation of the Eucharist is profitable to the whole world, 126—equivocations of the Sacramentarians upon the Eucharist, 143—how the Presence of the Body of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist is spiritual, *ib.*—whether a local Presence be to be admitted in the

**Eucharist**, 144—how the Eucharist is a Sign, 145—whether the Presence of the Body of Jesus Christ be durable in the Eucharist, 156—Doctrine of the Catholic Church about the Eucharist confirmed by Henry VIII., 269, 275—refinement of Calvin upon the Eucharist, 362—sentiment of the Catholic Church upon the Eucharist, 364—how the enjoyment of the Body of Jesus Christ is perpetual and permanent in the Eucharist, 366—what must be done to communicate worthily, *ib.*—we must be united to the Body of Jesus Christ more than by virtue and thought, 368—according to Calvin's expression, the true Body of Jesus Christ must be in the Eucharist, *ib.*—the subject of the Eucharist debated in the Conference of Poissy, 397—the decisions of the Bishops on this head, 402—*Vide* Real Presence, Vol. II.

**Faith**. According to Luther, one is assured of his Faith without being assured of his repentance, 24—Special Faith, according to Luther, its difficulties, 24—which are not removed in the Confession of Augsburg, 115—what Faith does in the Mystery of the Eucharist, 369—what it does there, according to Calvin, 368—*Vide* Certainty, *vide* Vol. II.

**Farel** is deputed from the Reformed Churches of France, to the assembly of Worms and Geneva, 393.

**Fathers (Holy)**, they pretend to follow them in the Reformation, 113, 130—in the main they despise them, 44, 130—the holy Fathers despised by Calvin, 391—they forced respect from Protestants in spite of their teeth, *ib.*—*Vide* Luther, *vide* Vol. II.

**Festivals** of Saints retained in England, 303.

**Figure**. The puzzling and contradictions of Calvin in the defence of the figurative sense, 379—the Calvinists send into Germany a Confession of Faith not agreeable to the figurative sense, 393.

**Fisher**, Bishop of Rochester, is condemned to death for not acknowledging the King for Head of the Church, 262.

**Flesh**. Calvin explains as we do this passage,—“The Flesh profiteth nothing,” 376.

**Fox**, Bishop of Hereford; his dissimulation, 276.

**France**. Beginning of the troubles of France, 354.

**Francis (St.)**, numbered amongst the Saints by Luther, 124.

**Francis I.** What Mr. Burnet imputes to this Prince was never before heard of, 314.

**Frankfort**. Assembly of the Lutherans at Frankfort, and how they there explain the Eucharist, 339.

**Fra-Paolo**, an imposition of Mr. Burnet's concerning Fra-Paolo, 314.

**Frederick**, Elector Palatine, retains both the Confession of Augsburg and the Doctrine of Zuinglius together, 344.

**Frederick III.**, Elector Palatine; this Prince's remarkable Confession of Faith, 356—his dissimulation with regard to the Confession of Augsburg, 406.

**Free-will**. Luther writes against Free-will, 61—Luther's Doctrine against Free-will retracted in the Augsburg Confession, 102—Melancthon's Doctrine concerning the co-operation of Free-will, 332—the Lutherans' Doctrine concerning Free-will contradicts itself, 334—decision of the Lutherans about the co-operation of Free-will, 346—the will free to retain or reject Grace, a Doctrine confessed by Melancthon, but condemned by his brethren, 333.

**Fulfilling** of the law owned in the Apology of the Augsburg Confession in the same sense as in the Church, 109—and in the Confession of Strasburg, 117.

- Gardiner*, Bishop of Winchester, imprisoned by the orders of Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, 301.
- Geneva*. Calvin makes an agreement with those of Geneva, 361—compared with the Catechism and Confession of France, 392—Calvin rules Geneva, 397.
- George*, Duke of Saxony, shamefully treated by Luther, 86—he is an enemy to the Lutherans, *ib.*
- Gerard (John Andrew)*, a Lutheran doctor; in what manner he explains the certainty of Salvation taught by his party, 353.
- Germany*, set all in a flame by Luther's writings, 56—the Lutherans by a great armament make all Germany tremble, 86—all Germany in arms at a word of Luther's, 138.
- Gerson*, Chancellor of the University of Paris, his opinion about the Reformation of the Church, 19, 21—he is praised by Luther, 124—he is cited to a wrong sense by Mr. Burnet, 316.
- God* the author of all crimes, according to Luther's Doctrine, 62—*Vide* Vol. II.—strange Doctrine of the Lutherans concerning the love of God, 119.
- Goods*, of Monasteries, pillaged in England, 265—the goods of the Church sold at a low price in England, 272—the goods of the Church exposed to the plunder of the Laity under Edward VI., 307.
- Grace*. Grace once received can never be lost, according to Calvin, 357—difficulties of this Doctrine, 360.
- Gregory (St.)*, Pope, under whom the English were converted, had no other sentiments than we have of the authority of the Holy See, 293.
- Gropper*. By the advice of the learned Gropper, Herman, Archbishop of Cologne, holds very holy councils, 321—he is present at the Conference of Ratisbon, 323.
- Helding*, titular Bishop of Sidon, present at the Conference of Ratisbon, and there revises the book of the Interim, 325.
- Henry II.*, King of France, did his utmost to depress the Calvinists, 393.
- Henry VIII.*, King of England, is basely handled by Luther, 51, 62—he reproaches Luther with his scandalous marriage and errors, *ib.*—he is for marrying a second wife, the first still living, his ceremonies, 253, 268, 283, &c.—what was the Faith of this Prince, 255—he assumes the title of supreme head of the Church of England, *ib.*—what were the instruments he made use of in his Reformation, *ib.*—he marries Anne Boleyn, 261—he becomes enraged against the Holy See, 262—he puts to death Thomas More, and Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, *ib.*—the remarkable date of his cruelties, *ib.*—all England takes the oath of Supremacy, 264—he appropriates to himself the goods of Monasteries, 265—he puts Anne Boleyn to death in favour of Jane Seymour, 268—he confirms the Doctrine of the Church with regard to Penance, 269—the Eucharist and Images, *ib.*—and invocation of Saints and Ceremonies, 270—and Purgatory and Masses for the dead, *ib.*—by his own authority he pronounces on matters of Faith, 271—he confirms anew the Faith of the Church, 272—he marries Anne of Cleves; falls in love with Catherine Howard, and executes Cromwell, *ib.*—he repudiates Anne of Cleves, 274—he marries Catherine Howard and puts her to death, 274, 275—he confirms again the Faith of the Church, 275—he makes all Ecclesiastical power proceed from the Crown, 277—his vices the beginning of the English Reformation, 281—examen of his first marriage, and the frivolous prettexts with which he covered his passion, 283—he bribes some Catholic Doctors, 285—what judgment

ought to be passed on the pretended consultation of the faculty of Paris concerning Henry's divorce, 286—testimony of the Civilian Charles du Moulin, *ib.*—in what manner he allows the people to read the Scripture, 288—he will have the Church of every country regulate her Faith independently of all other Churches, 290—his death, 253, 294—a total change in England after his death, *ib.*

*Heretics*. Why Heretics are forced to mimic the language of the Church, 385.

*Herman*, Archbishop of Cologne, calls the Protestants into his Diocese; his extreme ignorance, 321.

*Heshusius*, a Lutheran Minister, sadly abused by Calvin on the subject of the Eucharist, 378.

*Humility*, apparent, of Luther, 32.

*Huss (John)*, inspires the people with a hatred of the Clergy, 22—his Doctrine is approved by Luther, 36—*Vide* Vol. II.

*Jane Seymour* is beloved by Henry VIII., who marries her, 266—her death, 273.

*Jealousy* of Luther against the Dominicans, 23, 124.

*Jena*, Synod of Jena, where the Lutherans condemn the Zuinglians, 342.

*Illyricus (Flaccus)*, his jealousy, and his hidden designs against Melancthon, 329—he condemns Melancthon's Doctrine about Free-will, 334.

*Images*, pulled down by Carlostadius, 54—Luther's opinion concerning Images, 72—Calumnies of the Protestants with respect to the honour we shew Images, *ib.*, 129—Luther praises God for that the Church of Rome preserves the Images of the Crucifix, 132—the Doctrine of the Church concerning Images confirmed by Henry VIII., King of England, 269, 275—artifices employed to excite young Edward VI. against the Church's Doctrine with relation to Images, 305—*Vide* Vol. II.

*Impanation*, set up by some Lutherans, and rejected by Luther, 50.

*Imputation*, imputed justice—*Vide* Justification.

*Indulgences*, attacked by Luther, 23—the Indulgence that Luther preached, 31.

*Interim (Book of the)*, made by order of Charles V., and why, 322—this Book never approved by the Church, 323—the last hand put to it; the little success it was attended with, 324.

*Invocation*. Calumny of the Lutherans concerning Invocation of Saints, 129—Invocation of Saints confirmed by Henry VIII., 269, 275—*Vide* Vol. II.

*Islebius*, a Protestant present at the Conference of Ratisbon, 325.

*Julian*. What Cardinal Julian writes to Eugenius IV. concerning the Reformation of the Clergy's manners, 19.

*Julius II.* gives to Henry VIII., King of England, a dispensation to marry the widow of his brother Arthur, 282—the dispensation of Julius II. attacked by reasons of fact and right, 283—the Protestants of Germany favourable to the dispensation of Julius II., 284.

*Justification*, by imputation, is the ground-work of Luther's Reformation, 23—no difficulty about Justification since what has been said concerning it in the Confession of Augsburg, 102—and that of Saxony, 335—calumnies fixed on Catholics about Justification, 103—Justification, Regeneration, Renovation, are all in substance the same Grace, 112—how Luther defines Justification or justifying Faith, 113—the uncertainty of Justification which Catholics own, hinders not the repose of conscience, 116—what is in Justification the true repose of conscience, and what certainty is there received, 117—what is the Doctrine of

Justification according to the Catholic Church, *ib.*—error of Lutheran Justification, that one is assured of his Justification and not of his Conversion, 24, 112—the pernicious effects of this Doctrine, and how much it encourages negligence and laxity, 171, 196, 197—another error, 121—Osiander's Doctrine on Justification, 326—to Luther's Justification Calvin adds the certainty of Salvation, 356—he teaches that Justification cannot be lost, 357—difficulty resulting from this Doctrine, 359—*Vide* Luther, *vide* Melancthon, *vide* Vol. II.

*Koningsberg.* The University of Koningsberg disturbed by the new Doctrine of Osiander on Justification, 328—some Divines of Koningsberg oppose this Doctrine with great vigour, 338—they are astonished at the weakness of the Lutheran Party, *ib.*—one of them perceiving the Protestant Churches quite void of authority is converted, 339.

*Landgrave of Hesse,* takes up arms to maintain Luther's new Gospel, and owns he is in the wrong, 85—he strives in vain to reconcile both Parties of Protestants, 87—he makes a treaty with the people of Basil, Zurich, and Strasburg, 137—he sends Bucer to have an interview with Luther and Zuinglius, *ib.*—his scandalous incontinency, and what remedy the Reformation applied to it, 203—important Records of this matter printed by order of the Elector Charles Lewis Count Palatine, 204—he asks of Luther and the other heads of the Party to grant him leave to marry a second wife, the first still living, 205—he promises to Luther the goods of Monasteries if they favour his petition, 206—if they refuse him, he purposes to have recourse to the Emperor, and even the Pope himself, 207—he obtains leave to marry another wife, 208—his second marriage is performed in secret, 210—the contract passed between the parties, *ib.*—his answer to the young Duke of Brunswick relating to this marriage, 211—he obliges Luther to suppress the Elevation of the Blessed Sacrament in the Mass, 212—records appertaining to the Landgrave's second marriage, 231, &c.; he is defeated by the Emperor, 322.

*Latin.* The Latin son, preserved in the Lutheran Mass, 125.

*Leagues.* Protestant leagues condemned at first by Luther and Melancthon, afterwards approved by both of them, 138, 139, 199, 321—odious to Melancthon and all honest men of the Party, 199—made with evil designs which create a horror in Melancthon, 200—*Vide* War.

*Legislature* (The) make themselves Pope in the new Reformation, 174—Calvin condemns the Doctrine which makes the Church dependent on the Legislature, *ib.*

*Lent* retained in England, 303.

*Leo X.* causes Indulgences to be published, and Luther opposes them, 30—he makes Luther's writings be burnt, 37.

*Liturgy,* reformed by Parliament in England, 300—all the remains of antiquity which were at first preserved in the English liturgy are defaced, 301.

*Louvain.* Luther's passion against the Doctors of Louvain, 228.

*Luther,* the false motives of his pretended Reformation, 20, &c.—he makes the Reformation depend on the destruction of the Papacy, 21—his character and qualities, 22—the ground-work of his Reformation; what he means by his “imputed Justice and Justification by Faith,” 23—what is by him called special Faith, 24—according to him, one is assured of his Justification without being assured of his Repentance, 26—he maintains that all the sins of the just are mortal, *ib.*—the



difficulty which this Doctrine labours under, 26—he blames security, 27—this Doctrine inexplicable 28—his answer by distinction of two kinds of sins, 29—contradiction of his Doctrine on Justification, *ib.*—sequel of Luther's contradictions, *ib.*—he spoke better at the beginning of the dispute, 30—his strange Doctrine about the War against the Turk, 31—his apparent humility and his submission to the Pope, 32—reasons he grounds this submission upon, *ib.*—his transports of passion, for which he asks pardon, 33—he offers silence to Leo X. and Charles V. *ib.*—he will not hear of recanting, 34—he is condemned by Leo X., and flies into horrible excesses, 35—his rage against the Pope and Princes that abet him, *ib.*—out of spite he approves John Huss's Doctrine, 36—he makes the Decretals be burnt, 37—the difficulty he had in rejecting the authority of the Church, and how he glories when he had compassed it, *ib.*—Luther's Letter to the Bishops; his pretended extraordinary mission, 38—he presumes to make a Bishop, 39—his arguments against the Anabaptists who preached without mission and miracles, *ib.*—what sort of miracles he pretends to authorize his mission by, 41—what he writes to his Father upon his quitting the Monastery, *ib.*—he acts the Prophet, and promises to destroy the Pope without suffering arms to be employed, 42—his boasts, and the contempt he passes on all the Fathers, 44—he writes against Free-will, *ib.*—he blames continency though commanded by all the Fathers, 45—his buffoneries and extravagances, *ib.*—seditions and violence are the first fruit of Luther's preaching, 46—his book “of the Captivity of Babylon;” his sentiments on the Eucharist, and the desire he has to undermine the Reality, 48—he attacks Transubstantiation, 49—his gross manner of explaining the Reality, *ib.*—his Variations upon Transubstantiation; his unheard-of method of deciding in points of Faith, 50—he does not relish Impanation, *ib.*—his impotent rage against Henry VIII., 51—he is attacked by Carlostadius, 53—the origin of his contests with Carlostadius, *ib.*—his pride; he upbraids Carlostadius that he acts without mission, 54—Luther's sermon wherein he threatens to recant and set up the Mass again; his extravagance in boasting his power, *ib.*—he decides out of spite in the most important matters, 55—how war was declared betwixt him and Carlostadius, *ib.*—his Book of Christian Liberty spirits the people up to rebellion, 56—he is sent to Orlemond to pacify the people tumultuated by Carlostadius, 57—at his entry into it he is pelted with stones, *ib.*—drinking with Carlostadius at an inn, he bids him defiance to write against him, *ib.*—the share he had in the revolt of the Peasants of Germany, *ib.*—he marries a Nun, 58—great diminution of his authority, 60—his dispute with Erasmus about Free-will, 61—his blasphemies in his treatise of Will enslaved, *ib.*—he makes God the author of all crimes, 62—new transports of passion against Henry VIII., *ib.*—he brags of his pride, 63—he does not spare Zuinglius upon what he had said of the Salvation of Heathens, 64—he writes against the Sacramentarians, and treats Zuinglius worse than all the rest, 72—the words of a famous Lutheran upon Luther's jealousy against Zuinglius, 73—Luther's strong arguments for the Real Presence, and then his boasting of them, *ib.*—what he answered to this objection of the Sacramentarians, “the flesh profiteth nothing,” 74—he refutes their other objections, 75—he will have neither peace nor union with them, *ib.*—the Zuinglians prove to him that the Catholics understand the literal sense better than he, 76—how Luther overthrew his own Doctrine about Consubstantiation without thinking of it, *ib.*—he did not understand the force of these words, “This is my Body,” 78

—the Sacramentarians prove to him that he admits a kind of figure, 79—Luther affrighted at these disputes, 83—he teaches Ubiquity, *ib.*—he declares anew that it matters little whether the Substance of Bread be admitted, or taken away, 84—he abuses George, Duke of Saxony, after a vile manner, 86—he is present at the Conference of Marburg, and the only man that speaks of his whole Party, 87—he will not there unite himself to the Zuinglians, 88—his Doctrine about Free-will retracted in the Confession of Augsburg, 102—how he defines justifying Faith, 113—he rejects the Epistle of St. James, 123—he admits St. Bernard, St. Francis, St. Bonaventure into the list of Saints; his odd doubt of the Salvation of St. Thomas of Aquine, 124—he confesses the true Church in the Romish Communion, 131—his picture at the beginning of his works represents him on his knees before a Crucifix, 132—what he says in excuse for the whole Church with relation to Communion under one kind, 133—he warrants the Protestants' resolution of taking up arms, 137—he calls the Sacramentarians “a double-tongued faction,” 142—the Zuinglians complain of his insolence and inhumanity, and at the same time call him a great servant of God, 147—his Conference with the Devil, 148—he is deceived by Bucer, 153—his opinion concerning the durable Presence of the Body of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist, 156—he celebrates the Supper together with the Sacramentarians in token of peace, 157—he makes a new declaration of this Faith in the Smalcaldic articles, 163—he explains the words of the institution after a new manner, 164—he cannot evade the equivocations of the Sacramentarians, who elude everything, 165—his fury against the Pope in the Articles of Smalcald, 166—he receives his mission from the Prince to make his Ecclesiastical visitation, 174—his insupportable tyranny, 179—Calvin grieves at it in vain, 180—he allows the Landgrave to have two wives at once, 204, &c.—his dogmatical advice on Polygamy, 208—his answer upon the second marriage of the Landgrave, and his scandalous sermon about marriage, 211, 212—he suppresses the Elevation of the Holy Sacrament in the Mass, 212—yet without disapproving of it, 220, 224—his old jealousy against Zuinglius and his disciples is awakened, 214—he will not suffer the Sacramentarians to be prayed for, and believes them inevitably damned, 215—he has always the Devil in his mouth; his scandalous Prayer, in which he says he has never offended the Devil, 216, &c.—his blind hatred to the Oblation and Canon of the Mass, 218—he retains the Real and permanent Presence subsisting out of the use of the Sacrament, 220—remarkable letters of Luther in behalf of the permanent Presence, 223, &c.—his Doctrine about the Eucharist changed immediately after his death by the Divines of Wittemberg, 226—towards the end of his days he is more furious than ever; his passion against the Doctors of Louvain, 228—his last sentiments concerning the Zuinglians, *ib.*—his death, 229—a new piece produced by Mr. Burnet, about Luther's sentiment touching a reconciliation with the Zuinglians, *ib.*—Luther's consultation about Polygamy, 208, &c.—Luther's Theses to stir up the Lutherans to rise in arms, 321—what he says of the Pope, whom he compares to a mad wolf, *ib.*—the difference between Luther and Calvin, 388—Luther less bitter than Calvin, 389.

*Lutherans* (the) take up arms under the conduct of the Landgrave, 85—they unite under the name of Protestants, 87—what they say in the book of Concord about the tenth Article of the Augsburg Confession, 92—the Lutherans' shifts in defence of their Variations, 95—in their Doctrine, the Sacraments operate *ex opere operato*, 104—they believe

- Infant Baptism** necessary to Salvation, 114—their Variations in what they have retrenched from the Confession of Augsburg, 108—the Lutherans agree that Justification, Regeneration, and Sanctification, are confounded by Luther and Melancthon, 112—according to the Lutheran principles, the uncertainty of Justification acknowledged by Catholics ought to cause no trouble of conscience, 116—they acknowledge the Sacrament of Penance and Sacramental Absolution, 121—what they say of the Mass in the Augsburg Confession and Apology, 124—they cut off the Oblation of the proposed gifts, 125—what they have invented in order to render this Oblation odious, 126—what they say of Prayer for the Dead, and Aerius who rejected it, 127—their calumnies about invoking Saints, and concerning Images, 129—they dare not reject the authority of the Church of Rome, 130—the body of the Lutherans submit themselves to the general Council called by the Pope, 134—Melancthon's description of the Lutheran Churches, 182—the Lutherans are favourable to the dispensation of Julius II. and to the first marriage of Henry VIII., 284—their odd decision in this matter, 285—their dispute relating to Ceremonies, *ib.*—their Doctrine about Free-will self-contradictory, 334—their division in the Assembly at Worms, 336—they all with one voice condemn the necessity of good works for Salvation, 337—their divisions break forth, *ib.*—at Frankfurt they make a new formulary to explicate the Eucharist, 339—they condemn the Zuinglians at the Synod of Jena, 342—they meet at Naumburg, in order to agree about the Confession of Augsburg, 343—they set up Ubiquity, 345—their design in setting up Ubiquity, 346—two remarkable decisions of the Lutherans on the co-operation of Free-will, *ib.*—the perplexity and contradiction of the Lutheran Doctrine, 347—how they answer to the objections of Libertines, and to the difficulties of weak Christians, upon the co-operation of Free-will, 349—their resolution is clearly Demi-Pelagian; a proof of the Demi-Pelagianism of the Lutherans, 351—the Lutherans scurrilously used by Calvin, 390—*Vide* Vol. II.
- Manners.** No reformation of Manners in the Protestant Churches, 177, 200—*Vide* Reformation.
- Marpurg.** Conference of Marpurg, what passed at it, 87.
- Marriage.** Those of the Augsburg Confession acknowledge in marriage a divine institution and promises, 123—Luther's marriage, 58—Carlostadius's marriage, *ib.*—Ecolampadius's marriage, 69—Bucer's marriage, 90—Erasmus's sentiments on these scandalous marriages, 69—Luther's scandalous sermon upon marriage, 211, 212—Thomas Cranmer's marriage, 258—the Landgrave's second marriage—*Vide* Landgrave of Hesse.
- Mary,** daughter of Henry VIII.; they rebel against her in England, 309—she restores Catholic religion and makes Cranmer be condemned, *ib.*
- Mass.** Low Masses abolished by Carlostadius, 54—Luther threatens his Disciples with re-establishing the Mass, *ib.*—the Mass abolished at Zurich, 71—the Lutheran Mass, 124—Mass without communicants, 128—in what sense it is believed by Catholics that the Mass is profitable to the whole world, 127—Luther's treatise for abolishing the Mass, 131—in what sense we offer in the Mass for the Redemption of mankind, 219—the whole Mass is included in the sole Real Presence, *ib.*, 226, 227—what Melancthon does in order to destroy the Mass, 220—Mass for the Dead retained in England by Henry VIII., 270—Mass abrogated in England under Edward VI., 301—the Gallican Mass and the rest are in substance the same with that of Rome, 302—the Prayer

begging the change of Bread into the Body, 301, &c.—what is the sense of this Prayer, *ib.*—retained and afterwards taken away under Edward VI., *ib.*—Canon of the Mass; what it is that Luther blames therein, 218—*Vide Oblation.*

*Mediation of Jesus Christ* always necessary, 111.

*Melancthon* looks on Luther as an extraordinary man, 44—he owns that Luther had allowed Transubstantiation to certain Churches in Italy, 51—what he says of Carlostadius, 53—what he writes to Camerarius concerning Luther's marriage, 59—his anxiety on Luther's account, 60—he bewails the passionate transports of Luther, 61—in regard to the Doctrine of Free-will he is more moderate than Luther, 62—he laments the condition which the world was brought to by the disputes about the Eucharist, 63—he is scandalized at Luther's Doctrine relating to the Eucharist, 84—the quandary he is in how to excuse the Landgrave who had taken up arms to maintain Luther's Reformation, 86—he is present at the Conference of Marburg, 87—he draws up the Confession of Augsburg, 90—he makes the Apology of it, 91—how he there transcribes the Tenth Article of the Augsburg Confession relating to the Supper, *ib.*—he is careful to express in the Apology the literal sense of the words of Institution, 92—he knows not his own meaning, when in the Apology he denies that good works merit life everlasting, 107—remarkable words of Melancthon on the alterations he has a mind should be made in the Confession of Augsburg, 135—his trouble about the new designs of war, which were approved by Luther, 138—he wavers on this head; what he writes to Camerarius concerning it, 139—what he says of the Sacramentarians' Doctrine about the Eucharist, 142—his notion of equivocations in matters of Faith, 155—he begins to doubt of Luther's Doctrine; his unskilfulness in divinity, 160—Ratramnus's book puzzles him, 161—he wishes for a new decision about the Eucharist, 163—he is for owning the Pope's authority, 166—how he was drawn over to Luther, 168—how he excuses Luther's passion, 170—the beginning of his perplexities, 171—how he owns that Luther's great success was owing to bad principles, *ib.*—he foresees the disorders that would result from the contempt of Episcopal Authority, 172—he complains that discipline was quite ruined among the Lutheran Churches, *ib.*—he bewails the licentiousness of the Party who decided points of Religion at table, 176—tyrannized over by Luther; he thinks of retiring, 180—he is put to a plunge; his whole life long he is in search after his religion, 181, 183—what tenets he looked upon ill-explained, 185—at the very time he thinks of reforming the Confession of Augsburg he declares he stands by it, 186—his sentiments about the necessity of owning the Pope and Bishops, 188—at the Assembly of Smalcald he is of opinion that the Council called by the Pope should be acknowledged, 189—reasons for the restriction he made to his subscription of the articles of Smalcald, 191—Melancthon's remarkable words concerning the authority of the Church, 192—he cannot divest himself of the opinion of imputed justice whatever grace God bestows to reclaim him; two truths by him confessed, *ib.*—he foresees the dreadful consequences of the subversion of Church Authority, 195—the grounds of his errors; he alleges the promises made to the Church, and does not sufficiently trust in them, 197—he writes to Camerarius that the Protestant Princes and Doctors are equally insupportable, 199—the prodigies, the prophecies, and the horoscopes which affright him, 200—his Dogmatical advice concerning Polygamy, 208—he labours to render the Real Presence momentaneous, and to place it solely in the actual

use thereof, 217—no other means does he find of destroying the Mass than by denying the permanent Presence; his reasons, 220—his dissembling with Luther on this subject, 223—he is present at the Conference of Ratisbon, 323—his opinion concerning Osiander, 327—he is against rejecting Ceremonies, 328—he strives to undermine Luther's doctrine about the Real Presence, 329—he draws up the Saxonian Confession of Faith, *ib.*—he there explains the article of the Eucharist differently from that of Augsburg, 330—he changes his opinion concerning the Will of God, with respect to sin, 332—his Doctrine on the co-operation of Free-will, *ib.*—his Doctrine on Free-will condemned by his Brethren, 333—he owns the distinction between venial and mortal sins, 335—he complains of the Decisions which the Doctors of the Party made against him at their drinking bouts, 336—he declares, with the rest of the Lutherans, that good works are not necessary for Salvation, 337—the question of Ubiquity makes him incline towards the Sacramentarians, 339—whether Melancthon was a Calvinist with respect to the Eucharist, 340—Melancthon's deplorable condition, and his death, 342.

*Merit.* The Church traduced by the Lutherans upon the merit of good works, 105—the merit of good works asserted in the Confession of Augsburg and Apology, 106—there is something in life everlasting, which falls not under merit, 108—merit of Condignity, 110—merit of Congruity, *ib.*—how the merits of Jesus Christ are ours, and how imputed to us, 112—of merit according to Bucer, 118—the merits of Saints are profitable to us by Bucer's Confession, 119—the merit of good works retained by the English under Henry VIII., 275—and owned in the Confession of Wirtemberg, 336—in 1557 received by the Calvinists of France, 395—*Vide* Vol. II.

*Miracle.* Luther requires of the Anabaptists that they should warrant their pretended mission by Miracles, 39—the miracles Luther boasts of, 41—the Zuinglians will not bear the mention of any miracle in the Eucharist, 158—Calvin confesses a miraculous presence of the Body of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist, 370—he shifts off the miracle which he admits in the Supper, 377—what is the miracle of the Eucharist according to the Fathers, *ib.*—the Calvinists were more sensible of the necessity of admitting a miracle in the Eucharist than they did in fact admit one, 378.

*Mission.* Luther pretends his mission was extraordinary, 38—he confesses the necessity of mission, 40, 54—he receives his mission from the Prince, in order to make his Ecclesiastical visitation, 174.

*Monastery.* Pillaging of Monasteries under Henry VIII., 265.

*Monks.* Monks reckoned among the Saints in the Apology of the Augsburg Confession, 113.

*Montluc,* Bishop of Valence; what Mr. Burnet says of him, 256—he is present at the Conference of Poissy, 396—he endeavours to find out some ambiguous formulary for the Supper, 399—his empty discourses on the Reformation of manners, 436—his private marriage, *ib.*

*More, Thomas,* Lord Chancellor of England, is condemned to death for not owning the King supreme head of the Church, 262.

*Muncer,* Father of the Anabaptists, preaches without mission, 40—Luther condemned him on this head only, *ib.*

*Mystery.* Equivocations of the Sacramentarians on this word, 145—all the mysteries of Jesus Christ are signs in some respects, 146.

*Naumburg,* assembly of the Lutherans at, and what passed there, 343.

- Oblation** of the Eucharist cut off from the Lutheran Mass, 125—what was invented in order to render this Oblation odious, 126—how the Oblation of the Eucharist is profitable to the whole world, 127—it is a necessary consequence from the Real Presence; the Lutherans themselves own as much, 219, 220, 226—it is suppressed in England under Edward VI., upon a false pretence, 301, 305—*Vide* Mass.
- Æcolampadius** takes up the defence of Carlostadius, 63—his character, 68—what Erasmus says of his marriage, and the rest of his behaviour, 69—he writes against the Real Presence, *ib.*—his death, 141—he had admonished Bucer, that there was nothing but trick in his equivocations, 147.
- Operation, ex opere operato**, ill-understood by Protestants, 111, 127, 128—it is admitted by them, 104.
- Ordination of Pastors** still preserved in the Church of Rome by Luther's own Confession, 132—ordination of Bishops and Priests regulated by the Parliament in England, 296.
- Origin** of the contests between Luther and Carlostadius, 53.
- Orlemonde**, a town in Thuringia, where Carlostadius takes shelter, 55—he there raises great disturbances, and drinking with Luther, declares war against him, 57.
- Ornaments** preserved in the Lutheran Mass, 125—and in England, 303.
- Osiander** renews the Doctrine of impanation, 50—he is present at the Conference of Marburg, 87—his sister marries Thomas Cranmer, 258—Osiander's character and his Doctrine about Justification, 326—the profane spirit of Osiander observed by Calvin, 327—the notions that Protestants had of Osiander, *ib.*—he keeps within no bounds, 328—his Doctrine on Justification is spared at the Conference of Worms, 337—his triumph in Prussia, 338.
- Paris.** The pretended consultation of the Paris faculty of Divinity concerning the divorce of Henry VIII., 286.
- Paschasius Radbertus**, 162.
- Peasants** rebel in Germany, instigated by Luther's Doctrine, 57, 139.
- Penance.** The Lutherans acknowledge the Sacrament of Penance and Sacramental Absolution, 121—Henry VIII. confirms the Church's Faith of the Sacrament of Penance, 275.
- Peter D'Ailly.** The sentiments of Cardinal Peter D'Ailly, Bishop of Cambay, on the Reformation of the Church, 19 and 21.
- Peter Martyr** is called into England to begin the Reformation there. His Doctrine on the Eucharist, 299—his opinion of the equivocations of the rest of the Ministers, 401.
- Piercy, Lord,** Anne Boleyn falsely declares that she was married to him before she was wedded to Henry VIII., 266—what the engagement which Lord Piercy had with Anne Boleyn, *ib.*
- Pistorius**, a famous Protestant, present with Bucer and Melancthon at the Conference of Ratisbon, 323.
- Poissy,** Conference of Poissy, 396—how undertaken, *ib.*—matters handled in this Conference, and its opening, 397—all there in commotion at what Beza advanced against the Real Presence, 398.
- Polygamy**, warranted by Luther and the other heads of the party, 208—the Landgrave's instruction, and the dogmatical advice of Luther and the other heads of the Party upon polygamy, *ib.* 211, 231.
- Pope.** Luther's submission to the Pope, 32—Luther's passionate transports against the Pope, 166—Melancthon is for owning the Pope's authority, 166, &c. 189—the evils that resulted from rejecting it, 172

- owned by Capito, 173—the Pope's Supremacy rejected in England on false principles, 293—*Vide* Vol. II.
- Prayer*, Bucer undertakes the defence of the Church's prayers, 119—prayer and oblation for the dead, what is said of them by the Lutherans, 126—the calumnies on the prayers we address to Saints, 129—Luther's scandalous prayer, in which he says he had never offended the Devil, 216—prayer for the dead confirmed by Henry VIII., 270, 275—retained for a while, and then abrogated under Edward VI., 302—public prayers reformed in England by the Parliament, 300—prayers for the dead received in the Confession of Augsburg, and by the Calvinists in 1557, 395.
- Presence* of the body of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist, on what grounded, 53, 71, 84—inseparable from Transubstantiation, 77, 78—it causes horror in Zuinglius, 99—whether it be gross and carnal, 100, 144, 145, 161—Real Presence the foundation of spiritual union, 97—if the Presence of the body be no more than spiritual, the words of the institution are in vain, 144—they have a difficulty in rejecting the Real Presence, 97—how spiritual, 143—whether a local presence of the body of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist ought to be admitted, 144—whether the presence of the body of Jesus Christ be durable in the Eucharist, 156—the real permanent presence, and subsisting when not in use, retained by Luther, *ib.* 220, 222—the Real Presence owned in the Greek Church by Mr. Burnet's Confession, 300—the Real Presence believed by the English in 1548, 304—absolutely rejected, 301, 305—the liberty of believing it afterwards allowed, 305—Calvin admits a presence of the body of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist that is ineffable and miraculous, 372—he admits a presence that is proper and peculiar to the Supper, 373—he eludes the miracle of this presence after having confessed it, 377—a passage of Calvin for a Real Presence independent of Faith, 386—*Vide* Eucharist, Reality, Transubstantiation—*Vide* Vol. II.
- Preservative*. How Calvin's doctrine is explained in the book called "The Preservative," 383.
- Pride* of Calvin, 388.
- Primacy* of the Pope—*Vide* Pope.
- Protestants*. All Protestants look on Luther as their head, 22—whence came the name of Protestants, 87—their confederacy after the Diet of Augsburg, 137—they despise the authority of Bishops and ecclesiastical discipline, 172—their Reformation whereon grounded according to Melancthon, *ib.*—no Reformation of manners among Protestants, 177—the Protestants of Germany favourable to the dispensation of Julius II., and to the first marriage of Henry VIII., 284—remarks on the conformity of the sentiments of Protestants with the sentence of Clement VII., 285—the Protestants of Germany vanquished by Charles V., 322—what opinion Protestants had of the Calvinists, 387—the Holy Fathers force respect from Protestants, though against their will, 391.
- Prussia* set all in commotion by Osiander, 325—this country turns Lutheran, 326, 328.
- Psugijs*, Bishop of Naumburg, present at the Conference of Ratisbon, 323—he puts the finishing stroke to the book of the Interim, *ib.*—he presides in the Conference of Worms, 336.
- Purgatory*. The Church's doctrine on Purgatory confirmed by Henry VIII., 270, 275—retained for a while, then abolished under Edward VI., 320.
- Puritans*. What James I., King of England, said of the Puritans, 387.

- Ratisbon.** Conference of Ratisbon in 1541, and what passed at it, 323—another Conference of Ratisbon in 1549, and what passed at it, 324.
- Ratramnus.** Ratramnus's Book puzzles Melancthon, 161—what the dispute in Ratramnus's time, 162.
- Reality.** Luther had at the beginning a great mind to subvert the reality, from a very strange motive, 49—the reality attacked by Carlostadius, 53, 56—impugned by Zuinglius, 67—strongly defended by Luther, 73—Melancthon labours to place the reality during the time of the sole use of the Sacrament, 217—Calvin makes vain efforts to keep up the idea of reality, 382—he cannot satisfy the notion of reality impressed by our Lord's institution, *ib.*—the reality well expressed by the Prelates assembled at Boissy, 402—*Vide* Eucharist, Real Presence, *vide* Vol. II.
- Reformation** of the Church desired more than an age ago, 18—the Reformation that was desired touched only discipline, and not faith, 20—two ways of desiring the Reformation of the Church, 21—the Reformation of Protestants established by seditions and wars, 46—the Reform makes two separate bodies in Germany by different Confessions of Faith, 90—it is resolved in the new Reformation to take to arms, 137—no Reformation of manners in the Protestant Church, 177, 199, 214, 343—the causes of its progress, 171—no authority in the Reformation to terminate their disputes, 327, 331, 339, 343—Reformation in England, *vide* England: whether the progress of the Reformation be due to the reading of Scripture, and how, 289—foundation of the Reform laid on the ruins of ecclesiastical authority, 295—the Reformation under Edward began in England by Peter Martyr and Bernardin Ochin, 299—all order subverted in the English Reformation, 304—whether any advantage can be drawn from the sudden progress of pretended Reformation, 306—the Reformation goes from one excess to another, 334, 354—vain discourses of the Bishop of Valence on the Reformation of manners, 403—*Vide* Vol. II.
- Reformers**, or the heads of the Reformation, careful to secure themselves: Cranmer the only one among them that dies for this cause, 325.
- Remission of sins.**—*Vide* Sin.
- Rome.** The Church of Rome praised and respected by Luther, 32.
- Sacrament.** In the Lutheran doctrine the Sacraments operate *ex opere operato*, 104—what the Lutherans think of the seven Sacraments, 122—equivocation of the Sacramentarians on the word Sacrament, 145—the seven Sacraments retained by the English under Henry VIII., 275.
- Sacramentarians.** The beginning of the Sacramentarian war among the new reformed, 53—progress of the Sacramentarian doctrine, 69—the Sacramentarian party form themselves, *ib.*—the Sacramentarians prove to Luther that he admitted a kind of figure, 79—the Sacramentarian dispute undermines the ground-work of the Reformation, 85—Calvin owns it, *ib.*—the Sacramentarians offer to subscribe the Confession of Augsburg excepting the Supper-article, 90—they are not more steady in explaining their Faith than the Lutherans, 95—their equivocating on the Eucharist, 143—they make words signify just what they please, and inure themselves to strain all kind of language, 67, 141, 147, 157, 162, 165—in token of peace they celebrate the Supper with Luther, 157—Luther's wrath again enkindles against them, 214—Luther will not have the Sacramentarians any longer prayed for, and believes them irrevocably damned, 215.
- Sacrifice.** Luther's doctrine imports a Sacrifice, 226—*Vide* Mass, Vol. II.



- Salvation.* Certainty of salvation taught by Calvin, 356.
- Satisfaction.* Satisfactory works owned in the Apology for the Augsburg Confession, 113.
- Saxony.* The Saxon Confession of Faith, why made, and by what author, 329—how the Eucharistic article is there explained, 330—other alterations made in this Confession, on the will of God touching sin, and the co-operation of free-will, *ib.*—a considerable article in the Saxon Confession relating to the distinction of mortal and venial sins, 336.
- Scripture.* Luther boasts of understanding the Scripture better than ever any man had done, 72—Luther owns that the Scripture is miraculously preserved in the Church of Rome, 131—in what sense Henry VIII. permits the people to read Scripture, 288—whether the progress of the Reformation be owing to reading of the Scripture, and how, *ib.*—how they impose on men by Scripture ill-interpreted, 289—what the Holy Fathers have said of the manner of understanding Scripture, 291—*Vide* Vol. II.
- Seditions.* The first fruits of Luther's preaching, 46.
- Semi-Pelagianism,* favoured in the Confession of Augsburg, 103—and by Melancthon, 332—taught by the rest of the Lutherans, 351—*Vide* Vol. II.
- Sign.* How the Eucharist is a sign, 145—all the mysteries of Jesus Christ are signs in certain respects, 146—Calvin is not content with receiving a sign in the Supper, 363.
- Sin.* Errors of the Zuinglians on original sin, 65—the forgiveness of sins purely gratuitous, according to the Council of Trent, 105—enumeration of sins retained in confession by the Lutherans, 122—forgiveness of sins conserved in the Church of Rome by Luther's Confession, 131—a considerable article in the Confession of Saxony on mortal and venial sins, 335.
- Smalcald.* The Lutherans labour to form the Smalcaldic Confederacy, 138—the Assembly of Smalcald occasioned by the Council called by Paul III., 164—Luther flies out against the Pope in the Articles of Smalcald, 166—in the Assembly of Smalcald, Melancthon is of opinion that they should own the Council summoned by the Pope, 191.
- Somerset* (Duke of) begins the Reformation in England, 299—whether this Duke had anything of shew of a Reformer, 307.
- Song.* Latin Song retained in the Lutheran Mass, 125.
- Staphilus,* Professor of Divinity at Koningsberg, 338—his remarkable conversion, 339.
- Strasburg.* The Strasburg Confession of Faith, or of the four cities, 90—equivocal terms of this Confession on the Article of the Supper, 94—the Confession of Strasburg explains Justification in the same manner as the Church of Rome, 117—they at the same time receive at Strasburg two contrary Confessions of Faith, 325—*Vide* Vol. II.
- Substance.* Why this word is employed in the Eucharist, 100—*Vide* Vol. II.
- Swiss* (The), are incensed against Luther, 149.
- Theses* (The) of Luther, to excite the Lutherans to take up arms, 321.
- Thomas Aquinas.* Luther's odd doubt of the salvation of this Saint, 124.
- Thomas* (St.), of Canterbury, razed out of the list of Saints by the English, 318—his behaviour of this Saint quite different from that of Thomas Cranmer, *ib.*
- Thomas Cranmer*—*Vide* Cranmer.
- Thomas Cromwell*—*Vide* Cromwell.

*Thomas More*—*Vide* More.

*Thomas Muncer*—*Vide* Muncer.

*Tournon* (*Cardinal of*), Archbishop of Lyons, presides in the Conference of Poissy, 397.

*Transubstantiation*, attacked by Luther, 49—Variation of Luther on Transubstantiation, *ib.* 84—it follows from his expressions, 50, 165—and from that of Melancthon in the Apology, 220—Transubstantiation destroys not the Sacrament, 80—why the name of bread retained, 81—why the Church makes use of the word Transubstantiation, 101—Transubstantiation, according to the Zuinglians, is established by Luther's doctrine, 76—and according to the Divines of Leipsic and Wittemberg, 224—the doctrine of Transubstantiation confirmed by Henry VIII., 275—and abolished under Edward VI., 305—*Vide* Vol. II.

*Turk*. Luther's strange doctrine about war against the Turk, 31.

*Ubiquity*, taught by Luther, 83—maintained by Illyricus and his friends, 339—the question of Ubiquity causes Melancthon to incline towards the Sacramentarians, 339—Ubiquity, after Melancthon's death, established throughout almost all Lutheranism, 342—Ubiquity rejected by the Calvinists, 345—*Vide* Vol. II.

*Unworthy*. The Communion of the unworthy how real according to Calvin, 373—how the unworthy receive the body of Jesus Christ without receiving the spirit of it, 377.

*Variations* of Luther on Transubstantiation, 50, 84—Variation of the tenth Article of the Augsburg Confession, 91—the Lutherans' evasion with respect to these Variations, 95—their Variations in what they have lopped from the Confession of Augsburg, 108—Variation of the Sacramentarians how astonishing, 96—Variations in the Acts of the Calvinists, 392—*Vide* all the other titles, *vide* Vol. II.

*War*. Luther and the Lutherans confess that it is not lawful for them to make war, 42, 56, 57, 137, 198—they recant, 35, 85, 137, 199, 321—*Vide* League, *vide* Vol. II.

*Westphalus*, a famous Lutheran, teaches Ubiquity, 339.

*Wirtemberg*. The Confession of Faith of Wirtemberg, why made, and by what authors, 329—the Article of the Eucharist is there otherwise couched than in that of Augsburg, 331—the merit of good works is there confessed, 335.

*Wittemberg*. Agreement of Wittemberg, and its six Articles, 152—issue of this agreement, 156—the Divines of Wittemberg own that there is no avoiding the Sacrifice, Transubstantiation, and Adoration, otherwise than by changing Luther's doctrine, 224—the Divines of Wittemberg change Luther's doctrine immediately after his death, 226—the Lutherans unable to answer the arguments of the Divines of Wittemberg, *ib.*—the Divines of Wittemberg come back to Luther's sentiments, and why, 227.

*Works*. Satisfactory works owned in the Apology of the Augsburg Confession, 113—the merit of good works, *vide* Merit.—The necessity of good works, in order to salvation, condemned by the Lutherans, 337.

*Worms*. The Conferences of Worms, in order to reconcile both religions, 336—Assembly at Worms in 1557, whither the Reformed Churches of France and Geneva send Beza and Farel, 393.

*Zuinglius*, his character and doctrine on the salvation of Heathens, 63, 64

—his errors on original sin, 65—his errors on baptism, 67—he forces the Scripture in everything, *ib.*—his contempt of antiquity, *ib.*—he writes against the Real Presence, 70—he takes from the Eucharist all that raises it above the senses, *ib.*—a Spirit appears to him, and suggests that text to him where the sign of the Institution received immediately the name of the thing, 71—why Zuinglius is worse handled by Luther than the rest of the Sacramentarians, 72—Zuinglius preaches the Reformation in Switzerland, 73—he is present at the Conference of Marburg, where he confers with Luther, 87—he sends his Confession of Faith to the Emperor, 89, 90—his Confession of Faith free from equivocations, 99—what a presence of the body of Jesus Christ he acknowledges in the Supper, *ib.*—Zuinglius's death in battle, 141.

*Zuinglians* prove to Luther that the Catholics understand the literal sense better than he, 77—a whole synod of Zuinglians in Poland assert the same truth, 78—they prove to Luther that he admits a kind of figurative sense, 79—they will not hear a miracle or omnipotence spoken of in the Eucharist, 158—they reprove Luther for having always the Devil in his mouth, and call him madman, 216—Luther's last sentiments concerning the Zuinglians, 228—Zuinglianism gains ground in England, 299—the Zuinglians are condemned by the Lutherans, 342—their scoffs at the Confession of Augsburg, 344.

*Zurich*. The Mass abolished at Zurich, 71—those of Zurich laugh at Bucer's equivocations, 157—Calvin makes an agreement with those of Zurich, 361.

END OF THE FIRST VOLUME.















