

THE
ACTS AND MONUMENTS
JOHN FOXE.

1563

FAMILY EDITION
REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR, M.A., ED.

1855

PRELIMINARY DISSERTATION.

***The difference between the Church of Rome that now is,
and the ancient Church of Rome that then was.***

Christ our Savior, in the gospel of Matthew, 16.18, hearing the confession of Simon Peter who acknowledged him to be the Son of God, and perceiving the secret hand of His Father in it, answered Peter. Alluding to his name, Christ called him a *rock*, upon which he would build his church so strong that the gates of hell would not prevail against it, etc. In these words, three things are to be noted. *First*, that Christ will have a church in this world. *Secondly*, that the church would be mightily opposed, not only by the world, but also by the utmost strength and powers of hell. And, *thirdly*, that this church would continue, notwithstanding the devil and all his malice.

We see this prophecy of Christ wonderfully verified, in that the whole course of the church to this day may seem nothing but a verification of it. *First*, that Christ set up a church, needs no declaration. *Secondly*, that princes, kings, monarchs, governors, and rulers of this world, along with their subjects, both publicly and privately, with all their strength and cunning, have bent themselves against this church. And *Thirdly*, how the church, notwithstanding all this, has yet endured and held its own. It is wondrous to behold what storms and tempests it has withstood. I have written this history to more evidently declare this, intending by the favorable aid of Christ our Lord, not so much to delight the ears, as to profit the hearts of the godly in perusing antiquities of ancient times. This is done to the end that the wonderful works of God, in this church, might appear to His glory. Also, that the continuance and proceedings of the church from time to time, being set forth in these *Acts and Monuments*, may redound to the profit of the reader, and the edification of Christian faith.

To better accomplish this, I have thought it good to run over the whole state and course of the church in general, beginning from the time of the primitive church, and continuing to these latter years, dividing the whole of this history into five periods.

First, I will treat the SUFFERING time of the church, which continued from the apostles' age, for about three hundred years.

Secondly, the FLOURISHING time of the church, which lasted other three hundred years.

Thirdly, the DECLINING time of the church, which comprehends another three hundred years. During this time, the church was much altered in ambition and pride, from the simple sincerity of the primitive time. Yet in its outward profession of doctrine and religion, it was somewhat tolerable, and had some face of a church. Notwithstanding this, some corruption of doctrine, with some superstition and hypocrisy, had even then crept in. Yet in comparison with what followed, it might seem, as I have said, somewhat sufferable.

Preliminary Dissertation

Difference between Roman Church Then, and Now

Fourthly, followed the time of ANTICHRIST, and the desolation of the church, containing a space of four hundred years. In this time, both doctrine and sincerity of life were almost extinguished, namely, in the chief heads and rulers of this western church, through the means of the Roman bishops. Especially during four hundred years, counting from Gregory VII, called *Hildebrand* (p. 1073), Innocent III (p. 1198) and the friars which crept in with him, ¹ till the time of John Wickliffe (d. 1384) and John Huss (d. 1415),.

Fifthly, after this time of antichrist reigning by violence and tyranny, follows the REFORMATION and PURGING of the church of God, in which antichrist begins to be revealed, and to show his colors, and his doctrine to be detected; the number of the Antichrist's church is decreasing, and the number of the true church is increasing. This time has continued up to now, about the space of two hundred and eighty years. How long it will continue, only the Lord and Governor of all times knows.

I suppose that the whole course of the church may be comprised in these five periods. This church being universal and dispersed through all countries, I will not be bound to any one nation more than another. Yet notwithstanding, I have purposed to tarry principally upon those historical acts and records which most pertain to England and Scotland.

The church of Rome, in all these ages, has claimed for itself the supreme title, and the ringleading of the whole universal church on earth. Thus, in writing of the church of Christ, I cannot help but partly intermeddle with the acts and proceedings of the church of Rome also;. For so much of the doings and orderings of all other churches, here in England as well as in other nations, have for this long time chiefly depended upon Rome. Therefore, as it is needful and requisite to have the doings and orderings of that church made manifest to all Christian congregations, I have framed this history according to that purpose.

I will first briefly declare in a general description, the misguiding of that church, comparing the former primitive state of the church of Rome with these latter times. This being done, I will then, in a more special way, prosecute more at large all the particulars of it, so far as it seems profitable for the public instruction of all other Christian churches. In the church of Rome, four things seem to me to be chiefly considered: TITLE, JURISDICTION, LIFE, and DOCTRINE.

First, I must declare concerning the TITLE or primacy of the church, how it first began, and on what occasion.

Secondly, concerning its JURISDICTION and authority: what it was, and how far it extended.

Thirdly, regarding the disorder of LIFE and conversation, how inordinate it is. And,

Fourthly, the form of DOCTRINE, how superstitious and idolatrous it has been of late.

Of these four, the *first* was prejudicial to all bishops; the *second* was derogatory to kings and emperors; the *third* was detestable to all men; and the *fourth* was injurious to Christ.

[8]

For the *First*, the TITLE and style of that church was such that it went beyond all other churches, being called

¹ *Friars*: members of a mendicant Christian order such as the Carmelites (white friars), Franciscans (grey friars) or the Dominicans (black friars).

Preliminary Dissertation

Difference between Roman Church Then, and Now

“the Holy Universal Mother Church, which could not err; and its bishop, Holy Father the Pope, Bishop Universal, Prime of Priests, Supreme head of the Universal Church, and Vicar of Christ here on earth, who must not be judged — having all knowledge of Scripture, and all laws contained within the chest of his breast.”

Secondly, the JURISDICTION of that bishop was such, that claiming for himself *both* the swords — that is, both the keys of the Scripture and the sceptre of the laity — he not only subdued all bishops under him, but also advanced himself above kings and emperors. This caused some of them to lie under his feet, some to hold his stirrup, kings to lead his horse by the bridle, some to kiss his feet — placing and displacing emperors, kings, dukes, and earls, whom and when he chose — taking it upon himself to transfer the empire at his pleasure, from Greece to France, from France to Germany — preferring and deposing whomever he pleased, and confirming those who were elected. Also, being emperor himself when the throne was vacant, pretending authority or power to invest bishops, to give benefices, to spoil churches, to give authority to bind and loose, to call general councils, to judge over them, to set up religions, to canonize saints, to take appeals, to bind consciences, to make laws, to dispense with the law and the word of God, to deliver from purgatory, to command angels, etc.

Thirdly, what was the LIFE and conversation (public conduct) of the court of Rome, will be seen in this history.

Fourthly, his DOCTRINE was in like manner tedious to students, pernicious to men’s consciences, injurious to Christ Jesus, and contrary to itself. In laws it was more diverse, in volume more enlarged, in diligence and study more applied to, in vantage and preferment more gainful than the study and learning of the holy Scripture of God ever was.

These four points being well-considered in this history, I trust it may minister to the Christian reader, sufficient instruction to judge what is to be thought of this church of Rome.

Here it is to be noted that all these deformities of vain title, of pretended jurisdiction, of heretical doctrine, of schismatic life, did not come into the church of Rome all at one time. Nor did it spring up with the beginning of the church, but with long working, and little by little. And it did not come to full perfection till the time partly of Pope Boniface III, partly of Pope Gregory VII, partly of Pope Innocent III, and finally of Pope Boniface VIII. Of these four popes, the first, Boniface, brought in the TITLE (A.D. 607), which was never in such an ample way before it was publicly enacted, and received publicly in the church of Rome. The second, Gregory, brought in JURISDICTION (A.D. 1073). The third, which was Pope Innocent (A.D. 1198), with his rabble of monks and friars, and those other bishops who succeeded him, corrupted and obscured the sincerity of Christ’s DOCTRINE and MANNERS (LIFE). And lastly, Pope Boniface VIII (A.D. 1294); and after him Pope Clement V. (A.D. 1305), besides the jurisdiction advanced before by Pope Hildebrand, added moreover the *temporal sword* to be carried before them, so that the succession of no emperor would be sufficient and lawful without the pope’s admission, By this, the pope’s power was brought to his full pride and perfection in the fourteenth century. And thus arose the corruption of the Romish church in continuance of years, by degrees, and not altogether nor at one time.

Therefore, whoever has to deal with any adversaries about the antiquity or authority of the church of Rome, let him well consider when and how the title, jurisdiction, and corruption of doctrine first began in the pope’s see. And so he will see that the church of Rome, as it is now governed, never descended from the primitive age of the apostles. Just as the picture of the holy virgin is not the holy virgin, and just as a man painted on the wall is not a man; so it

Preliminary Dissertation

Difference between Roman Church Then, and Now

is to be said of the church of Rome (I mean the institution and doctrine of the church of Rome), that although it has the *name* of the apostolical church, and although it brings out a long genealogy of outward succession from the apostles — as the Pharisees in Christ's time brought out their descent from Abraham their father ^{Joh 8.38-44} — yet all this is in name only, and not in effect or matter. For the *definition* of the apostolical church does not now agree with this present church of Rome, nor with the manner, form, and institution of the Romish church as it now stands, if it ever had any succession from the primitive church. But just as Christ said of the pharisees, that they were not the children of Abraham, but of the devil, so it may be answered that this church of Rome now present, with this title, jurisdiction, and doctrine now used, cannot be fathered upon the apostles, nor Peter, nor pope Linus, but on another author, whom I will not name here.

And here comes the argument of Pighius, Hosius, and Eccius.² In arguing for the antiquity and authority of the church of Rome, they reason in this manner:

“That just as an ordinary and known visible church must be known continually on earth, from the time of the apostles, to which all other churches must have recourse; and seeing ;that there is no other church visible known to have endured from the apostles' time, except the church of Rome; they conclude that the church of Rome is therefore that church to which all other churches must have recourse,” etc.

To which I answer, that although the name of the church and the outward succession of bishops have continued from the time of the apostles, yet the definition and matter which makes a true apostolical church, is not now in the church of Rome. Nor yet was the form and institution of the church that is now used in Rome, ever from the apostles. They were never the authors or fathers of this title, jurisdiction, and doctrine now taught in Rome, but rather were ever enemies to the same.

Again, although the necessity of the church enduring from the apostles, may and must be granted, yet the same necessity was not bound to any certain place or person, but only to *faith*. So that wherever and in whatever church true faith was found, ^{Gal 2.16} *there* was the church of Christ. And because the true faith of Christ must ever remain on earth, the church also must remain on earth. And God forbid that the true faith of Christ should only remain in one city in the world, and not in another as well. And therefore, just as this true and sincere faith of Christ is not given to remain fixedly in one place or city alone, so neither is there any one church in the world so ordained and appointed by God, that all other churches should have their recourse to it, for determination of their causes and controversies.

Now, as to the authorities of the fathers in commendation of the church of Rome, whoever rightly understands their authorities, must learn to make a distinction between the church of Rome, as it *was* and as it *is*. The church of Rome is not the same church now which it was then; and nothing now agrees to what it was then, except in outward name and place. I therefore answer by this distinction, the description of Ireneus,³ Cyprian, etc. commending the church of Rome as “catholic and apostolical,” and say that they speak of the church of Rome *as it then was*. Calling it catholic and apostolical was not untrue, for that same church took its ordinary succession of bishops, joined with the ordinary doctrine and institution, from the apostles. But speaking of the church of Rome *as it now is*, we say that this

² Albert Pighius (1490- 1542); Stanislaus Hosius (1504-1579); and John von Eck (1486-1543). These were leaders in the Catholic Counter-Reformation, and well-known in Foxe's day.

³ The Latin spelling is Ireneus (c. 130-200), often pronounced Eyerenay'us, instead of the English Eyereen'eeus.

Preliminary Dissertation

Difference between Roman Church Then, and Now

description by the fathers is not true; but then, neither does it pertain to the same church. For they neither knew the church of Rome as it now is, nor if they had, would they ever have judged anything in it worthy of such commendation.

Our adversaries objecting against us still more, and laboring for the antiquity of the Romish church, for lack of other reasons, are driven to scanning the times and years. “What? (they ask) Where was this church of yours fifty years ago?” In answer, we demand to know what they mean by this *church of ours*? If they mean the ordinance and institution of doctrine and sacraments now received by us, we affirm that our church was in existence when this *church of theirs* was not yet hatched out of the shell, nor had yet seen the light.

[9]

That is, in the time of the apostles, in the primitive age, in the time of Gregory I. and the old Roman church, when as yet no universal pope was publicly accepted, but was repelled in Rome. Nor was this fulness of plenary power yet known, nor this doctrine and abuse of sacraments yet heard of. In witness of this, we have the old acts and histories of ancient time to give testimony with us. In these we have sufficient matter for us to declare the same form, usage, and institution of this “our church,” as now reformed, is not the beginning of any new church of our own, but the renewing of the old ancient church of Christ.

And our adversaries charge us with the faith of our fathers and godfathers, in which we were baptized. They accuse us of revolting from them and their faith in which we were first christened. We answer that we, being first baptized by our fathers and godfathers in water, in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit — the same faith in which we were christened then, we *retain*. And because our godfathers were themselves also in the same faith, they cannot therefore say that we have forsaken the faith of our godfathers. As for other points of ecclesiastical uses and circumstances considered, besides the principal substance of faith and baptism, if they held anything which receded from the doctrine and rule of Christ, we now remove ourselves from that. This is not because we would differ from them, but because we would not, with them, remove ourselves from the rule of Christ’s doctrine. Nor does our baptism bind us in all points to the opinions of those who baptized us, but to the faith of Him in whose name we were baptized. For, it is as if a man were christened by a heretic; the baptism, notwithstanding, would be good, even if the baptizer was nothing.⁴ So too, if our godfathers or fathers who christened us were taught anything that is not consonant with Christian doctrine in all points, neither is our baptism any the worse for that; nor are we bound to follow them in all things in which they themselves did not follow the true church of Christ.

Therefore, just as it is false that we have renounced the faith of our godfathers in which we were baptized, so is it not true that we are removed from the church of Rome. But rather I say, and I will prove, that the church of Rome has utterly departed from the church of Rome, according to my former distinction. To more evidently declare this, I will here compare the church of Rome with the church of Rome; and in a general description, I will set forth the difference of both churches; that is, of both periods of the church of Rome. The intent is that it may be seen whether we or they have most apostatised from the church of Rome. And here, I divide the church of Rome into two distinct periods of time. The first of

⁴ Most reformed churches today will not accept the baptism of Mormons, Jehovah’s Witnesses, etc., because the vows made at their baptism did not profess faith alone, in Christ alone for their salvation,. But if a believer’s vows were indeed true to the Christian Faith, then it doesn’t matter if the person administering the baptism was saved or not, sinful or not. Christians are saved by their own faith, not by the faith of their baptizer.

Preliminary Dissertation

Difference between Roman Church Then, and Now

those is the first six hundred years immediately after Christ. The second is the other six hundred years, which include our own later days. And so, in comparing these two together, I will search out what difference is between them. Of these two ages and states of the Roman church, I call the first the *primitive* church of Rome; the other I call the *later* church of Rome.

The Corrupting of Church Order and Life

To begin with the order and qualities of life, I ask, where was this church of theirs in the time of the primitive church of Rome — with this pomp and pride, with these riches and this superfluity (excesses); with this worldly splendor and the name *cardinals*; with this prancing dissoluteness; with this extortion, bribing, buying and selling of spiritual dignities, these annates, ⁵ reformations, procurations, exactions, and other practices for money; with this insatiable avarice, and intolerable ambition; with this most detestable fleshly filthiness, barbarousness and negligence in preaching; with this promise-breaking faithlessness, poisoning and supplanting of one another; with such schisms and divisions in the elections and courts of Rome, *for these past seven hundred years* — with such extreme cruelty, malice, and tyranny, in burning and persecuting their poor brethren to death?

It would take too long to dwell particularly on these things. And if a man were to detail all the schisms in the church of Rome (numbering eighteen), what a volume it would require! Or if it were recorded here, all that this see has burned and put to death, who would be able to number them? Or if all their schemes to get money were to be described, who would be able to recite them all? Of these, the principal ones are reckoned to be at least fourteen or fifteen schemes:

1. For annates or vacancies of arch-bishoprics, bishoprics, abbasies, conventual priories, and other elective benefices.
2. For holding all spiritual livings whatever (benefices).
3. New annates for the same office over again, as often as any one of all his spiritual livings are, or are feigned to be, come by in a disorderly way; hereby it has chanced, at various times, that three or four annates are to be paid for one benefice.
4. For giving benefices before they end, and many times giving them to several persons for money's sake.
5. For resignations, which in many cases the pope claims are reserved to himself.
6. For commendams. ⁶
7. For compounding with those who are not under their charge.
8. For dispensations, so as to dispense with requirements of age, order, or incompatible benefices; also for irregularity, for adultery, for times of marriage, for marrying in forbidden degrees [e.g., first cousins], or for gossips to marry — in France at one time, a thousand crowns were paid to Rome for this; for dispensing with this canonical affinity of gossips; also dispensations for eating meats at prohibited times.

⁵ *Annate*: The first year's profits of a Catholic benefice (endowed office), traditionally paid directly to the Pope.

⁶ *Commendam*: a vacant benefice commended to a cleric until an incumbent is provided.

Preliminary Dissertation

Difference between Roman Church Then, and Now

9. For innumerable privileges, exemptions, graces; for not visiting [shut-ins], or visiting by a proctor; for confirmations of privileges; for transactions made upon favor of the pope; for exchanges of benefices, or for making pensions, with similar things.

10. For mandates granted by the pope to ordinaries,⁷ of which every ordinary, if he often has the collation or presentation, ⁸ may receive one mandate; if he has fifty, two mandates; and for every mandate about twenty ducats [\$520] comes to the pope. And yet as many are sold, as there are buyers to pay for them.

11. For the pope's penitentiary [doing penance]; for absolution of cases reserved to the pope; for the breaking of vows; for transfer from one monastery to another, or one order to another; for the licence to enter into certain monasteries, to carry around altars, with many other things of similar devising.

12. For giving and granting pardons and indulgences, to be read not only in public temples, but also to be bought in private houses.

13. For making notaries, prothonotaries [registrars], and other offices of the court of Rome.

14. For bulls and commissioning new foundations, or for changing the old; for reducing regular monasteries to a secular state, or for restoring them again to the old; and for other writs about matters in controversy, that ought to be decided by the ordinary.

15. For giving the pall to archbishops.⁹

Because of all these devices (besides the annates) it has been accounted from the king's records in France, that in the time of Louis IX (c. 1250), the sum of two hundred thousand crowns were paid out of France and transported to Rome. Since that time, this sum has been doubled and trebled, besides annates and palls, which altogether, in recent years, has been reckoned to total a yearly sum of one hundred thousand crowns going out of France into the pope's coffers. Now, as to what has been drawn from other kingdoms and nations besides, let others conjecture.

Therefore, if the gospel sends us to the fruit in order to know the tree, then what is to be thought of the church of Rome with these fruits of life? Or if we seek the church in length and number of years, then where was *this* church of Rome, with *these* qualities, when the church of Rome was a persecuted and not a persecuting church? And when its bishops did not make martyrs, as they now do, but were made martyrs themselves, one after another, numbering twenty-five? ¹⁰ Or when its bishops were elected, not by conspiring factions, not by money or making friends, as they are now, but by the free voices of the people and of the clergy, with the consent of the emperor, and not by a few conspiring cardinals closed up in a corner, as they are now.

[10]

⁷ *Ordinary*: a church officer who has power to execute the church's laws. This includes diocesan bishops. They have the authority to make, enforce, and judge laws within their jurisdiction.

⁸ *Collation*: the presentation of a clergyman to a benefice by a bishop.

⁹ *Pall*: a piece of stiffened linen used to cover the chalice at the Eucharist, or the cloth used to cover a coffin.

¹⁰ It is unclear where Foxe got this number; perhaps the 11 apostles (Matthias, not John), Paul, James, Barnabas, Linus, Clement of Rome, Ignatius, Antipas, Polycarp, Ptolomaeus, Lucius, Justin Martyr, Cyprian, Pothinus, and Ireneus.

Preliminary Dissertation

Difference between Roman Church Then, and Now

And yet if there were no other difference in the matter, but only in the corruption of life, we would impute all that to the common frailty of man, and charge them no further than we might charge ourselves.

Now, over and above this deformity of life, we have to charge them in greater points that more nearly touch the substantial ground of the church, such as,

- (1) in their JURISDICTION presumptuously usurped;
- (2) in their TITLE falsely grounded;
- (3) in their DOCTRINE heretically corrupted.

In all three points, this later church of Rome has utterly separated itself from the nature of the ancient church of Rome.

1. Jurisdiction Presumptuously Usurped.

And they have erected for themselves a new church of their own making, usurping a jurisdiction never before known to their ancient predecessors. For although the church of Rome in the primitive time had its due authority among other patriarchal churches, and over such churches as were within its boundary, yet the plenitude of power, both spiritual and temporal — in deposing and dispensing of matters not belonging to the pope; in taking appeals; in giving elections; investing in benefices; in exempting himself from obedience and subjection to his ordinary (secular) magistrate — such things were never accepted in the old Roman church.

For although Victor, bishop of Rome (A.D. 200), went to excommunicate the Eastern churches for observing Easter day, he neither proceeded in this, nor was he permitted by Ireneus to do so. Boniface I, writing to the bishops of Carthage, required them to send their appeals to Rome, alleging the decree of the Nicene council for his authority. However, the bishops and clergy of Carthage assembling in a general council (called the sixth Council of Carthage) — numbering two hundred and seventeen bishops — after they had perused the decrees of the Nicene council, found no such matter as Boniface alleged. They made a decree that no one in that country should make any appeal to that see in Rome, etc. What wonder, if appeals were forbidden to be made to Rome back then, that here in England the kings would not permit any to appeal to Rome, before the time of Henry II? Also in France, like prohibitions were expressly made by Louis IX (A.D. 1268), which forbade by a public instrument, all exactions of the pope's court within that realm. Also King Philip of Spain (A.D. 1296) not only restrained all sending of his subjects to Rome, but also that no money, armor, or subsidy should be transported out of his kingdom. Also King Charles V, and his son Charles VI, punished certain persons as traitors for appealing to Rome. The same resistance was also made in France against the pope's reservations, preventions, and other like practices in the days of Pope Martin V; also when King Henry VI in England, and King Charles VII in France, both agreed with the pope, in investing and in the collation of benefices. Yet notwithstanding, the high court of parliament in France did not allow it, but still maintained the old liberty and customs of the French church. This went so far that when the duke of Bedford came with the king's Letters patent ¹¹ to have the pope's procurations and reservations admitted, the court of parliament would not agree to it (A.D. 1425). In the days of King Charles VII., *The Pragmatic sanction*, as they call it, was set forth in France, against the annates, reservations, expectatives, and other proceedings of the popes (A.D. 1458). What wonder, then, if this jurisdiction of the pope's court, in

¹¹ Letters patent: (law) an official document granting a right or privilege.

Preliminary Dissertation

Difference between Roman Church Then, and Now

excommunicating, taking appeals, and giving benefices, was *not* used in the old church of Rome, when in these latter days it has been so much resisted?

And what should I say about the form of elections now used in the church of Rome, being quite changed from the manner of the old church of their predecessors? For in those ancient days, when the church remained in the hands of the apostles and a few other disciples, the apostles then, with prayer and imposition of hands, elected bishops and ministers — just as the apostle James was made bishop of Jerusalem, Paul elected Titus to Crete and Timothy to Ephesus; also, Peter ordained Linus and Clement in Rome, etc. After the time of the apostles, when the church began to multiply, the election of bishops and ministers remained in the clergy and the people, with the consent of the chief magistrate. And so it continued during all the time of the primitive church, till the time of Constantine, who (as Platina and Sabellicus write) published a law concerning the election of the Roman bishop — that he should be taken as a true bishop, whom the clergy and people of Rome chose and elected without waiting for any authority of the emperor of Constantinople or the deputy of Italy, which had ever been the custom before that day. And here the bishops first began to extricate their elections and their necks a little from the emperor's subjection. But there are many reasons to think this constitution of Constantine was rather forged and untrue. For it is taken out of the pope's library (a suspected place), and collected by the keeper of the pope's library (a suspected author), who carefully compiled whatever feigned or apocryphal writings he could find in the pope's chest of records, favoring anything on his master's side.

And as in elections, so also in judiciary power, in deciding causes of faith and of discipline, the state of the church of Rome now has no conformity with the old Roman church. For then bishops debated all causes of faith only by the Scriptures. And other questions of discipline, they determined by the canons, not of the pope, but of those which were decreed by the ancient councils of the church. Whereas now, both the rule of Scripture and sanctions of the old councils are set aside, and all things are decided for the most part by certain new and extravagant constitutions, compiled in the pope's canon law, and practiced in his courts.

The old ordinance of the common law, as well as of the sacred councils and institution of ancient fathers, gave the authority to bishops and other prelates; also to patrons, and doctors of ecclesiastical benefices, each within his own precinct and dominion; also to cathedral churches and others — to have their free elections, disposing all ecclesiastical benefices whatever, according to their own wills. This appears by the first general Council of France, by the first general Council of Nice (cap. 6.), and by the general Council of Antioch (cap. 9). And besides these ancient decrees, it likewise appears in more recent years, by Louis IX of France, in his constitution — made and provided by full parliament, *against* the pope's exactions (A.D. 1228), evidenced in these words:

“All exactions and oppressive burdens of money, which the court of Rome has laid upon the church of our kingdom (by which our kingdom has been, up to now, miserably impoverished), or hereafter shall impose or lay upon us, we utterly discharge and forbid to be levied or collected hereafter for any manner of cause, unless some reasonable, godly, and most urgent and inevitable necessity comes; and that also is not to be done without the express and voluntary commandment of us, and of the church of the same foresaid kingdom,” etc.

Now, contrary to these express decrees of general councils and constitutions, those in this later church of Rome, degenerating from all the steps of their elders, has taken it upon themselves, for their own advantage, to intermeddle in disposing churches, colleges, monasteries — with the collations, exemptions, election, goods and lands belonging to them

Preliminary Dissertation

Difference between Roman Church Then, and Now

— because of which have come these impropriations,¹² first-fruits, and reservations of benefices, to the miserable despoiling of parishes and the great decay of Christian faith. These things were never known among the old Roman elders.

Likewise, advowsons¹³ and pluralities of benefices were things as much unknown then, as they are now pernicious to the church, taking away from the flock of Christ all free election of ministers.

All these inconveniences, just as they first came and crept in by the pretended authority abused in this later church of Rome, so it cannot be denied that the later church of Rome has taken and attributed to itself much more than either the limits of God's word give, or can stand with the example of the old Roman church — specifically in the three things I mentioned before. So I will briefly recapitulate them.

The *first* is this: that whatever the Scripture gives and refers either to the whole church universally, or to every particular church severally, this church of Rome arrogates to itself absolutely and only. This both injures other churches, and abuses the Scriptures of God.

[11]

For although the Scripture gives authority to bind and loose, it does not limit it either to person or place — that is, neither to the city of Rome more than to other cities, nor to the see of Peter more than to other apostles. But Scripture clearly gives it to the *church*. So that, wherever the true church of Christ is found, power is annexed to bind and loose, given and taken merely as it comes from Christ, and not mediately by the pope.

The *second* point in which this present church of Rome abuses jurisdiction, contrary to the Scripture and steps of the old Roman church, is this: it extends her authority further and more amply than either the warrant of the word, or example of time will give. For although the church of Rome has (as other particular churches have) authority to bind and absolve, yet it has no such authority to absolve subjects from their oath, subjection, and loyalty to their rulers and magistrates, to dispense with perjury, to denounce remission where no earnest repentance is seen before, to number remission by days and years, to dispense with things expressly forbidden in the word, or to restrain that which the word makes free, to burden consciences with the constitutions of men, to excommunicate for worldly matters —

such as for breaking parks,¹⁴ for not ringing bells at the bishop's coming, for not bringing litter for their horse, for not paying their fees and rents, for withholding the church goods, for taking their prince's side in princely cases, for not going at the pope's commandment, for not agreeing to the pope's election in another prince's kingdom, along with other such things, more and more vain than these, etc.

Again, although the Scripture gives leave and authority to the bishop and church of Rome to *minister* sacraments: yet it gives no authority to *make* sacraments, much less to *worship* sacraments. And though their authority serves to baptize men, it does not extend to christen *bells*.¹⁵ Nor do they have authority by the word of God to add to the word of God, or to take

¹² *Impropriation*: A benefice, tithe etc. that has been put in lay hands.

¹³ *Advowson*: the right of presenting a nominee to a vacant ecclesiastical benefice.

¹⁴ *Breaking parks*: “park” was a kind of fishing net, and might refer to damaging one. Or, perhaps using a public park for private purposes, by opening a gap in its fencing (paling) to hunt, fish, farm, etc., thus “going beyond the pale.”

¹⁵ The blessing of bells was said to imbue the bells with spiritual power, so that when rung, they would protect the faithful from evil spirits and natural calamities such as storms.

Preliminary Dissertation

Difference between Roman Church Then, and Now

from it — to set up unwritten tenets under pain of damnation, to make other articles of belief, to institute strange worship, other than God has prescribed, who has told us how he would be worshipped, etc.

The *third* abuse of the pope's jurisdiction stands in this: that just as they have vehemently exceeded the bounds of Scripture in *spiritual* jurisdiction, so they have impudently intermeddled themselves in *temporal* jurisdiction, in which they had nothing to do. It has gone so far, that they have transferred their empire. They have deposed emperors, kings, princes, rulers, and senators of Rome, and set up others, or done the same again at their pleasure. They have proclaimed wars, and they have warred themselves. And whereas emperors in ancient times dignified popes with titles, enlarged them with donations, and given them confirmation, they have afterwards, like ungrateful clients to such benefactors, stamped on their necks, made them to hold their stirrups, some to hold the bridle of their horse, and caused them to seek their own confirmation at the popes' hand. Moreover, they have extorted into their own hands the power and jurisdiction of *both* swords (spiritual and temporal power), especially since the time of Pope Gregory VII, surnamed *Hildebrand*. This Hildebrand, deposing emperor Henry IV, made him attend at the city gate. And after him, Pope Boniface VIII showed himself to the people, on the first day like a bishop, with his keys before him; and the next day he showed himself in his imperial robes, having a naked sword carried before him, like an emperor (A.D. 1298.) This inordinate jurisdiction has not only been used by them in the past, but it is still maintained at Rome to this day. Let us therefore now compare her to the old manner in times past, meaning the primitive age of the church of the Romans. In that age, the old bishops of Rome, just as *they* were then subject to their emperor, so were other bishops of other nations in like manner subject every one to his own king and prince. They acknowledged them as their lords, were ordered by their authority, and obeyed their laws — and that was not only in civil causes, but also ecclesiastical.

Thus Gregory I (the Great), was subject to Maurice, and to Phocas (even though he was a wicked emperor). So, also, both the pope and people of Rome took their laws from the emperors and submitted to them, not only in the time of Honorius, a hundred years after Constantine the Great, but also in the time of Marcian (A.D. 451), and up to the time of Justinian I (A.D. 527) and of Charlemagne (A.D. 768). In all this period, the imperial law ruled and bound in Rome, both in the days of Justinian, and one hundred and fifty years after. Thereby it may appear false that the city of Rome was given by Constantine to the bishop of Rome. For Pope Boniface I, writing to the emperor Honorius, calls Rome the emperor's city; and the emperor Lothaire appointed magistrates and laws in Rome.¹⁶ Moreover, the bishop of Rome and all other ecclesiastical persons were in former times (and ought to be) subject to their emperors and lawful magistrates, in spiritual causes as well as civil. This may appear by many evidences taken out both of God's law, and man's law.

And first, by God's law, we have the example of godly King David, who numbered all the priests and Levites, and disposed them into twenty-four orders or courses, appointing them continually to serve in the ministry, every one in his proper order and turn. Good King Hezekiah afterwards renewed this institution of the clergy. It is written of him: "He did what was right in the sight of the Lord, according to all that his father David did. He removed the high places, and broke the images," etc., 2Kng 18.3-4. Hezekiah also reduced the priests and Levites into their orders as prescribed by David, each one according to his service, 2Chr 31.2. And this order from David still continued till the time of Zacharias, at the coming of

¹⁶ Lothair I (795-855) - Carolingian emperor, and king of Italy and Middle Francia.

Preliminary Dissertation

Difference between Roman Church Then, and Now

Christ. He was of the course of Abia, which was the eighth order of the priests appointed to serve in the tabernacle, Luk 1.5. Passing over other lighter offices, such as those concerning the ordering of oblations in the temple, and the repairing of the house of the Lord, we find Solomon displacing Abiathar the high priest by his kingly power, and placing Zadok in his stead, 1Kng 2.27,35. Also, Solomon dedicated the temple of the Lord with all the people, and blessed all the congregation of Israel, 1Kng 8.55. Judas Maccabeus also elected priests, those who were without spot. He had a zeal for the law of the Lord, to purge the temple, which the idolatrous Gentiles had profaned, 1Mac 4.42. Also, King Alexander, writing to Jonathan, appointed him chief priest, 1Mac 10.18-20. Demetrius ordained Simon and Alcimus in the like office of priesthood, 1Mac 7.9; 15.1. Jehoshaphat likewise, set judges throughout the land. So also in Jerusalem he appointed Levites and priests, and the chief of the fathers of Israel, to hear causes and to minister judgment over the people, 2Chr 19.8.

By these and many other passages, it is to be seen that kings and princes in the old time had the dealing in ecclesiastical matters, such as calling the people to God's service, cutting down groves, destroying images, gathering tithes into the house of the Lord, dedicating the temple, blessing the people, casting down the bronze serpent, correcting and deposing priests, constituting the order and offices of priests, commanding things which pertained to the service and worship of God, and punishing the contrary, etc. And in the New Testament, what does the example of Christ himself mean, both giving and teaching that tribute is to be given to Caesar? to *Caesar*, I say, and not to the high priest. ^{Luk 20.22-25} What do his words to Pilate mean, not denying that power was given to Pilate from above? ^{Joh 19.11}

And again, he declared that the kings of nations have dominion over them, and commanded his disciples not to have such dominion. ^{Mat 20.25-26} Thereby He gives us to understand the difference between the regulation of his spiritual kingdom, and that of the kingdoms of this world. He commands all states to be subject under the rulers and magistrates, in whose regulation is dominion and subjection. This also accords with the doctrine of St. Paul, where it is written: "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers," Rom 13.1 — under whose obedience, neither pope, cardinal, patriarch, bishop, priest, friar nor monk, is excepted or exempted. In like agreement with the holy apostle St. Paul, St. Peter joins also: "Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man, whether to the king as supreme, or to governors," etc., 1Pet 2.13-14. Let any man now judge whether the pope has not done open wrong to the emperor, in raising himself above the jurisdiction of his lawful prince and magistrate.

[12]

And as it is proved by God's law, that all ecclesiastical persons owe subjection to their lawful princes, in temporal as well as spiritual matters, so it may no less be inferred from man's law, and the examples of the oldest fathers. The popes' decrees and canons are full of records testifying how the ancient church of Rome not only received, but also required of the emperors, laws and constitutions to be made that touch not only such causes, but also such persons as were ecclesiastical. Boniface I, bishop of Rome, sent a humble supplication to the emperor to provide some remedy against the ambitious contentions of the clergy concerning the bishopric of Rome. Honorius, at his request, directed and established a law, that none should be made bishop of Rome through ambition. He charged all ecclesiastical ministers to cease from ambition; appointing, moreover, that if two were elected together, neither of them should be taken, but the election was to proceed to another, to be chosen by a full consent of voices.

To this I also add the law and constitution of the emperor Justinian (r. 527-565), ratified and renewed afterwards in the Council of Paris. In these, all bishops and priests are

Preliminary Dissertation

Difference between Roman Church Then, and Now

expressly forbidden to excommunicate any man before his cause was known and proved to be such as the ancient canons of the church would have him excommunicated. Moreover, in his laws and constitutions, Justinian disposed and ordained in church matters, to have a determinate number of churchmen or clerks in churches (Const. 3). Also matters concerning monasteries and monks (Const. 5). How bishops and priests should be ordained (Const. 6). Concerning the removing of ecclesiastical persons from one church to another. Also, that the holy mysteries should not be done in private houses, and whoever attempted the contrary, would be deprived (Const. 57). Moreover, concerning clerks leaving their churches (Const. 58). Also, concerning the order and manner of funerals (Const. 59). And that bishops should not keep away from their flock (Const. 67). And agreeable to the doctrine of St. Paul (Const. 123), the emperor commands all bishops and priests to sound out their service, and to celebrate the mysteries, not in a secret manner, but with a loud voice, so that everything which was said and done might not only be heard, but also be understood by the faithful people. By this it is to be gathered that divine prayers and service was then in the vulgar tongue (the common language).

And just as Justinian and other emperors in those days had jurisdiction and government over spiritual matters and persons, so too, like examples may be given of other kings in other countries, who had no less authority in their kingdoms than the emperors had in their empire. For example, in France, Clovis summoned a council of thirty-three bishops, at which thirty-three canons were instituted concerning the government of the church. Charlemagne called five synods, one at Mentz, the second at Rome, the third at Rhemes, the fourth at Cabilone, the fifth at Arelate, where various ordinances were given to the clergy, about 810 years after Christ. He also decreed that only the canonical books of Scripture, and none other, should be read in the church; which had also been decreed before, in the third general Council of Carthage (A. D. 417).¹⁷

Moreover, he instructs and informs the bishops and priests in the office of preaching, desiring them not to allow any to preach to the people any new doctrine of their own invention, not agreeing with the word of God; and that they themselves will preach those things which lead to eternal life, and set others to do the same.

Also, these kings and emperors forbade any freeman or citizen to enter monastic life, without having obtained a license from the government. They gave two reasons for this: first, that many gave themselves to religion not for mere devotion, but for idleness and to avoid the king's wars; secondly, many were craftily circumvented and deluded by subtle covetous persons, who sought to get from them whatever property they had. They also forbade that any young children or boys should have their heads shaved, or enter into any profession without the will of their parents; and that no young maiden should take the veil or profession of a nun before she came to sufficient years of discretion, so as to discern and choose what she should follow.

Moreover, Louis the Pious,¹⁸ with his son Lothaire, mentioned before, ordained among other ecclesiastical sanctions, a godly law for *laymen* to communicate the sacrament of the body and blood of the Lord. They also enacted that no goods of the church should be alienated (sold off to foreign interests). Louis II, the son of Lothaire, who succeeded as

¹⁷ The third general council of Carthage was held in A.D. 397; but a compilation of its ordinances was made c. 417-19, in the *Codex Canonum Ecclesiae Africanæ*.

¹⁸ *Louis the Pious*: that is, Louis I (778-840), son of Charlemagne. He was king of Aquitaine, and later of the Franks. This references the *Code of Canon Law*, Title III (Can. 1290-1298).

Preliminary Dissertation

Difference between Roman Church Then, and Now

emperor and king of France about the year 848, caused Pope Leo IV to be brought before him on a charge of treason. The pope pleaded his cause at the bar, before the emperor, and was acquitted and released. This declares that popes and bishops all that time were in subjection to their kings and emperors.

Moreover, Louis IX (A.D. 1228) made a law against the corruption of *simony* in the church; also for the maintenance of the liberty of the church of France. And he established a law or decree against the new inventions, reservations, preventions, and exactions of the court of Rome. Philip IV (A.D. 1303) also set forth a law forbidding any exaction of new tithes and first fruits, and other unaccustomed collections, to be put upon the church of France. King Charles V (A.D. 1369) commanded that no bishops or prelates, or their officials within his kingdom of France, should execute any censure of suspense, or excommunication, at the pope's commandment, over or upon the cities or towns, corporations, or commons of his realm. Charles VI (A. D 1388) provided by law, that the fruits and rents of benefices, with other pensions, and the goods of bishops who departed, should no longer be exported to Rome by the cardinals and by other officials and collectors of the pope, but should be brought to the king, and so restored to those to whom they rightly pertained.

Similar things may also be proved by the examples of our kings in England, such as Offa, Egbert, Ethelwolf, Alfred, Edgar, Canute, Edward the Confessor, William the Conqueror, William Rufus, Henry I, Henry II, till the time of king John and after. Their dealing in ecclesiastical as well as temporal cases, is sufficient to prove what injury the popes in these latter days have done to the emperors, their lawful governors and magistrates, in usurping such power and jurisdiction over them, to whom they properly owe subjection. This was contrary to the steps and example of their ancestors, the old Roman bishops; although it is not to be denied that ecclesiastical ministers have their power committed to them, within their scope, in the Lord. Yet it becomes every man to know his own place and standing, and to stay where his own precinct confines him, and not rashly break out into other men's walks. Just as it is not lawful for a civil magistrate to intermeddle with a bishop's or a preacher's function, so it was unseemingly and disorderly that Boniface VIII should have the temporal mace and naked sword of the emperor carried before him; or that any pope should bear a triple crown, or take it upon himself to be like a lord and king. Therefore, let every man consider the compass and limitation of his charge, and exceed no further.

2. Title Falsely Grounded

The *second* point in which the church of Rome has departed, is in the style and TITLE annexed to the bishop of that see. For example, where he is called pope, most holy father, vicar general, and vicar of Christ, successor of Peter, universal bishop, prince of priests, head of the church universal, head bishop of the world, the admiration of the world, neither God nor man, but a thing between both, etc. For all these terms are given to him in popish books. The name *pope* — being a Greek name, and equivalent to *father* — may seem more tolerable, having been used in the old time among bishops. For so Austin was called by the Council of Africa, also Jerome, Boniface and others; also Cyprian, bishop of Carthage. But that this or *any* of these terms were so peculiarly applied to the bishop of Rome, that other bishops were excluded from using it, or that any one bishop above the rest had the name *ecumenical*, or *universal*, or *head*, to the derogation of other bishops, is to be found neither in histories of the old time, nor in any example of the primitive church.

[13]

Preliminary Dissertation

Difference between Roman Church Then, and Now

Before the Council of Nice, it is evident that there was no respect paid to the church of Rome, but every church then was ruled by her own government, till the year 325. Then followed the Council of Nice, where it was decreed that throughout the whole church, which was now far spread over all the world, four provinces or precincts were to be appointed, each one to have its head church, and chief bishop. These were called the *metropolitan* or *patriarch*, and each had the oversight of those churches which lay about him. Among these patriarchs or metropolitans, the bishop of Rome had the first place, the bishop of Alexandria the second, the bishop of Antioch the third, and the bishop of Jerusalem was the fourth patriarch. Afterward, in the number of these patriarchs, the bishop of Constantinople also came in, taking the place of the bishop of Antioch. So that these four or five metropolitans or patriarchs had their peculiar circuits and precincts especially appointed, in such a way, that one of them would not deal within another's precinct; and also that there would be an equality of honor among them. Again, speaking of the said patriarchs or primates, we read in the second and third chapter of the Council of Constantinople, that bishops should not invade the diocese of other bishops beyond their borders, nor confound together churches, etc. Moreover, the old doctors (theologians), for the most and best part, accord in one sentence, that all bishops, wherever placed in the church of God, are of one merit, of like honor, and all are equally successors together of the apostles. Also, the author of the book called *Dionysius Areopagita*, says all the bishops were of equal order, and of like honor, etc. — all this while the bishop of Rome was a patriarch, and a metropolitan or bishop of the first see. But he was no ecumenical bishop, nor head of the universal church, nor any such matter. This went so far that he, with all other bishops, was debarred from that by a plain decree of the Council of Carthage (Can. 39). “That the bishop of the first seat shall not be called the prince of priests, or the high priest, or any such thing.”

And lest any take occasion here to cavil at hearing him called “bishop of the first seat,” let me expound on what is meant by “the first seat,” and why he was so called. It was not for any dignity of the person, either of the one who succeeds, or of the who is succeeded, but only of the place in which he sits. This is plainly proved by the Council of Chalcedon, cap. 28. In this it was manifestly declared the reason why the See of Rome among all other patriarchal sees is numbered as the first see by the ancient fathers. For the council says, our forefathers worthily attributed the chief degree of honor to the see of old Rome, because the principal reign or empire was in that city, etc. The same is also confirmed by Eusebius,¹⁹ declaring that the excellency of the Roman empire advanced the popedom of the Roman bishop above other churches. etc. He says too, that the Council of Nice gave this privilege to the bishop of Rome, for just as the king of the Romans is named emperor above all other kings, so the bishop of the city of Rome should be called pope above all other bishops, etc. By these documents (and many more), it appears, that although these titles of superiority had been attributed to the bishop of Rome, yet it remains certain that the bishop of Rome received that preferment by man's law, and *not* by the law of God.

Therefore, regarding these titles of pre-eminence, we will set forth and declare what history says in this matter.

1. First, we will see what titles the bishop of Rome takes and claims for himself, and what the meaning of them is.
2. When they first came in (whether in the primitive time or not), and by whom.

¹⁹ Bishop of Caesarea in Palestine, advisor to Constantine I, and primary church historian (c. 270-340).

Preliminary Dissertation

Difference between Roman Church Then, and Now

3. How they were first given to the Roman bishops; that is, whether it was from necessary duty, or from voluntary devotion; and whether it was in respect to Peter, or in respect to the city, or else to the worthiness of the bishop who sat there.
4. And if the aforesaid names were then given by certain bishops, to the bishop of Rome, whether all of the stated names were really given.
5. Or whether they were then *received* by all the bishops of Rome to whom they were given, or whether they were refused by some.
6. And finally, whether they should have been refused when given, or not.

And first, to begin with the names and titles that are now claimed by and attributed to the bishop of Rome — that is, the Chief Priest of the World, the Prince of the Church, Apostolical Bishop, the universal Head of the Church, the Head and Bishop of the Universal Church, the Successor of Peter, most holy Pope, Vicar of God on Earth, neither God nor man but a mixed thing between both; the Patriarch or Metropolitan of the Church of Rome, the Bishop of the first See, etc. To these titles or styles is annexed a triple crown, a triple cross, two cross keys, a naked sword, and sevenfold seals in token of the sevenfold gifts of the Holy Spirit. Allegedly having the plenary fulness of power, of temporal as well as spiritual things in his hands, all things are his, and all those princes who have given him anything, have but given him his own, having it at his will and pleasure to preach indulgences and the cross against princes. As such, the emperor and certain other princes, it is claimed, ought to confess to him at their coronation, their subjection to him. And also confess,

that the pope has the authority to depose; that he has deposed emperors and the king of France; that he has the authority to absolve the subjects from their allegiance to their princes (interdiction); that kings have served as foot-men to lead his horse, and the emperor to hold his stirrup; that the pope may and does give power to bishops over the bodies of men, and has granted it to them to have prisons; that without the pope's authority, no general council has any force; that appeals in all manner of causes may and ought to be made to the pope; that his decrees are equal with the decrees of the Nicene council, and are to be observed and taken in no less force than if they had been confirmed with the heavenly voice of St. Peter himself; that the bishop of Rome may dispense above the law, and make justice of injustice in correcting and changing laws, for he has the fulness of power; that if the pope leads innumerable souls by flocks into hell with him, no man may presume to rebuke his faults in this world; and that it stands upon necessity of salvation, to believe in the primacy of the See of Rome, and to be subject to that See, etc.

Now let us see whether these names and titles were ever attributed to anyone in the primitive time of the bishop of Rome. If our adversaries, being convicted by plain evidence from history and the example of time, will yield to us (as they must) in part if not in the whole, then let us come to the particulars. Let us see what part they will defend and derive from the ancient custom of the primitive church — that is, from the first six hundred years after Christ. First, in the Council of Nice (Nicea), in the year 325, and in the sixth canon of that Council, we find that some one church was decreed in every province or precinct, and a bishop was appointed to have the inspection and government of other churches about him. This was according to the ancient custom, as the words of the council purport. So that, the bishop of Alexandria would have power over Libya and Pentapolis in Egypt, in so far as the bishop of Rome has the same power, in the same manner. And so it was also in Antioch and in other countries. Let every church have its due honor, and consequently the bishop of Jerusalem would have his due honor as well. Such order was kept, that the metropolitan

Preliminary Dissertation

Difference between Roman Church Then, and Now

cities would not be defrauded of their dignity which was due and proper to them. In this council, and in the same sixth and seventh canons, the bishops of Alexandria, of Rome, and of Antioch are joined together in like manner of dignity, and there appears no difference of honor meant in this. Also, there immediately follows that no bishop should be made without consent of their metropolitans, the city of Jerusalem included, and that the Metropolitan would have full power to confirm every bishop made in his province,

After this followed the sixth Council of Carthage (A.D. 420), at which 217 bishops were assembled, among whom were Augustine, Prosper, Orosius, and various other famous persons. This council continued for the space of five years, at which there was great contention about the supremacy and jurisdiction of Rome.

[14]

Zosimus, the Roman bishop, had received into the communion of the church, without any examination, someone who came from Africa to complain to him. He was named Apiarius of Sicca,²⁰ a priest whom the metropolitan with the Council of Africa had worthily excommunicated. Upon this, Zosimus, having received and shown favor to Apiarius, who had appealed to him, sends his messengers to the Council, with these requests:

- that Apiarius, whom he had absolved, might be received back by them;
- that it might be lawful for bishops or priests to appeal from the sentence of their metropolitans, and also from the sentence of the council, *to the See of Rome*;
- that if any priest or deacon were wrongfully excommunicated by the bishops of their own province, it should be lawful for them to move the hearing and judging of their cause to their neighboring bishops;
- that Urban, their bishop, should either be excommunicated, or sent to Rome, unless he corrected those things that were to be corrected, etc.

For the proof of this, Zosimus alleged the words (as he pretended) of the Nicene council. The Council of Carthage hearing this, remembered no such thing in the Council of Nice. And yet, not suspecting the bishop of Rome would dare to wrongfully falsify the words of that Council, the Council writes to Zosimus, declaring that they never read any such canon in their common Latin copy of the Nicene council. Yet for quietness' sake, they would observe it until they might procure the original copies of that council to be sent to them from Constantinople, Alexandria, and from Antioch. In like effect, they afterward wrote to Pope Boniface I, who succeeded Zosimus (A.D. 418); and thirdly, also to Celestine, who shortly after succeeded Boniface (A.D. 422).

In the meantime, this council sent to Atticus, patriarch of Constantinople, and to Cyril, patriarch of Alexandria, for the authentic copies in Greek of the Nicene council, which being sent to them, and they finding no such canon in the true originals, as the bishop of Rome had falsely forged, they wrote a sharp letter to Celestine, bishop of Rome, in which they styled him "brother bishop." They declared to him, that they had perused all the copies of the Council of Nice, and could find no such canon as he and his predecessors had falsely alleged. Reciting the sixth canon, they declared that the decrees of the Nicene council had committed all and singular ecclesiastical persons, bishops as well as others, to the charge of their metropolitans.

²⁰ This was similar to the case of Celestius, a proponent of Pelagianism, who also appealed to Zosimus in 418, to overrule the bishop of Constantinople. But Zosimus condemned Pelagianism.

Preliminary Dissertation

Difference between Roman Church Then, and Now

Therefore they declared that it was not convenient to bring their matters over to Rome; nor was it to be found in the decrees of any council, that any legates should be sent from Rome to them, to decide in their matters. And they therefore exhorted the bishop of Rome not to introduce the swelling pride of the world into the church of Christ, which shows and gives the light of simplicity and of humility to those who love God, etc. In these letters, moreover, it is signified that Apiarius, whom the bishop of Rome had absolved and received to the communion of the church, was afterwards found culpable. Therefore the council proceeded against him, brought him to open confession of his faults, and so enjoined him to due penance for his demerits, notwithstanding the absolution and inconsiderate clearing of the bishop of Rome before proceeding.

In short, these points are to be gathered from this Council of Carthage:

1. First, that the bishops of Rome were glad to receive those who came to them for succor.
2. That their pride was increased by it, thinking and seeking to have all be under their subjection.
3. The intent was to allure others to seek them, from being ready to release and acquit this Apiarius as guiltless, even though he was afterwards found culpable by his own confession.
4. That contrary to the acts and doings of the Romish bishop, this council condemned the one whom the bishop of Rome had absolved, little respecting the proceedings of the Romish church.
5. That the bishops of old time have been falsifiers of ancient councils and writings; by this, it may be suspected that those who were not ashamed to falsify and corrupt the Council of Nice, would not hesitate to abuse and falsify the decretal epistles and writings of particular bishops and doctors for their own advantage, as they have often done.
6. In this council, at which Augustine was present, and where the president, Aurelius, was called *Papa* (pope), the bishop of Rome was expressly called in their letters merely *bishop* of the city of Rome.
7. The dominion of this Roman patriarch, in this Council of Carthage, was cut so short, that it was neither permitted to those of Africa to appeal over the sea to him, nor for him to send over his legates to them for ending their controversies. By this it may sufficiently appear that the bishop of Rome in those days was not at all admitted to be the chief of all other bishops, nor the head of the universal church of Christ on earth, etc.
8. We hear causes or reasons given in this council, why it is not necessary, nor yet convenient, for all foreign causes to be brought to one universal head or judge.
9. Lastly, by this Council of Carthage, we hear a virtuous exhortation given to the bishop of Rome, that he would not induce the meek and humble church of Christ to fume and swell with the pride of the world, as has been described. In this, or in some other Council of Carthage, it was moreover provided by express law, and also specified in the pope's decrees, that no bishop of the first seat should be called the prince of priests, or the chief priest, or any such thing.

Not long before this council, there was celebrated in Africa another council, at which Augustine was also present, where it was decreed under pain of excommunication, that no minister or bishop should appeal over the sea to the bishop of Rome. By this it may appear that the bishop of Rome at this time was not universally called by the term of ecumenical or

Preliminary Dissertation

Difference between Roman Church Then, and Now

universal bishop, but bishop of the first seat. So that, if there were any preferment in this, it was in the reverence of the *place*, and not in the authority of the *person*.

We do not deny, then, that these titles, such as Bishop, Metropolitan, the Bishop of the first See, Primate, Patriarch, Archbishop — that is to say, chief bishop, or head bishop to other bishops of his province — were applied in the old time, and might be applied to the bishop of Rome, just as the same titles were also applied to other patriarchs in other chief cities and provinces.

And likewise, concerning the name of the high priest, or high priesthood, neither do I deny that it has been found in old monuments and records of ancient times. But it was in such a way and sort as it has been common to bishops indifferently, and not singularly attributed to any one bishop or see.

And thus much regarding upon the name or title of *high priest*, or *supreme bishop*. Just as I *do not* deny that this title was used in the manner and form said before, so I *do deny* that this title, as it is now used in Rome, was used or usually received during all the primitive time of the church — that is, for six hundred years after Christ. It was not used in the manner and with that authority and glory, which is given to it these days, until the time of Phocas, the wicked emperor, which was after the year 608. This title, just as it is too glorious for any one bishop in the church of Christ to use, so is it not to be found in any of the approved and most ancient writers of the church — namely these: Cyprian, Basil, Fulgentius, Chrysostom, Jerome, Ambrose, Augustine, and Tertullian. Rather, they wrote against it. Therefore, not without cause, it is written and testified by Erasmus, who in speaking of this name, plainly denies it is to be heard among the old writers.

The same is also to be affirmed about other presumptuous titles of like ambition — such as the Head of the Universal Church, the Vicar of Christ on earth, Prince of Priests, and the like. All of these are new-found terms, strange to the ears of the old primitive writers and councils, and were not received openly and commonly before the time of Boniface III (607), and the Emperor Phocas (608).

Now remains the name of *pope*. This being a word which signifies *father*, was then used, not as proper only to the bishop of Rome, but it was common to all other bishops or personages of worthy excellency.

[15]

But now this name is so restrained and abused, that not only is it appropriated to the bishop of Rome, but it also distinguishes the authority and pre-eminence of that bishop alone, from all other bishops. For this reason, it has now worthily come into contempt and execration.

Although it cannot be denied that some in the primitive time began to privately pretend to that proud and wicked title of *universal bishop*, such as Menna, and especially John, the patriarch of Constantinople. Calling a council at Constantinople, John set about to dignify his throne by the consent of the council, and by the emperor of Constantinople, and obtained this title. This appears in the fifth general Council of Constantinople (A.D. 553), the first act, where Menna and John are titled “Universal Patriarchs.” Although it was then used in Constantinople through the sufferance of the emperors, who were willing to have their imperial city advanced, this title was not used in Rome. And in Constantinople, it stayed in force only by man’s law. Neither the bishop of Rome, nor any of the Western

Preliminary Dissertation

Difference between Roman Church Then, and Now

churches acknowledged, but rather opposed the title; namely, Pelagius II and Gregory I, both bishops of Rome at that time. Pelagius, writing to all bishops, plainly says:

“that no patriarch should take the name of universality at any time, because if any are called *universal*, the name *patriarch* derogates from all others. But let this be far from all faithful men, to will to take that thing to him, by which the honor of his brethren is diminished.”

Therefore Pelagius charges all such bishops, that “none of them in their letters will name any patriarch *universal*.” What can be more evident than these words of Pelagius, who was bishop of Rome just before Gregory? (A.D. 583). In like manner, Gregory also writes (or even more plainly and earnestly), proving that no man ought to be called *universal bishop*. With sharp words and rebukes, detesting that title, calling it new, foolish, proud, perverse, wicked, profane, he says that to consent to it, is as much as to deny the faith. He further added that whoever goes about extolling himself above other bishops, in so doing, follows the act of Satan, to whom it was not sufficient to be counted equal to or like other angels. In his epistles, how often Gregory repeats and declares this name to be directly against the gospel, and the ancient decrees of councils. Thus he affirms that none of his predecessors ever usurped that style or title for himself. And he concludes that whoever does so, declares himself to be a forerunner of antichrist, etc.

But Gregory, confirming the sentence of Pelagius, had no small conflicts about this title, both with the patriarch, and with the emperor of Constantinople. The history is thus: John had been made a patriarch of Constantinople, by his flattery and hypocrisy, and obtained from the emperor, that he was to be extolled above other bishops, with the name *universal patriarch*. Afterward, he decided to write to Gregory, then bishop of Rome, for his consent concerning this. Gregory, abiding still in his constancy, set himself stoutly against the antichristian title, and would give it no place. But perceiving the Emperor Maurice to be displeased with him about the matter, Gregory writes to Constantina, the empress, arguing and declaring in his letters, that the presumption and pride of John, to be universal patriarch, was both against the rule of the gospel and decrees of the canons. Namely, it was against the sixth canon of the Nicene council. And the novelty of that new-found title, declared nothing else but that the time of antichrist was near. Upon this, the emperor Maurice, being displeased with him, calls home his soldiers from Italy, and incites the Lombards against the Romans. They, with their king, set upon the city of Rome, and besieged it for a whole year. Notwithstanding, Gregory remained in his former constancy. After these afflictions, Eulogius, patriarch of Alexandria, writes to Gregory, and in his letters names *him* the universal pope — which Gregory refuses, and answers as follows:

“Behold: in the preface of your epistle directed to me, you have used a term of a proud name, calling me *universal pope*, which I pray your holiness will cease to do hereafter. For that derogates from you whatever is attributed to another, more than right and reason require. As for me, I do not seek my advancement in words, but in manners. Nor do I account that any honor in which I see the honor of my brethren is hindered. For my honor I take to be the honor of the universal church. My honor is the whole and perfect vigor of my brethren. I am honored when no man is denied the due honor which belongs to him. For if your holiness calls me *universal pope*, in so doing you deny yourself to be that which you affirm me to be, *universal*. But that God forbid. Let these words therefore go, which do nothing but puff up vanity, and wound charity, etc.”

It would be too long to insert here all such letters of his concerning this matter, but these will appear more largely hereafter in the body of the history, when we come to the year and time of Gregory, which was well near six hundred years after Christ. In the meantime, this is

Preliminary Dissertation

Difference between Roman Church Then, and Now

sufficient to declare how the church of Rome with the form and manner of their title of *universal supremacy* as now used and maintained, has utterly swerved from the ancient steps of the primitive church of Rome.

Now let us see what the adversary has to object in favor of the title of their *universality*, or rather *singularity*.

One objection of our adversaries is this: although (they say) no bishop of Rome was ever called, or would be called by the name *universal bishop*, it does not therefore follow that they are not, or ought not to be heads of the universal church. Their reason is this:

St. Peter had the charge of the whole church committed to him, even though he was not called *universal apostle*. So it is no more absurd for the pope to be called the head of the whole church, and to have charge of it, even though he is not called *universal bishop*, etc.

A double untruth is to be noted in this. *First*, they pretend that Peter was the head, and was to have charge of the whole church. Let us take “charge” or “head” as having dominion or mastership upon or above the church in all judiciary cases, both spiritual and temporal. For the words of the Scripture are plain: “Not as being lords over God’s heritage, but being examples to the flock,” 1Pet 5.3; and “But you shall not be so; rather, he that is greatest among you, let him be as the younger, and he who is chief as one who serves,” Luk 22.26. Again, it is clear that the church is greater than, or rather, the head of Peter., “All things are yours, whether it be Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or death, or life, and you are Christ’s, and Christ is God’s,” etc. 1Cor 3.22-23. In these words, the dignity of the church is no doubt preferred above the apostles, and above Cephas also. Moreover, just as the dignity of the wife is above the servant, so must the honor and worthiness of the church (being the spouse of Christ) surmount the state of Peter or other apostles, who are but servants to Christ and to the church. The same Lord who said to Peter, “Feed my sheep,” also said to the others, “Go and preach this gospel to all nations.” Mar 13.10 And He who said to Peter, “Whatever you loose,” Mat 16.19 also said to the others, “Whatever you remit on earth.” Joh 20.21 Moreover, if the matter goes by preaching, Paul the apostle labored more in this than Peter ever did, by his own confession, 1Cor 15.10; he also suffered more for it, 2Cor 11.23; nor was his doctrine less sound. Indeed, in one point he went before Peter, and was teacher and schoolmaster to Peter, and Peter was justly corrected by him, Gal 2.11. Furthermore, teaching is not always, nor in all things, a point of mastership, but sometimes a point of service. It is as if a Frenchman went to an Englishman to teach him French, even though he excels him in that kind of knowledge. Yet it does not therefore follow, that he has full power over him, to appoint his diet, to rule his household, to prescribe his laws, to limit his lands, and other such things. In travel of teaching, in pains of preaching, in gifts of tongues, in largeness of commission, in operation of miracles, in grace of vocation, in receiving the Holy Spirit, in vehemence of torments, and death for Christ’s name, the other apostles were not at all inferior to Peter. I see no reason, then, why Peter should claim any special prerogative above the rest, as indeed he never claimed any.

[16]

But the patrons of the apostolical See, claim for Peter what he never claimed for himself. Nor if he were here, would he less abhor it with soul and conscience, than we do now. And yet our abhorrence now is not for any malice of person, or any vantage to ourselves, but only the vehemence of truth, and of zeal for Christ and his Church. Moreover, if these men would have Peter be the curate and overseer of the whole universal church (which was too much

Preliminary Dissertation

Difference between Roman Church Then, and Now

for one man to take charge of) and be prince of all other apostles, then I would happily learn from them what the meaning is of the right hand of fellowship between Peter, Paul, and Barnabas, mentioned Gal 2.9. What handshaking is there between subjects and their prince in the way of fellowship? Or where there is fellowship, what mastership is there? Or, again, what state of mastership is it likely that Christ would give to Peter? Christ was indeed master of all, yet he took so little mastership upon Himself, not only in inward affection but also in outward act. ^{Joh 15.15} Although I am not ignorant that in various places of the gospel Peter has Christ's commendation; nor do I deny that Peter was worthy of it. Yet these words of commendation give him no state of superiority or jurisdiction over all others, so as to have all others under subjection to him.

These patrons produce another argument, proving that in the primitive time, the bishop of Rome was entitled "the head of Christ's church."

St. Peter, they argue, was called *head of Christ's church* by the ancient fathers. And because St. Peter was bishop of Rome, the *bishop of Rome* was therefore called *head of the church* in the ancient time.

How can they prove that St. Peter — although he was at Rome, and taught at Rome, and suffered at Rome — was yet bishop and proper ordinary of that city of Rome? As to the writings of the fathers to prove this, I answer concerning Orosius, Tertullian, Cyprian, Jerome, and Augustine, that where they speak of St. Peter's *chair*, or of *planting the faith* at Rome, the papist straightway argues from this that Peter was bishop of Rome. But that does not clearly follow. For the office of the apostles was to plant the faith in all places, and in every region; yet they were not *bishops* in every region. And as for the *chair*, that is not the essential difference which makes a bishop. Just as a doctor may have a chair, and yet not be a bishop, so they cannot conclude by the chair of Peter, that St. Peter was bishop of Rome. All of this proves no more than this: that Peter was at Rome, and there he taught the faith of Christ — as Paul also did, and perhaps in a chair. Yet we do not say that Paul was therefore bishop of Rome, but only that he was there as an apostle of Christ, whether he taught there standing on his feet, or sitting in a chair. In Scripture, the "chair" commonly signifies doctrine or judgment, just as "sitting" declares those who teach or judge, whether they sit in the chair of Moses, or in the chair pestilence. *Planting* likewise is an apostolical word, and does not signify the office of a bishop only. Therefore it is not a good argument to say that he *sat*, he *taught*, he *planted* at Rome, that his chair and seat was at Rome, and that *therefore* he was bishop of Rome.

As for Abdias, Ado, Optatus, and others, I answer with this distinction of a bishop, taken either generally or specially. First, generally, a bishop is whomever the public cure ²¹ and charge of souls is committed, without any limitation of place. And so the name of bishop is coincident with the office of apostle, or any public pastor, doctor, or curate of the universal flock of Christ. And thus Paul, Peter, or any other of the apostles may be called bishops. So Christ himself is called bishop and pastor, by this express word: 1Pet 2.25, "the Shepherd and Overseer (*episkopos*) of your souls." And thus Peter may well be named a bishop. But this public and general charge, universally over the whole without limitation, ceased after Christ and the apostles. For then bishops were appointed by places and provinces, to have

²¹ *Cure*: having spiritual charge or care of a soul; the office of a parish priest or *curate*.

Preliminary Dissertation
Difference between Roman Church Then, and Now

special oversight of some particular flock or province, and so to be resident and attendant only upon that.

The other view of this name *bishop*, is to be taken in a more special way, which is when a person is assigned specially to some one certain place, city, or province, where he is bound to employ his office and charge, and nowhere else, according to the old canons of the apostles, and of the Council of Nice. And *this* bishop, differing from the other, bears the name of his city or diocese. Thus we deny that Peter the apostle was ever elected, installed, or intituted bishop to the city of Rome. And if Ado say that Peter was bishop of Rome for twenty-five years, until the last year of Nero, that is easily refuted both by the Scriptures and by histories. For so we understand by the declaration of St. Paul, Gal 2.1, that fourteen years after his conversion, St. Paul had Peter by the hand at Jerusalem.

Moreover, Paul witnesses that the apostolical charge was committed to Peter over the circumcised, Gal 2.7. Also, St. Paul writing to the Romans, in his salutations to those in Rome, makes no mention of St. Peter who, doubtless, would not have been forgotten if he had then been in Rome. ²² Again, St. Peter, in dating his epistle from Babylon, was not then at Rome. ²³

²² Archbishop Tillotson says of Barrow's celebrated *Treatise of the Pope's Supremacy*, "He has exhausted the subject and has said enough to silence this controversy forever." Barrow has thus expressed himself on this point.

"The discourses of those men, have evinced that it is hard to assign the time when Peter was at Rome, and that he could never long abide there. For,

"The time which old tradition assigns his going to Rome, is rejected by diverse learned men, even of the Roman party.

"He was often in other places, sometimes at Jerusalem, sometimes at Antioch, sometimes at Babylon, sometimes at Corinth, sometimes probably at each of those places to which he directs his catholic epistles. Among these, Epiphanius says, Peter often visited Pontus and Bithynia.

"And that he was seldom at Rome, may well be collected from St. Paul's writings; for writing at different times, one epistle to Rome and diverse epistles from Rome, such as that to the Galatians — that to the Ephesians — that to the Philippians— and that to the Colossians and the Second to Timothy, he never mentions him sending any salutation to him or from him.

"Particularly, St. Peter was not there when St. Paul, mentioning Tichicus, Onesimus, Aristarchus, Marcus and Justus, adds, 'These alone, my fellow-workers for the kingdom of God, have been a comfort to me,' Col 4.11.

"He was not there when St. Paul said, 'At my first defense no man stood with me, but *all* men forsook me,' 2Tim 4.16.

"He was not there immediately before St. Paul's death, 'When the time of his departure was at hand,' when he tells Timothy that 'All the brethren saluted him,' and naming various of them, omits Peter. 2Tim 4.21.

"These things being considered, it is not probable that St. Peter would assume the Episcopal Chair at Rome, he being little capable of residing there, and other needful affairs would have forced him to leave so great a church destitute of their pastor.

"Had he done so, he must have given a bad example of non-residence, a practice that would have been very ill-relished in the primitive church."

²³ It was during the life of our Author, John Foxe, that the Rhemish Testament was published; and though he little thought that the Papists would identify Babylon with Rome, yet his "Acts and Monuments" were scarcely before the world, when the Rhemish Annotators — finding no evidence in the Scriptures to prove that Peter was ever at Rome — actually fastened upon the dating of his first epistle from Babylon, and explained it as a mystic name for Rome!

Cartwright — who was a contemporary of Fox, and wrote his "Confutation of the Rhemists," etc. during the lifetime of our Martyrologist — writes thus:

"That Peter did not sit at Rome is confirmed in that Peter writes from Babylon, which to be Babylon in Chaldee, and not in Italy, this is an evident reason, for this Babylon was a place of principal abode of the Jews, towards whom Peter's charge specially lay. Gal 2.7. Whereas at this time, the Jews were not allowed to make their abode in Rome, Act 18.2. To which it may be added that, writing to the dispersed Jews, and listing the diverse countries which they

Preliminary Dissertation

Difference between Roman Church Then, and Now

Furthermore, histories record that Peter was at Pontus five years, then at Antioch seven years. How could he then be at Rome for twenty-five years? Finally, where our adversary says that St. Peter was there twenty-five years, until the last year of Nero, how can that stand when St. Paul, suffering under Nero, was put to death the same day twelve months later, that is, a whole year after Peter? But especially, how does this agree with Scripture, that Christ would make Peter a universal apostle, to walk in all the world? “Go into all the world,” Mar 16.15; and “you shall be witnesses to the uttermost part of the earth,” Act 1.8. And our papists would make him a sitting bishop, and locate him at Rome. How do these accord — *apostle* and *bishop* — to *go* and to *sit* — to *all nations* and *at Rome* — together?

[17]

Now, the second untruth in the argument is that, because Peter was the head of the church, therefore the pope must also be the head of the church, even though he was not called *universal bishop* for along time. But we deny this; indeed, the matter denies itself by their own position. For the title *universal bishop* was not accepted at Rome, but was refused to the time of Gregory. Then it must necessarily be granted that the bishops of Rome, before Gregory, did not have the charge of the whole church, nor for that reason could they be admitted to be *heads of the church*. For, just as there can be no “head” except that which is universal to the whole body, so none can have the charge of the whole, unless he is universal to all parts of that which he has charge of. Therefore, if a bishop is the one who has charge of all souls in his diocese, whose charge extends to all churches, and who must give account for every Christian soul in the whole world, the name of *universal bishop* cannot be denied to him, for he has the *office* of a universal bishop. Or, if he is *not* a universal bishop, then he cannot have the charge of the whole, that is, of all the churches of Christ. This word *universal* in the Greek writers, signifies that which we in our English tongue call *catholic*. Yet I suppose our adversaries here will not take *universal* in that sense. For according to that meaning, just as we do not deny that the bishops of Rome may be universal bishops, so neither can they deny that other bishops may also be as universal — that is, as catholic as they are. But those who more distinctly discuss this matter, define *universal* or *catholic* by three things: to wit, by *time*, *place*, and *person*. So that, whatever extends itself to all times, all places, and all persons, *that* is properly universal or catholic. And contrariwise, what is to be called *universal* or *catholic*, either reaches to all those three, comprehending all places, times, and persons, or else it is not to be properly called universal or catholic. And thus there are three things which we most commonly call catholic or universal; that is, (1) the church, which is called the catholic church; (2) faith, which is called the catholic faith; and also (3) a man whom we call a catholic man. This is because these three things extend themselves so that no time, place, or person is excluded. These three conditions, if they altogether concur in the charge of the bishop of Rome, then it is a *universal charge*, and he is a *universal bishop*. But if not, then his charge is not universal, nor is he the head of the church, nor yet is he universal bishop. For I cannot see how these three can be separated, unless they prove it more evidently than they have yet done.

And thus much as to the objection of our adversaries, arguing that just as St. Peter, though not called *universal apostle*, was yet the head of the universal church, so too the pope,

were in, he leaves out Chaldea, which he would never have done, considering the great numbers that still remained there after the return into Judea out of Captivity, unless Chaldea were the place from which he wrote his epistles.-⁷
— Cartwright *in loc.* [Ed.]

Preliminary Dissertation

Difference between Roman Church Then, and Now

though he was not at first called *universal bishop*, did and might have the charge of the whole church, and was its universal head. Our adversaries, notwithstanding, busy themselves to prove out of Theodoret, Ireneus, Ambrose, and Augustine; that the See of Rome, having the pre-eminence and principality, has been honored above all other churches. They argue that Ireneus, Ambrose, Augustine, and Theodoret affirm that the church of Rome is the chief of all other churches; and that therefore the bishop and head of that church is chief and head over *all* bishops, and head over *all* other churches.

But this conclusion is to be denied. For the excellency of the church or place does not always argue for the excellency of the minister or bishop, nor does it necessarily cause it. For in spiritual matters of the church, all pre-eminence stands upon spiritual and inward gifts, such as faith, piety, learning, and godly knowledge, zeal and fervency in the Holy Spirit, unity of doctrine, etc. These gifts many times may excel in a church where the minister or bishop is inferior to the bishops or ministers of other churches. Just as the most famous school in a realm does not always have the most famous schoolmaster, nor does that office thereby make him more excellent in learning than all others. So, if our adversaries mean by this *pre-eminence* of the church of Rome, that it has such inward gifts of doctrine, faith, unity, and peace of religion, then, I say the excellency of it does not argue for the excellency of the bishop. But here our adversaries will reply that by the *pre-eminence* of the church of Rome is not meant so much the inward gifts and endowments belonging to a Christian church, as its outward authority and dominion over other churches. To which it must be asked, What necessity is there, or where did our papists learn, to bring into the *spiritual* church of Christ, this outward form of *civil* policy? Just as the Roman emperors in times past governed over all the world, so the Roman bishop must impose his monarchy upon the universal clergy, to make all other churches stoop under his subjection. And where then are the words of our Savior? — “But it shall not be so among you.” If they say there must be a distinction of degrees in the church, and superiority must be granted for the discipline of the church — for quieting schisms, for setting orders (appointing clergy), for commencing convocations and councils, etc. We do not stand against this superiority. And therefore we yield to our superior powers, kings, and princes, our due obedience — to our lawful governors under God of *both* governments, ecclesiastical and temporal. Also, in the ecclesiastical state, we do not take away the distinction of degrees, as appointed by the primitive church, or allowed by Scripture, such as patriarchs, archbishops, bishops, ministers, and deacons. In these degrees, just as we grant diversity of office, so we admit diversity of dignity. For, just as we give the minister a place above the deacon, to the bishop a place above the minister, to the archbishop a place above the bishop, so we see no cause of inequality — why one minister should be above another minister; one bishop in his degree above another bishop, to deal with him in his diocese; or one archbishop above another archbishop. And this is to keep order duly and truly in the church.

Now, here is joined the question between us and the papists, whether the metropolitan church of Rome, with its archbishop, ought to be preferred above other metropolitan churches and archbishops, throughout universal Christendom, or not? In answer to this, if the voice of order might here be heard, it would say, give to things that are equal and similar, equal honor; to things that are unequal and dissimilar, unequal honor, etc. Therefore, seeing that the See of Rome is a patriarchal see, appointed by the primitive church, and that its bishop and archbishop are limited within their own bordering churches (which the Council of Nice calls *suburban* churches), as other archbishops are, he should therefore have the honor of an archbishop, and have the same outward preeminence that is due to other archbishops. If he requires more, then he breaks the rule of right order; he falls

Preliminary Dissertation

Difference between Roman Church Then, and Now

into presumption; and he does wrong to his equals. And they also do wrong to themselves, who feed his ambition by giving more to him than the rule of order requires. The more they yield to him than is his right, that much more they take from themselves. And this is the reason why both Gregory and Pelagius reprehend those who gave to the archbishop of Constantinople that which the bishop of Rome now claims for himself, charging them with the breach of order in these words: “Lest while any singular thing is given to one person, all other priests are deprived of their due honor.” And Pelagius exhorts that no priest give to any archbishop the name of *universal bishop*, “Lest in so doing he takes from himself his due honor, while he yields that which is not due to another.” And also in the same epistle, “If he is called the chief universal patriarch, then the name *patriarch* is derogated from others,” etc. This is why, seeing that the bishop of Rome is an archbishop, order requires that he have the dignity which is due to archbishops; whatever more is added, is derogatory to the rest. And thus much concerning distinction of degrees, and order in giving to every degree his place and honor.

[18]

Therefore, even if it is admitted that the pope sits and succeeds in the chair of Peter, and that he is the bishop of the greatest city in the world, it does not follow that he should have rule and lordship over all other bishops and churches in the world. For, first, regarding the succession of Peter, many things are to be considered: —

1. Whether Peter sat and had his chair in Rome or not.
2. Whether he sat there as an apostle, or as a bishop.
3. Whether sitting in the outward seat of Peter makes successors of Peter.
4. Whether one may sit in Peter’s chair and seat, who does not sit in Peter’s doctrine?
5. Whether the succession of Peter makes an *apostle* rather than a *bishop*, and so we should call the pope the apostle of Rome, and not the bishop of Rome.
6. Whether ecclesiastical functions ought to be esteemed by ordinary succession of place, or rather by God’s private calling and sending?
7. Whether it stands by Scripture, that any succession *at all* is appointed in Christ’s church, or why it is more from Peter than from other apostles.

All of these being well discussed, it would appear what little reason the pope has to take this state upon himself, above all other churches. In the meantime, just this *one* argument may suffice, instead of many arguments, for our adversaries to answer at their convenient leisure:

- All the *true* successors of Peter sit in the chair of the doctrine of Peter and of the other apostles, uniformly.
- But no popes of this latter church of Rome sit in the chair of the doctrine of Peter and of the other apostles, uniformly.

Therefore, no popes of this latter church of Rome are the true successors of Peter.

And when they have well-perused this argument, and have well-compared the doctrine taught them by St. Peter, with the doctrine now taught by the popes —

Preliminary Dissertation

Difference between Roman Church Then, and Now

of the justification of a Christian-man, of the office of the law, of the strength and largeness of sin, of men's merits, of free-will, of works of supererogation,²⁴ of setting up images, of seven sacraments, of auricular confession, of satisfaction (penance), of sacrifice of the mass, of communion under one kind (wine is reserved for priests), of elevating and adoring the sacramental elements, of Latin service, of invocation, of prohibition of meats and marriage, of vowing chastity, of sects and rules of diverse religions, of indulgences and pardons: also of their doctrine now taught concerning magistrates, of the fulness of power of the See of Rome, with many other things like these,

— then I will be glad to hear what they say.

And if they would prove by Ireneus, Ambrose, Augustine, and Theodore, that the bishop of Rome is the chief of all bishops, because the city of which he is bishop is the chief and principal church above all others, then this too would follow: London is the chief city in all of England, and therefore the bishop of London is the chief of all bishops in this realm. This argument would be derogatory to the archbishops both of Canterbury and York.

Indeed, to grant yet more to our adversaries, that in giving principality to Rome, these fathers referred to the succession from Peter, and not to the greatness of the city, their argument will still fail, if their argument is rightly considered. They say,

— The apostolical See of Rome, having its succession from Peter, with its bishops, was chief of all other churches in the *primitive* time.

Therefore, the apostolical See of Rome, with its bishops, having succession from Peter, should *now* be the chief of all other churches.

This might follow if the times were alike, or if the succession which gave it pre-eminence was the same now as it was then. But the time and succession do not correspond now. For then, succession was in apostolical *doctrine* as well as in apostolical *place*. The succession of apostolical doctrine has long since ceased in the apostolical see, and nothing remains but the place alone, which is the least matter of true spiritual and apostolical succession.

Besides these objections, our adversaries object against us examples of the primitive time of the church, testimonies of general councils, and opinions of ancient writers taken out of the book of councils, and decretal epistles, by which they intend to prove that the foresaid terms (head of the church, ruler of the church, chief of all other priests) are to be applied not only to Peter, but also to *any* bishop of Rome within the compass of the primitive time. To fully and exactly answer all these objections in order, would require a whole volume by itself. I will leave that to those to whom it more properly pertains. In the meantime, I will address these and all similar places where St. Peter with his successors are called head of the church, chief of bishops, prince of the apostles, etc., with the following short distinction.

In these places, this word *head*, *chief*, and *prince* of the apostles, may be taken in two ways: to note either dominion, or else commendation. For sometimes we read *head* and *chief*, to be words, not of authority, but of excellency, by which is declared the chief and worthiest among many, and not the possessor and governor of the whole. It is like the person of a man, in which the head is the principal part of the whole body, being endued with reason and furnished with senses, by which the whole man is directed. From this is derived a metaphor that to whatever man, nature or condition has given the greatest excellency of gifts, he is called head or chief. And yet he does not always have dominion or jurisdiction of

²⁴ *Supererogation*: here it means exceeding what is required by Scripture for salvation (justification).

Preliminary Dissertation

Difference between Roman Church Then, and Now

the rest. So in our common speech, we call the head or chief men of the parish, those who are most specially noted for their riches, wisdom, or place. In a like phrase of speech, we call the head man of the inquest, the one who has first place. And yet neither of these have any dominion or jurisdiction over the rest. In a school, the chief scholar in learning is not therefore the master or governor of his fellows. Nor does Cicero have any title to claim the subjection of all other orators, just because he is named the prince of eloquence. And though Homer may be also called the prince of poets, yet poets do not owe to Homer anything but fame and praise.

And so what if Peter is called and accounted the head and prince of the apostles for his excellent faith, for his divine confession, and singular affection for the Lord Jesus? What right does he have to claim authority over the other apostles, or the pope after him to claim it over all the other bishops and the whole church of Christ, even if the pope had the same excellency of Christ's faith that Peter had (as would to God he had)?

If our adversaries provoke us to numbering testimonies, and dividing the house (speaking of the writers and councils of the primitive age) for these testimonies alleged to be on their side, I could recite out of the witness of doctors, out of the examples of councils, and out of the practices of emperors, no less than sixty voices that are much more opposed to their assertion. But I refer it either to those who have more leisure at this time. Or else I will omit it to another time, if the good pleasure of the Lord grants me further leisure in another book to address it at large, and in such order as appears sufficient to prove by the doctors, general councils, examples, and histories, that the bishops of Rome, during the first five hundred years after Christ, the bishops of Rome did not have this state of title, jurisdiction and power which they now usurp. Although, for the greatness of the empire, they were somewhat more magnified than the others, and therefore they were sought, and flattered, and showed themselves forth more than they should. Yet by the common consent of the churches, they were stopped from their purpose. So that, by the consent of most in that age, they were but taken as archbishops of equal honor, of equal merit with other archbishops and rulers of the church. And if any preference was given to them above the rest, either it was not so given by all, or even by most; or secondly, it was not so given for any such necessity of God's word as would bind them to it, nor so much out of respect for Peter and his succession, as it was for certain other causes and respects. These may gathered into thirteen.

[19]

1. The greatness of the city and monarchy of Rome.
2. The authority of the emperor Constantine the great, the first of the emperors converted to the faith, and ruling in the same city by whom the universal liberty of the church was first promoted. And the causes of the bishops then at variance, were committed partly to the bishop of Rome, and partly to other bishops nearby, to be decided, as appears by Eusebius. (lib. 10, cap. 5.)
3. The Council of Nice, which confirmed the preeminence of that church to have the oversight of the churches bordering around it.
4. The unquiet state of the Greek church, which was much troubled in those days with sects, factions, and dissensions.
5. When synods were called by other metropolitans, if the bishops of Rome chanced to be absent, and their sentence was required, then by the occasion of this they began at length to

Preliminary Dissertation

Difference between Roman Church Then, and Now

take the sentence of the Roman church as a canon or ecclesiastical rule, and to refuse other synods where their decree or sentence was *not* required.

6. When any common matter was in hand at other places, whatever was done, the manner commonly used was to write to the Roman bishop for his approval for public unity and consent in Christ's church.

7. Also sometimes, the testimony of the Roman bishop was also usually desired in those days for admitting teachers and bishops in other churches.

8. The sentence of the Roman church was not only required, but also often accepted by other bishops. When there was any dissension among the bishops of other provinces, they would, of their own accord, appeal to the bishop of Rome. They desired him to cite both parties, and to hear and decide the cause, as when Macarius and Hesychius sent to Julius, who was then bishop of Rome, etc.

9. Certain of the Arians returning from their Arianism,²⁵ offered up and exhibited to the bishops of Rome their evidences of repentance, and were received back, as Ursatius and Valens did to Julius. (Socrat. lib. 2, cap. 24.)

10. Gratian the emperor made a law that all men should retain that religion which was held by Damasus, the bishop of Rome, and Peter, bishop of Alexandria. (Sozom. lib. 7, cap. 4.)

11. If it happened that the bishop of Rome disallowed the appointment of any minister or ministers, the popes perceiving how diligent and ready these ministers were to seek their favor, and to send their messengers to Rome for their purgation, thereby took no little manner of exaltation for themselves. (Theodoret, lib. 5, cap. 23.)

12. The bishops of Rome also had another artful (crafty) practice, that in sending their letters abroad, they were ever harping on the greatness of their name, and of their apostolic see, and of the primacy of St. Peter their predecessor, and being prince of all the apostles, etc. They used to do this in every letter, whenever they wrote to any, as it appears in all their decretal letters; namely, in the letters of Miltiades, Marcellus, and Marcus, etc.

13. If any of the Eastern church directed any writing to the Roman bishops, in which any signification was contained of ever so little reverence given to those bishops (such as learned men commonly use for modesty's sake), that was taken by and by, and construed as plain subjection and due obedience.

Thus you have the first and original grounds by which the archbishops of the Romish See achieved their great kingdom over Christ's church. These were the beginnings of the mystery of their iniquity — by what was modestly and voluntarily given to them. Afterward it continued by use and custom, claiming it ambitiously out of duty and service. And lastly, the bishops of Rome held it fast once they had possession of it. So that now, in no case can they abide the birds calling their feathers back home, which they have so long usurped.

CHURCH GOVERNMENT

And thus much concerning the life, jurisdiction, and title of the Roman bishops. In all of this (as it has been declared) they, and not we, have fallen from the primitive church of Rome. To these three things I might also join the manner of GOVERNMENT which the Romish bishops have no less altered, both from the rule of Scripture, and from the steps of the true

²⁵ Arianism: denied the divinity of Christ, teaching that he was a created being, not eternal.

Preliminary Dissertation

Difference between Roman Church Then, and Now

church of Rome. This government has been and ought to be only *spiritual*. And yet the bishop of Rome has used it, of recent years, in no other way than as an earthly king or prince might have governed his realm and dominions — with riches, glory, power, terror, outward strength, force, prison, death, execution, laws, policies, promoting his friends to dignities, revenging his affections, punishing and correcting faults against his person more than other offences committed against God. In all these things, he has been using and abusing the word of God for his pretext and cloak, to work his *worldly* purpose. Whereas indeed, the word of God ministers no such power to spiritual persons, but only that which is *spiritual*, according to the saying of the apostle: “the weapons of our warfare are not carnal,” ^{2Cor 10.4} but spiritual — those which do not serve against flesh and blood, nor against the weak person of man, but against Satan and the gates of hell. ^{Mat 16.18}

Just as all these weapons are spiritual, so those who deal with them should likewise be spiritual, well-furnished with all those gifts and graces of the Holy Spirit which are fit for the governance of His spiritual church —

with wisdom and knowledge in the Scripture to instruct the ignorant; with inward intelligence and foresight of the crafty operations of Satan; with the power of the Spirit to resist him; with practice and experience of temptations, to comfort those who are afflicted and oppressed by Satan; with heavenly discretion to discern spirits, ^{1Cor 12.10} and to discern truth from untruth; with judgment and knowledge of tongues and learning, to convict error; with zeal for God’s glory; with fervency of prayer; with patience in persecution; with a mind contented with all cases and incidental states; with tears and compassion upon other men’s griefs; with stoutness and courage against proud and stout oppressors; with humility towards the poor and miserable; with the counsel of the Lord Jesus by his Word and Spirit to direct him in all things; with strength against sin; with hatred of this world; with the gift of faith, and the power of the keys in spiritual causes,

— so as to minister the word, the sacraments, and excommunication when the word bids, “that the spirit may be saved;” ^{1Cor 5.5} and to reconcile again as cause requires, etc. These gifts and others like them are the matters which compose the sinews and strength of the church, and the true governing of the church.

But contrary to these, the bishop and clergy of this later church of Rome, under the name and pretense of Christ and his word, have for a long time exercised nothing else but a *worldly* dominion. Indeed, they have been seeking their own glory, not the glory of Christ; the riches of this world, not the lucre of souls; not feeding the flock, but filling the purse; revenging their own wrongs, but neglecting God’s glory; striving against man only, even killing him, but not killing the vice nor confuting the error of man; strong against flesh and blood, but weak against the devil; stout against the simple, but meek against the mighty. Briefly, they have been doing almost all things preposterously, more like secular princes than spiritual pastors of Christ’s flock, with outward enforcement and fear of punishment, with imprisoning, famishing, hanging, racking, drowning, beheading, slaying, murdering, and burning, and warring also. And on the other side, they have been seeking their own glory with riches and treasures, with guard and strength of men, with court and cardinals, with pomp and pride about them, with their triple crown, with the naked sword, with their ordinary succession, with their laws and executions, their promotions and preferments, their biddings and commandings, their threatenings and revengings, etc.

Therefore, in fine, to compare the images of a worldly kingdom, with this kingdom of the pope, we find there is no difference, except that this kingdom of the pope, under hypocrisy, makes a facade of the spiritual sword, which is the word of God; but in very deed, it does all

Preliminary Dissertation

Difference between Roman Church Then, and Now

things with the temporal sword; that is, with outward force, not differing from civil and secular government in any respect or condition.

[20]

For as in an earthly kingdom, first a prince or some chief magistrate is appointed, having dominion over his nobles and commons, constraining all his subjects under his statutes and laws. These laws, notwithstanding, he dispenses at his pleasure. Under him all other inferior magistrates have their order and place appointed to rule over the subjects, and yet to be subject under him. So too, if the state and form of the *pope* is well considered, we see that it differs nothing at all from the earthly, except in the names of the persons. In civil government, all subjection is referred to one head ruler, whose authority surmounts all the rest, and keeps them under obedience. In like manner, the government of the popish church is committed to one man who, as chief steward, overseer, and ruler of Christ's household, in Christ's absence, has supreme power over all churches, to direct all its affairs. But here stands the difference: in *civil* policy he is called a king or prince; *here* he is called a pope.

The king has his dukes and earls next to him; the pope's nobility stands in his cardinals and legates. Though they are no dukes in name, yet in pomp and pride, they will not only check them, but also checkmate kings themselves, if they might be allowed. This is what Theodore, Lanfranc, Anselm, and Thomas a Becket did; and so would Thomas Wolsey have done, had the king not checked him at times. In civil policy, next to dukes and earls, follows the order of lords, barons, knights, esquires, and gentlemen, with majors, sheriffs, constables, bailiffs, wardens, etc. A similar race is also to be seen, though under other names, in the pope's policy of primates, bishops, suffragans, provosts, deans, canons, vicars, archdeacons, priests, deacons, subdeacons, acolytes, exorcists, lectors, door-keepers, singsters, with other clerks. In the other, under wardens comes the order of scavengers. So too, the pope's monarchy does not lack chanelrakers (gutter-scrapers), to whom may well be compared that rabble of abbots, provincials, priors, monks, and friars, with their convents and nunneries.

Moreover, how do justices, judges, lawyers, sergeants, or attorneys, which are necessary officers in the commonwealth, differ from the pope's inquisitors, canonists, doctors, and bachelors of the pope's law? Commissaries, officials, proctors, promoters, and other such persons, serve no less in the *spiritual court*, and in the consistory, than the others do in the *temporal court*. Now, whoever wishes to compare the glory and magnificence of the one with the glory of the other; and also the power of the one with the power of the other; and the riches of the one with the riches of the other — I suppose he will see no great odds between them, taking the pope's kingdom as it stood in his full ruff, and still stands where churches are not reformed. As for subtlety and political practice, there is no one who is impartial, that doubts or does not see that the pope's hierarchy, in upholding their state, far excels all the kingdoms of worldly princes.

Thus, in comparing the pope's government with civil governments, just as they disagree in little or nothing; so in comparing again the same government with the order of Scriptures, or with the government that was in the ancient church of Rome, we will see no resemblance between them. As we read in the apostles' time, all the armor of Christ's ministers was spiritual, and full of godly power against the spiritual enemies of our salvation. They governed the church with peace, patience, humility, true knowledge of God, the sword of the Spirit, the shield of faith, the breastplate of righteousness, hearty charity, sincere faith, and a good conscience. So also after the apostles, in the time of Ambrose (c. 339-397), by his own testimony, it is to be understood that the armor of churchmen was then prayers and tears. Where now the armor of the pope's priesthood is nothing else but fire and sword, with

Preliminary Dissertation

Difference between Roman Church Then, and Now

which they keep all things under their subjection. And here comes the enormous and horrible abuse of excommunication, suspension, and interdict. In many things, for which the civil magistrate will not commit any citizen to the stocks, the pope's censure will not hesitate to commit a Christian to the devil, not to mention other usurped dealings and doings in matters that belong to the civil sword. For example, in punishing immorality and adultery, in administration and probates of testaments, in bearing civil office; in making cardinals to be captains in war, and rulers of regions; bishops to be presidents or chancellors; priests to be stewards in great men's houses, or masters of mints, or clerks of the market, or gardeners to gentlemen, etc. All of this I pass over here, referring them to the consideration of those who have more leisure to mark the order of their doings, and so to judge such things with impartiality, according to the rule of truth taught in God's word, and the public examples of the ancient church of Christ in the primitive time.

3. Doctrine Heretically Corrupted.

Thus I have discoursed so much concerning the manner of life, title, jurisdiction, and government of the pope's see. In all these points, it is to be seen how this later church of Rome has receded from the true ancient church of Rome. It now remains, according to my promise, to proceed to the third and last point, which is DOCTRINE. In this consists the chief matter that is with us, and against them. So that, they are not to be reputed as true catholics, whose doctrine has altered so far; nor are we to be reputed as other than heretics, if we were now to join with them. For the proof of this, let us examine the doctrine and rites of the church of Rome as now used, and compare them with the teaching of the ancient catholics. This is done, that those simple souls who have been, and still are being seduced by the false appearance and image of this pretended and bastardly church, perceiving what lies within it, may be warned in time. They may either eschew the peril, if they are willing to be instructed, or if not, to blame none but themselves for their own willful destruction. And although here I could charge the new-fangled church of the pope with seven or eight heinous crimes, such as blasphemy, idolatry, heresy, superstition, absurdity, vanity, cruelty, and contradiction (in which it neither agrees with the old learning of their predecessors, nor with themselves in sundry points), yet I will and dare to boldly affirm that in this doctrine of the pope that is now taught in the church of Rome, there is neither any consolation of conscience, nor the salvation of man's soul. For there is no life nor soul's health except in Christ alone, nor any promise of salvation or comfort made except by faith in the Son of God. What assurance of perfect peace, life, or salvation can there be, then, where that which alone makes for all these is made least of, and other things which make least for these, are the most esteemed? To say the simple truth, what else is the whole course and body of the pope's law now set forth, but a doctrine of laws, a heap of ceremonies, the teaching of traditions, a mediation of merits, and a foundation of new religions? All of this does not avail one jot to the justification of our souls before the terrible judgment of God.

And, therefore, just as it may be truly said that this doctrine of the pope is void of all true comfort and salvation; so likewise it seems that those who addict themselves so devoutly to the pope's learning, were never earnestly afflicted in conscience, never humbled in spirit nor broken in heart, never entered into any serious fearing of God's judgment, nor ever felt the strength of the law and of death. For if they had, they would soon have seen their own weakness and been driven to Christ. Then they would have seen what a horrible thing it is to appear before God the Father, or to think even once upon Him, as Luther says, without

Preliminary Dissertation

Difference between Roman Church Then, and Now

Christ.²⁶ And on the contrary side, they would then know what a glory, what a kingdom, what liberty and life it was to be in Christ Jesus by faith, holding their inheritance, not with the bondson of Hagar, but with the free son of Sarah; Gal 4.22 by promise, and not by the law; by grace, and not by works; by gift, and not by deserving — so that God alone might be praised, and not man.

And thus the old Romans were first taught by St. Paul, writing to the Romans. Cornelius the Roman, the first baptized of all the Gentiles, learned the same from St. Peter. He received the Holy Spirit, not by the deeds of the law, but only by hearing the faith of Jesus preached. And the church of the Romans continued in the same doctrine for many years, so long as they were in affliction. And the bishop of Rome, with his Romans, would now also remain in the same doctrine, if they were such ancient catholics as they pretend, and would follow the old mother church of Rome, and retain the first liqueur with which they were first seasoned.

[21]

But the sweet freshness and scent of that liqueur, and its pleasant perfume, has now been completely pushed out through other unsavory infusions of the pope's. So that, hardly any taste or piece remains of all that primitive doctrine which St. Paul and the other apostles first planted among the Gentiles. And what marvel is it if the Romans now, after so long a time, have lost their first sap. Consider that the church of the Galatians in the very time of St. Paul, their schoolmaster, as soon as he turned his back a little, were almost turned from the doctrine of faith, and had much ado to be recovered again. Gal 3.1 f. St. Paul expressly foretells us about this defection and falling away from the faith, in his epistles both to the Thessalonians, and also to Timothy. There he shows that a defection will come, and that some will depart from the faith, attending to spirits of error, etc. (1Tim 4.1-4). And to know what errors these will be, in the same place where the apostle speaks of seared consciences, the circumstance plainly leads us to understand these include forbidding men to marry, or to eat meats ordained by God to be taken with thanksgiving for man's sustenance. Most evidently, as if with his finger, he points out to us the church of Rome, which not only in these points, but also in all other conditions, has almost utterly revolted from the pure original sincerity of that doctrine which St. Paul planted in the church of the Romans, and in the churches of all other Gentiles.

Summary of St. Paul's Teachings.

1. The doctrine of St. Paul ascribes all our justification freely and only to faith in Christ, as to the only means and cause by which the merits of Christ's passion can be applied to us, without any respect to work or works of the law whatever; Eph 2.8-9; and in this doctrine, the church of the Romans was first planted.
2. The same doctrine of St. Paul, cutting off and excluding all man's deserving, rests only upon God's promise, and upon grace, not man's merits: upon mercy, not man's laboring or running; upon election and calling, not upon man's willing, etc., Rom 9.16.
3. The same doctrine casting down the strength of man and his natural integrity, as they call it, imprisoned all flesh under sin, and makes them destitute of the glory of God, Rom 3.9-23.

²⁶ Alluding to Luther's *Lectures on Galatians*, delivered in 1531, and published as a *Commentary* in 1535.

Preliminary Dissertation

Difference between Roman Church Then, and Now

4. It distinguishes between the law and the gospel, declaring their use and end to be different — the one to kill, the other to make alive; the one to condemn, the other to justify; the one to have an end, the other to be perpetual, etc.: Rom 5.20; 7.4. Gal 3.10-13.
5. The same doctrine of St. Paul, just as it distinguishes between the law and the gospel, so it makes no less distinction between the righteousness of God and the righteousness of man, abhorring the one — that is, man's own righteousness, coming by the law and works — and embracing the other, which God imputes freely and graciously to us for Christ his Son's sake, in whom we believe, Phi 3.9; Rom 4.24.
6. It wipes away all traditions, and constitutions of men, especially from the binding of our conscience, calling them beggarly elements of this world, Gal 4.9; Col 2.20-22.
7. Likewise it rejects and wipes away all curious subtleties, and superfluous speculations, and knows nothing else but Christ and Him crucified, which is the only object to which our faith looks, 1Cor 2.1-2.
8. Furthermore, the same doctrine of St. Paul declares that all men are transgressors by the disobedience of one man, Adam; even though they never touched the apple, they own his stock by nature. So too, this doctrine proves that all men are justified by the obedience of one man, Christ; even though they did not perform his obedience, they are likewise born of Him by spiritual regeneration and faith, Rom 5.17-19.
9. And therefore, just as all men coming from Adam are *condemned* originally, before they grow up to commit any sin against the law; so all men regenerated by faith in Christ are *saved* originally before they begin to do any good work of charity, or any other good deed, Rom 5.18-19.
10. The doctrine of St. Paul, considering the high glory of a Christian man's state in Christ Jesus by faith, [establishes that such faith does the following]:
 - First*, it sets him in a perfect peace with Almighty God, Rom 5.1.
 - Secondly*, exempts him from all condemnation, Rom 8.1.
 - Thirdly*, it matches him with angels; makes him equal with saints and fellow-citizens of heaven; numbers him with the household of God; and makes him heir with Jesus Christ himself. Eph 2.19; Rom 8.17.
 - Fourthly*, it adopts him from the state of a servant, to the state of *a son of God*, crying, "Abba, Father:" Gal 4.6.
 - Fifthly*, it opens to him a bold access and entrance to the high Majesty and throne of grace, Eph 2.18; Heb 4.16. ²⁷
 - Sixthly*, it subjects all things under him, such as ministers — yes, the apostles themselves, in their highest office — death, life, things present, things to come, with the whole world besides; and it assigns to him no spiritual head but Christ alone, saying, "And you are Christ's, and Christ is God's," 1Cor 3.21-23.
 - Seventhly*, it advances and sets him in a spiritual liberty or freedom, above all terrors of spirit, either of God's law, or man's law; above all dreadful fears of sin, damnation, malediction, rejection, death, hell, or purgatory; above all servile bondage of ceremonies; above men's precepts, traditions, superstitions, vices, yokes, customs, or whatever else oppresses and entangles the spiritual freedom of a conscience which Christ has set at liberty; and it requires, moreover, that we walk and stand stoutly in that liberty to which we are brought with the free son of Sarah; and no longer allow

²⁷ Foxe, like most reformers, accepts Paul as the author of Hebrews; hence he cites that letter here.

Preliminary Dissertation

Difference between Roman Church Then, and Now

ourselves to be clogged with any such servile bondage — that is to say, although we must be content to subject our bodies to all service, and to all men, yet we must not yield our spiritual consciences and souls as slaves and servants, to be subject to the fear or bondage of anything in this world, for we are made lords and princes over all things whatsoever that can harm, bind, or terrify us. Gal 4.9.

11. The right vein of St. Paul's doctrine makes no distinction between days and times to be observed. Gal 4.10; Col 2.16; Rom 14.5-6.
12. It leaves all foods as indifferent, eaten with thanksgiving; they are to serve the necessity of the body, and not the body to serve them, Col 2.16; 1Tim 4.4.
13. It permits marriage without restraint or exception, as lawful and also expedient for all men having need of it, 1Cor 7.2; Heb 13.4.
14. It admits no other sacrifice for sin, but the sacrifice of Christ alone, and that was done once for all with blood. For without blood there is no remission of sin, which is applied to us by faith alone, and by nothing else, Heb 9.22.
15. Regarding the holy communion, we understand from the first epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians, 1Cor, 11.23-26, that the use then among them, was to have the partaking of the bread, called the Lord's body, *and* of the cup, called the Lord's blood, administered not at an altar, but at a plain board or table, the congregation meeting there together after the time of their supper. The minister did not receive it alone, as the others looked on; but the whole congregation together communicated with reverence and thanksgiving — not lifting it over the priest's head, nor worshipping it, nor kneeling before it, nor beating their breasts; but either sitting at the supper, or standing after the supper.
16. The apostle, besides the sacramental supper, mentions baptism, or the "washing of regeneration," Tit 3.5 although he himself baptized but few, 1Cor 1.14; he makes no mention of other sacraments.
17. By the same doctrine of St. Paul, no tongue (language) is to be used in the congregation, which is not known, and does not edify, 1Cor 14.2.
18. The rule of St. Paul's doctrine subjects every creature to the obedience of kings and princes, and ordinary magistrates. Such are ordained by God to have the sword and the authority of public government, to order and dispose in all things that are not contrary to God — whatever pertains to the maintenance of the good, or to the correction of the evil. There is no exemption from their jurisdiction, regardless of vocations or persons, whether they are ecclesiastical or political.

[22]

And therefore it pertains to this office to preserve peace, to set things in lawful order, to preserve Christian discipline in the church of Christ, to remove offences, to bridle the disobedient, to provide and procure wholesome and faithful teachers over the people, to maintain learning and set up schools, to have oversight not only of the people, but also of all ecclesiastical ministers, to see everyone do his duty, and to remove or punish those who are negligent; also, to call councils and synods, and to provide that the church goods are faithfully dispensed by the hands of true dealers, to the sustenance of the church and of true teachers, and to the public needs of the poor, etc. Rom 13.1,4,6; Tit 3.1.

19. Furthermore, by St. Paul's doctrine, the ministers of Christ's church have their authority and armor likewise limited; this armor is spiritual only and not carnal, by which they fight,

Preliminary Dissertation

Difference between Roman Church Then, and Now

not against flesh and blood, but against the power of darkness, error, and sin; against spiritual seduction and craftiness in heavenly things; against the works and proceedings of Satan the prince of this world; in comforting weak consciences against the terrors of the devil and desperation; and finally against every thought lifted up against Christ — to subdue every lofty thing to the subjection and power of Christ Jesus the Son of God. Eph 6.13-18.

To briefly reduce the whole doctrine of St. Paul, it consists chiefly in *these five points*:

First, in setting forth the grace, great love and good will, and free promises of God the Father in Christ Jesus his Son, to mankind. God so loved the world that he has given his own Son for the redemption of it, Joh 3.16. He gave his Son to die for us, who were His enemies, Rom 5.8. He has made us alive, who were dead in sin, Eph 2.1. He has so mercifully reconciled the world to himself by his Son; and also by his ambassadors, He desires us to be reconciled us to Him, 2Cor 5.18-20. He has given his own Son to be sin for us, 2Cor 5.21, and to be accursed for us, Gal 3.13. By firm promise, He has assured us of our inheritance, Rom 4.16. Not by the works of righteousness that we have done, but of his own mercy He has saved us by the washing of regeneration, Tit 3.4-5.

The **second** point consists in preaching and expressing the glorious and triumphant majesty of Christ Jesus the Son of God, and the excellency of his glory; who being once dead in the infirmity of the flesh, rose again with power, and ascending up with majesty, has led captivity captive, Eph 4.8. He sits and reigns in glory at the right hand of God in heavenly things, above all principalities, and powers, and dominions, and above every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in the world to come, Eph 1.21. At His name every knee will bow both in heaven and in earth, and under the earth, and every tongue will confess our Lord Christ Jesus to the glory of God the Father, Phi 2.10. In Him and by Him all things are made both in heaven and in earth, things visible and invisible, whether thrones or dominions, or principalities, or powers — all are created by him and for him, and he is before all, and all things consist in him who is the head of his body, the church, the beginning and firstborn from the dead, in whom dwells all fulness, Col 1.16. The Father has given all judgment to him, and no longer judges any man Himself, Joh 5.22. The Father has given all things into his hands, Joh 13.3. The Father has given him authority over all flesh, Joh 17.2. All authority in heaven and earth has been given to him, Mat 28.18. In Him all the promises of God are yes and amen, 2Cor 1.20.

Thirdly, Paul declares the virtue of Christ's cross and passion, and what exceeding benefits proceed to us by them. By Christ's blood we have redemption and the remission of our sins, Eph 1.7. By His stripes we are healed, Isa 53.5. By His cross all things are made peace, both in heaven and in earth, Col 1.20. By His death we are reconciled to God, Rom 5.10. He has destroyed death and brought life to light, 2Tim 1.10. By His death He has destroyed the one who had the power of death, that is, the devil, and He has delivered those who all their life lived in bondage, for fear of death, Heb 2.14-15. By His obedience we are made righteous; by His righteousness we are justified to life, Rom 5.18. By His curse we are blessed, and are delivered from the curse of the law, Gal 3.13. By His blood we who once were far off, are made near to God, Eph 2.13. In one body He has reconciled to God both Jews and Gentiles, Eph 2.16. By his flesh He has taken away the division and separation between God and us, abolishing the law which was set against us in precepts and decrees, Eph 2.14-15. He is our peace, our advocate, and the propitiation for the sins of the whole world, 1Joh 2.2. He was accursed, and made sin for us, that we might be the righteousness of God in him, 2Cor 5.21., He became for us, from God, our wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and

Preliminary Dissertation

Difference between Roman Church Then, and Now

redemption, 1Cor 1.30. By Him we have boldness and access with all confidence through faith in him, Eph 3.12. He forgives all our sins, and has torn in pieces the obligation or hand-writing which was against us in the law of the commandments; He has crucified it on the cross, and utterly dispatched and abolished it, and has spoiled principalities and powers, as in an open show of conquest, triumphing over them openly in himself, Col 2.14-15. He justifies the wicked by faith, Rom 4.5. In Him we are made full and complete. Col 2.10, etc.

The **fourth** branch is to teach us and inform us, to whom these benefits of Christ's passion and victory pertain, and by what means they are applied to us. There is only one means, which is by faith in Christ Jesus, and no other thing. It pleases Almighty God to accept this faith for righteousness. And it is this righteousness alone which stands before God, and none other, as we are plainly taught by the Scriptures, and especially by the doctrine of St. Paul. This righteousness thus rising from *faith in Christ*, St. Paul calls the righteousness of God. He speaks of himself utterly refusing the other righteousness which is of the law, so that he might be found in Christ, not having his own righteousness, which is of the law, but the righteousness of Christ, which is of faith, Phi 3.9. Again, in writing of the Jews who sought righteousness and did not find it, and of the Gentiles who did not seek it and yet found it, the apostle shows the reason why: Because, he says, the one sought it by the works of the law, and not knowing the righteousness of God, and seeking to set up their own righteousness, they did not submit themselves to the righteousness which is of God. The other, which were the Gentiles, who did not seek it, obtained righteousness — *that righteousness which is of faith*, etc., Rom 9.30-32. Also, in another place from the same epistle, St. Paul writes of this righteousness which comes from faith, calling it *the righteousness of God*. He says of Christ, “whom God has set forth for a propitiation by faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God,” Rom 3.25. By this *righteousness*, it is evident that St. Paul means the *righteousness of faith*, which Almighty God now reveals and makes manifest by the preaching of the gospel. Would you see still more plainly this *righteousness of God* — how it is taken in St. Paul for the *righteousness of faith*, and is therefore called the righteousness of God, because it is imputed by God only to faith, and is not deserved by man? Look in the same epistle to the Romans, third chapter. Paul's words are manifest: “the righteousness of God,” he says, “is by faith in Jesus Christ, to all and upon all who believe,” etc., Rom 3.22.

Therefore, whoever studies to be accepted by God and to be found righteous in His sight, let him learn diligently, by the doctrine of St. Paul, to differentiate as far as heaven is from earth, between the righteousness of *works*, and the righteousness of *faith*. Bring no other means for his justification, or for the remission of his sins, but faith alone, apprehending the body or person of Christ Jesus crucified. For just as there is no way into the house but by the door, so there is no coming to God but by Christ alone, ^{Joh 14.6} which is by faith. ^{Gal 2.16}

[23]

And just as the mortal body, without bodily sustenance of bread and drink, can but perish, so the spiritual soul of man has no other refreshing by which to be saved, except by faith alone in the body and blood of Christ. With this faith, the idolatrous Gentiles apprehended Jesus Christ, and thereby received righteousness. As soon as Cornelius (the first baptized Roman) heard Peter preach Christ, he received straightway the Holy Spirit, Act 10.44. Peter himself confessed, and for his confession had the keys of heaven, Mat 16.19. Zaccheus received the person of Christ into his house, and with this he received salvation both for himself and his whole household, Luk 19.9. What a sinner Mary was, who had no less than seven devils in her; and yet, because she set her heart and affection upon that person of

Preliminary Dissertation

Difference between Roman Church Then, and Now

Christ, many sins were forgiven her, Luk 7.47. The thief at Christ's right hand on the cross, how far he was from all works of the law; and yet by faith he entered into Paradise *justified*, the same day as Christ, Luk 23.43. In like manner, although the poor publican came to the church with less holiness after the law, yet he went home to his house more justified than the pharisee with all his works, and all because of faith, Luk 18.14. Consider the parable of the prodigal son who was lost, and yet revived again; also of the lost piece of silver; and of the lost sheep which went astray and was found again. Luk 15.11f, 9f, 6f. What do these declare, if not that what is lost by the law, is to be recovered by faith and grace?

And how often do we read in the gospels, "Your faith has saved you," etc., Luk 18.42; "Jesus, seeing their faith," etc., Mat 9.2; "Whoever believes in me, I will raise him up at the last day," etc., Joh 6.40; "Believe also in me," etc., Joh 14.1; "He that believes in me has everlasting life," etc., Joh 3.36; "Without me you can do nothing," etc., Joh 15.5; "He that is in me," etc., Joh 15.4; "He that loves me," etc., Joh 14.23; "He that hears me," etc., Joh 5.24; "He that abides in me," etc., Joh 15.5; "He that receives me," etc., Luk 9.48; "Unless you eat my flesh, and drink my blood," etc., Joh 6.53; "That they may receive forgiveness of sins by faith in me," etc., Act 26.18; "To Him all the prophets witness, that through his name, whoever believes in Him will receive remission of sins," etc., Act 10.43; "Whoever believes and is baptized," etc., Mar 16.16; "Whoever believes in me, the works that I do he will do also, and greater than these," etc., Joh 14.12. And likewise in the writings of St. Paul, how often do we hear the name of Christ in almost every third or fourth line, where he still repeats, In Christ Jesus — by Christ Jesus — through Jesus Christ our Lord, etc. Who believe in him, etc. All who believe in him, etc. Believing on him, in him, in his name, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, etc. St. Paul says to the jailor, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and you shall be saved, and your house," etc., Act 16.31.

Thus you see then, that just as the passion of Christ is the only efficient or personal cause immediate to our salvation; so faith is the only instrumental or mean cause that makes the merits of Christ available. For just as the passion of Christ serves none but those who believe, so neither does faith itself justify (as it is only a bare quality or action in man's mind), unless it is directed to the body of Christ crucified as its *object*, from whom it receives all His virtue. And therefore, these two must always jointly concur together: faith, and Christ Jesus crucified. For example, when the children of Israel were bid by Moses to look up to the bronze serpent, the serpent could not have helped them unless they looked up, nor could their looking up have profited them unless they had directed their eyes to the serpent as the only object for them to behold. So too, our faith directed to the body of Jesus our Savior, is the only means by which Christ's merits are applied to us, and we are justified before God, according to the doctrine of St. Paul. In express words, he defines for us what this faith is, and how it justifies. He says, "if you confess with your mouth the Lord Jesus, and believe in your heart that God has raised him from the dead, you shall be saved," etc. Rom 10.9. Besides this, whatever action or quality there is in man, either hope, charity, or any other kind of faith and believing, however true it is, unless it apprehends this object, which is the body of Christ the Son of God, it does not serve for justification. That is the reason why we add this particle (*only*) to faith, and say that *only* faith in Christ justifies us. It is to exclude all other actions, qualities, gifts, or works of man, from the cause of justifying. For there is no other knowledge or gift given by God to man, however excellent, that can stand before the judgment of God for justification, nor to which any promise of salvation is annexed. There is only *this* faith: looking up to the bronze serpent — that is, to the body of Christ Jesus crucified for us.

Preliminary Dissertation

Difference between Roman Church Then, and Now

For example, when the Turk says that he believes in one living God who made heaven and earth, his belief in this is true, yet it does not justify him, because it lacks the right object, which is Christ. So too, when the Jew says that he believes in one God maker of heaven and earth, and also believes the same God to be omnipotent, merciful, just, and true of promise, and that He has elected the seed of Abraham, it is true that he believes this. And yet all this does not serve him, because Christ the Son of God is not joined with it. And though the said Jew is ever so devout in his prayers, or charitable in alms, or precise in keeping the law, and believes ever so steadfastly that he is elected to be saved, yet he is never any nearer to salvation for all this — so long as his faith is not grounded upon the chief cornerstone, which is the person and body of Jesus Christ, the true Savior. In the same way, it may be said of the papist, when he says that he is baptized, and believes in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, three persons, and one God, and also confesses Jesus Christ to be the Son of God who died for our sins, and rose again for our righteousness, etc., his belief in this is true. And indeed it would save him, if he stayed his salvation in this faith, and upon Christ alone as his Savior according to the promise and grace of God, and goes no further. But this he does not do. Nor does he admit that Christ alone is his perfect Savior, without the help of the patrons, heads, advocates, and mediators. Nor yet does he permit his faith in Christ to be the only means of his justification, but he sets up other by-means, such as hope, charity, the sacrifice of the mass, confession, penance, satisfaction, merits and pardons, supposing thereby to work his justification before God, *contrary* to both the word of promise, the gospel of grace, and the doctrine of St. Paul.

And thus much in the fourth branch, of the **true causes of our justification** according to St. Paul's doctrine. Now, concerning these causes, this distinction is to be added: that regarding the original causes of our salvation, which are various, some are *external* and outside us; some are *internal* and within us.

Of the EXTERNAL causes which are outside us, the first and principal cause is the mercy and grace of God. Predestination and election follow this. Then comes vocation (the gospel call). The last and next cause is the death and bloodshed of Christ, by which we are redeemed. All these are external causes, because they are outside us.

Of the INTERNAL causes that are in man through the gift of God, there is but one, and no more are appointed in Scripture; and that is our *faith in Christ*, which is the gift of God in us. ^{Eph 2.8} Besides this, there is no gift of God given to man — whether virtue, work, merit, or anything else — that is any part or cause of salvation, but only this gift of faith: *to believe in Christ Jesus*. And this is the reason why we hold that faith alone justifies, meaning that among all the works, deeds, actions, labors and operations whatsoever, that man does or can do, there is nothing in man that works salvation, but only his faith given to him by God to believe in Christ his Son. And therefore, in the epistle to the Romans, St. Paul reasons about the glory of justifying, and asks this question: How is our boasting of this glory excluded? Is it excluded by the law of *works*? And he concludes no; he ascribes the glory of it only to the law of *faith*. And consequently he infers this: “We conclude that a man is justified by faith *without* the deeds of the law,” Rom 3.27-28.

[24]

How then can that, which St. Paul utterly debars and excludes, be counted as any part of our justification? Of which the whole course of St. Paul's doctrine is full, where he still concludes; “It is the gift of God, not of works, lest any man should boast,” etc., Eph 2.8-9; “Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy He saved us,” etc. Tit 3.5; “Not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace

Preliminary Dissertation

Difference between Roman Church Then, and Now

which was given to us,” etc., 2Tim 1.9; “A man is not justified by works,” etc., Gal 2.16; “To him who does not work, but believes on him who justifies the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness,” etc., Rom 4.5. What does he mean by these plain declarations, if not to utterly exclude all kinds of man’s merits and works of the law, from the office and dignity of justifying? And, although he does not expressly use the word *only*, based on his exclusives and negatives, this exceptive must be inferred.

And thus much concerning faith in Christ proved to be the only means, or instrument, or conditional cause of our salvation. And no other means besides faith alone, was taught by the doctrine of St. Paul to the ancient Romans.

The *fifth* branch, which I note in St. Paul’s doctrine, is this: that after he has thus established us in the certainty of our salvation through faith in Christ, then he vehemently exhorts us to **good works**, showing the true use and end of good works. This is, *first*, to show our obedience and dutiful service to God, who has done such great things for us. *Secondly*, to relieve our neighbors with our charity and kindness, just as God has been kind to us, His enemies. *Thirdly*, to stir up others by our example, to praise God, to embrace the same religion, and to do the same. For it is requisite, that just as God has been so merciful to us, and gracious in eternal gifts, we should likewise be merciful in temporal things. And seeing that it has pleased him of his Fatherly goodness to call us to so high a calling, to give the blood of his Son for us, to forgive us all our sins, to deliver us from this present wicked world, to make us citizens of heaven, indeed, His children more than servants — little then can we do, and well may we think those benefits are ill-bestowed, if we do not forgive our neighbors, and do not show something worthy of that holy calling with which he has called us, in mortifying our worldly lusts here, and pursuing heavenly things. And, *finally*, if being provoked with such love and kindness, we do not render back some love for love, some kindness for kindness, seeking how to walk in the steps which He has prepared for us to walk in, serving him (as much as we may), in holiness and righteousness all the days of our life. And though our obedience will always be imperfect, yet we should show obedience, as loving children to such a loving father.

And this is the reason why St. Paul so vehemently and urgently calls upon us to do good works: not that works should justify, but that we being justified so mercifully and tenderly through the grace of God, should not abuse his grace in vain. Rather, we should endeavor to our uttermost, to render our service back to Him, in such a conduct of life as may most make to His glory, and the profit of our neighbor. And though the words of our Savior seem, in some places, to attribute great rewards in heaven to our obedience and charity here on earth, that is of His own free grace and goodness to thus impute small matters for great deserts. And it is not for us to claim any reward thereby, or thanks from his hand, as if any there were any worthiness in our doings. This is no more than the servant can do, when he comes from the plough, and serving the cattle in the field, first serves his master at home, and waits upon his table. The master is not bound (says Christ) to thank his servant because he did the things that were commanded of him: “So likewise you,” he says, “when you have done all those things which are commanded of you, say, ‘We are unprofitable servants; we have done only what was our duty to do,’” Luk 17.10.

Again, here also is to be understood that where such rewards are ascribed to men’s deeds, it is not the worthiness of the deed itself, but the faith of the doer, which makes the work to be good in God’s sight. For if an infidel were to do the same work that the Christian does, it would be nothing but mere sin before God. Therefore, if the Christian man’s work is accepted, however small (such as to give a cup of cold water), it is only for his faith’s sake

Preliminary Dissertation

Difference between Roman Church Then, and Now

that God does it, and not for the work which is done. By this, again, we may learn how faith alone justifies a man, and that is in three ways: —

First, it justifies the person in making him accepted, and the child of God by regeneration, before he begins to do any good work.

Secondly, it justifies a man from sin, in procuring remission and forgiveness of the same.

Thirdly, it justifies the good deeds and works of man, not only in bringing forth good fruits, but also in making the same works to be good and acceptable in the sight of God, which otherwise would be impure and execrable in his sight.

Therefore, the offices of faith and of works are different, and must not be confounded. Faith goes before, and regenerates a man, and justifies him in the sight of God, both in covering his ill deeds, and making his good deeds acceptable to God — in a sense, climbing up to heaven, and there wrestling with God and his judgment for righteousness, for salvation, and for everlasting life. Works and charity *follow* faith. They are exercised here on earth, and have glory only before man, but not before God, in showing forth obedience both to God and to man. Our good works do not reach further than this, nor do they have anything to do in the judgment of God, regarding salvation. I speak of our good works (as St. Paul speaks of them in Romans 7). as they are ours, and imperfect. For if our works could be perfect according to the perfection of the law, as Christ wrought them in the perfection of his flesh — that is, if we could perfect them — then as it is said: “The man who does those things shall live by them,” Rom 10.5. But now, seeing that the weakness of our flesh cannot attain that, it follows that all glory of justifying is taken away from works, and transferred to faith alone.

And thus much concerning the principal contents of St. Paul’s doctrine. The church of the ancient Romans was first grounded and planted in this, and so continued, or at least it did not alter much during the primitive state of the church. Likewise, the later Romans should have maintained the same form of doctrine, and not have fallen away for any man’s preaching, but should have held him accursed — “even if he were an apostle or angel from heaven, teaching any other doctrine than that which we have preached to you ,” Gal 1.8. For so they were warned before to do by the apostle St. Paul. And yet, notwithstanding all this forewarning and diligent instruction by this blessed apostle of the Gentiles, what a defection of faith has fallen among the Gentiles, especially among the Romans, which the apostle also foretold them so long before, prophesying that the day of the Lord “will not come unless a falling away comes first, and the man of sin is revealed,” etc., 2The 2.3. This meant a departing and a falling from that faith which the Holy Spirit had then planted by his ministry among the Gentiles — as we see it has now come to pass in the church of Rome. That church has so gone from the faith that St. Paul taught, that if he were now alive and saw these things.

— the decrees and decretals of the bishop of Rome, these heaps of ceremonies and traditions, these mass-books, these festivals and legends, these processions, hymns, and sequences, these beads and graduals, and the manner of their invocation, their canons, censures, and later councils, such swarms of superstitious monks and friars, such sects, and so many diverse religions — the testament of St. Francis, the rule of St. Benedict, of St. Bridget, of St. Anthony, etc. — the intricate subtleties and labyrinths of the schoolmen, the infinite cases and distinctions of the canonists, the sermons in churches, the assertions in schools, the glory of the pope, the pride of the clergy, the cruelty of persecuting prelates with their officials and promoters —

Preliminary Dissertation

Difference between Roman Church Then, and Now

he would say this was not a defection, but rather a plain destruction and ruin of faith. Nor would he say that this was any true church of Christ, but a new-found religion, or rather paganism, brought in under the shadow of Christianity, in which remains almost nothing besides the name of Christ, and the outward form of his religion. The true vein and effect of it, however, is utterly decayed; as will soon appear to those who examine all the parts of this new Romish religion.

[25]

Except that they pretend the solemn form and words of the creed, and are baptized by confessing the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, in all other points, and in true sincerity of the Christian faith — which they profess only outwardly — they are utterly degenerated from that which St. Paul and the word of God had first taught them.

For they confess the Father in word, but they renounce his will as expressed in his word; they do not acknowledge his grace; they do not receive his benefits and promises given to us in his Son; they do not feel the vigor of his law; they do not fear the terror of his judgments; and they observe his commandments by traditions and commandments of their own.

Likewise they confess the name of Christ his Son in word, but in deed they deface and diminish his office; they do not seek his glory, but under his name they seek their own glory; they do not know the power of his blood and passion, for they neither admit that He is the head of his church alone, nor Savior alone, nor our only patron and advocate. Rather, they place him with the Virgin Mary and other patrons, so that almost every parish in Christendom has its peculiar patron, besides Christ.

In like manner, they confess the name of the Holy Spirit, but God knows how far they are from the comfort, knowledge, and taste of the Holy Spirit. This may well appear by their councils, by their expounding of Scripture, by their superstitious ceremonies, by their outward worshipping, and idolatrous invocation to stocks and stones, and to dead creatures, by their scrupulous observation of days, times, places, numbers and gestures; and no less also by their *doctrine*, which defrauds the poor hearts of simple Christians, of their due consolation, joy and liberty in the Holy Spirit. It keeps them in a servile bondage, and a doubtful uncertainty of their salvation, contrary to the working of the Holy Spirit of God.

And thus the church of Rome, only pretending the name of Christ and of his religion, is so far altered from the truth of what it pretends, that under the name of Christ, it persecutes both Christ and his religion. It works more harm to the church of Christ than the open tyrants and persecuting emperors among the heathen ever did. It is not unlike the old synagogue of the scribes and pharisees who crucified the Son of God in the name of God; and fought against the gospel under pretense of the law; and persecuted the children of Abraham under the title of Abraham's children. They destroyed the true temple of the Lord, boasting so highly of the physical temple of the Lord. So too, these pretended catholics in these days, after they raised up a catholic church of their own, and armed it with laws, and gathered a multitude of priests, prelates, abbots, priors, monks, cardinals, and also secular princes, to take their part — now, under the *name* "catholic church," they persecute the *true* catholic church. Still coloring their proceeding with the name of the Lord, they most cruelly put to death those who die for the name of the Lord, condemning them as heretics, schismatics, and rebels — those who deny no part of the creed which these catholics profess themselves, and whom they cannot convince by any Scripture — who will not join with their errors and heresies which are contrary to the honor of God, and truth of his word.

Preliminary Dissertation

Difference between Roman Church Then, and Now

And lest any think that our protest against the corrupt errors and manifold deformities of this later church of Rome proceeds more from rancor or affection, rather than being grounded on necessary causes and demonstration, my purpose is to take some little pains in addressing this. A little earlier, I collected the contents of ST. PAUL'S DOCTRINE, with which the old church of Rome was first seasoned and acquainted. ²⁸ So now, in a similar summary table, I will describe the particular branches and contents of the POPE'S DOCTRINE, so that all true Christian readers, comparing one with the other, may discern what great alteration there is between the church of Rome that now is, and the church of Rome that then was planted by the apostles in the primitive time. And to open to the simple reader some way by which he may better judge in such matters of doctrine, and not be deceived in discerning truth from error, we will first propound certain *Principles* or *General Propositions*. These are infallible rules or truths of the Scripture, by which all other doctrines and opinions of men may be tried and examined, as with a touchstone, ²⁹ to more easily judge whether they are true or false, and whether they contradict the Scripture, or not.

Twenty Biblical Principles.

1. Just as sin and death came originally by the disobedience of one to all men of his generation by nature, so righteousness and life came originally by the obedience of one to all men regenerated of Him, by faith and baptism, Rom 5.15.
2. The promise of God was freely given to our first parents, without their deserving, that the seed of the woman would bruise the serpent's head, Gen 3.15.
3. The promise was given freely to Abraham, before he deserved anything, that in his seed all nations would be blessed, Gen 12.3.
4. We must neither add to, nor diminish from the word of God, Deu 4.2.
5. Whoever does the works of the law, shall live by them, Lev 18.5; Gal 3.12.
6. Accursed is the one who does not abide in everything that is written in the book of the law, Deu 27.26; Gal 3.10.
7. God alone is to be worshipped, Deu 6.13; Luk 4.8; [Isa 45.6]
8. All our righteousnesses are like filthy rags, Isa 64.6.
9. In all my holy hill they shall not kill nor slay, says the Lord, Isa 11.9; 65.25.
10. God loves mercy and obedience more than sacrifice, Hos 6.6; 1Sam 15.22.
11. The law brings about wrath, condemns and exposes sin, Rom 4.15; 3.19-20.
12. Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to everyone who believes, Rom 10.4.
13. Whoever believes and is baptized, shall be saved, Mar 16.16.
14. A man is justified by faith without works of the law, freely by God's grace, and not of ourselves, Gal 2.16; Eph 2.8-9.
15. There is no remission of sins without shedding of blood, Heb 9.22.

²⁸ See above, those nineteen doctrinal points, reduced to five branches.

²⁹ *Touchstone*: a basis for comparison; a reference point or standard against which other things can be evaluated.

Preliminary Dissertation

Difference between Roman Church Then, and Now

16. Whatever is not of faith is sin, Rom 14.23. Without faith it is impossible to please God, Heb 11.6.

17. There is one mediator between God and man, Christ Jesus, 1Tim 2.5; And he is the propitiation for our sins, 1Joh 2.2.

18. Whoever seeks to be justified by the law, has fallen from grace, Gal 5.4.

19. In Christ all the promises of God are yes and amen, 2Cor 1.20.

20. Let every soul be subject to the higher powers (governing authorities), giving to Caesar what is Caesar's, and to God what is God's, Rom 13.1; Mar 12.17.

[26]

Just as no man can deny these principles and infallible rules of the Scripture, so if they are granted, the doctrine of the pope's church must be found not to be catholic, but rather full of errors and heresies. In the sequel, ³⁰ by the grace of Christ, this remains to be proved more expressly and particularly. For now, I proceed to give a summary account of the errors, heresies, and absurdities that are contained in the pope's doctrine, which are contrary to the rules of God's word, and the first institution of the church of Rome.

Doctrinal Errors of this Roman Church

OF FAITH AND JUSTIFICATION

First, as to the only means and cause of our justification, by which the merits of Christ's passion are applied to us and made ours, we saw before how St. Paul ascribes it only to faith. This appears in all his epistles, especially to the Romans, where he excludes all kinds of works, and ascribes all our salvation, justification, righteousness, reconciliation, and peace with God, only to faith in Christ. Contrary to this doctrine, the pope and his church have set up diverse and sundry other means of their own devising, by which the merits of Christ's passion (as they say) are applied to us and made ours, to the putting away of sins, and for our justification — such as hope, charity, sacrifice of the mass, auricular confession, satisfaction, merits of saints and holy orders, the pope's pardons, etc. So that, according to this teaching, Christ's sacrifice, stripes, and suffering do not heal us, however well we may believe, unless we also add these works and merits recited above. If this is true, then what Isaiah the prophet promises is false, "by his stripes we are healed," etc. (chapter 53.5.) At first sight, this error and heresy of the church of Rome, seems to the natural reason of man to be but of small importance. Yet if earnestly considered, it is indeed one of the most pernicious heresies that ever crept into the church. All or the greater part of the errors, absurdities, and inconveniences of the pope's church, are grounded upon this heresy, as their foundation. For once this is admitted, that a man is *not* justified by his faith in Christ alone, but that other means must be sought by our own working and merits to apply the merits of Christ's passion to us, there is neither any certainty left of our salvation, nor any end to setting up new means and merits of our own devising for the remission of sins. There has not been any heresy that has rebelled more presumptuously against the high majesty of God the Father, nor more perniciously injured the souls of the simple, than this doctrine.

First of all, it subverts the will and testament of God. For almighty God, of his mercy, has given us his Son to die for us. And with him, God has given his full promise that whoever believes in him will be saved by faith. He assigns no other condition either of the law or of

³⁰ Foxe uses *sequel*, throughout, to mean the aftermath of the things he lists, *i.e.*, their consequences.

Preliminary Dissertation

Difference between Roman Church Then, and Now

works, but only of faith, to be the means between his Son and us. However, these men take it upon themselves to alter this testament that God has set, and to add other conditions which the Lord in his word never appointed or knew. The words of Jerome's commentary on the epistle to the Galatians, may be well applied to them: "They make of the gospel of Christ, the gospel of men, or rather the gospel of the devil," etc.

Secondly, the Christian reading in the gospel, of the great grace and sweet promises of God given to mankind in Christ his Son, might thereby take much comfort of soul, and be at rest and peace with the Lord his God. But then comes the pestiferous doctrine of these heretics, with which they obscure this free grace of God, choke the sweet comforts of man in the Holy Spirit, oppress Christian liberty, and bring us into spiritual bondage.

Thirdly, in their impious doctrine, they show themselves to be manifest enemies to God's grace. And they are no less injurious to Christian men, whom they leave in doubtful distrust of God's favor and of their salvation, contrary to the word and will of God, and the right institution of the apostolic doctrine. And whereas they object to us, that we rather leave men's conscience uncertain, for if life (they say) were not a due reward, it would be uncertain. And to the extent that the due debt is *certain*, and mercy or favor is *uncertain*, we are therefore (they say) leaving men's consciences to the mercy of God, and in doubtful uncertainty of their salvation. To this I answer that due debt, if it is proved to be duly deserved by the law, it must be certain. But if the law proves it to be imperfect, or not due, then it is *not* certain, nor can there be anything duly claimed.

Now, regarding mercy, for so long as it remains secret in the prince's will, and is not known to his subjects, it is uncertain. But when this mercy is openly published by proclamation, ratified by promise, conferred by will and testament, established in blood, and sealed with sacraments, then this mercy no longer remains doubtful, but should be firmly believed by every true faithful subject. And therefore, to establish our hearts in this assurance, and to answer this doubt, in his epistle to the Romans, St. Paul teaches us, saying, "Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace, to the end that the promise might be sure to all the seed," Rom 4.16. Meaning by this, that works have nothing to do in this case of justifying, and he states the reason why: for then our salvation would stand in doubt, because in working, we are never certain whether our deserts are perfect and sufficient in God's judgment or not. And therefore (says St. Paul), with the intent that our salvation should be beyond all doubt, and certain, it does not stand by works in *deserving*, but by faith in *apprehending*, and by God's free grace in *promising*.

Fourthly, just as their sinister doctrine breaks this principle of Christian religion, that *a man is justified by faith without works*, so again, it breaks another principle repeated above. For this rule being granted, *that nothing is to be added to God's word, nor taken from it*, these men have done wickedly in adding (as they do) to God's word. For the word of God limits our justification to no condition but faith: "Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and you shall be saved, and your household," etc. Act 16.31. These men add other conditions besides, which the word excludes, such as hope, charity, the sacrifice of the mass, the work of the priest, auricular confession, satisfaction, meritorious deeds, etc. And thus much concerning the doctrine of faith and justification. By this it may appear to what horrible blindness and blasphemy the church of Rome has now fallen, where such false doctrine is not only permitted, but also publicly professed.

OF WORKS AND THE LAW

Preliminary Dissertation

Difference between Roman Church Then, and Now

As regarding the doctrine of good works and the law, we have seen before what the teaching of St. Paul was to the Romans. Although he excludes good works from the office of justifying, he does not exclude them from the practice and conduct of Christian life. Rather, he most earnestly calls upon all faithful believers in Christ to walk worthy their calling, to lay down their old conduct, to make their members servants of righteousness, to offer their bodies up to God as a living sacrifice, etc. The reformed churches follow his teaching, as their sermons, preachings, writings, exhortings, and lives bear record. Although they cannot say with Christ, “Which of you convicts me of sin?” yet they may say to their adversaries, whichever of you is without fault, cast the first stone of reproach against us. ^{Joh 8.7}

Regarding this part of doctrine, what the errors of the church of Rome are, remains to be stated.

First. Their first error stands in this: that misunderstanding the nature of good works, they call good works, not what are properly commanded by the law of God, but what are agreeable to the pope’s law — such as building abbeys and churches, giving to the high altar, founding trentals (paid requiem masses), finding chantries (endowments for singing masses), gilding images, hearing masses, going on pilgrimage, fighting for the holy cross, keeping vows, entering into orders, fasting vigils, creeping to the cross, praying to saints, etc. All of these are not only reputed to be good works, but they are so preferred above all other works, that pardon is given from the pope for these, double and triplefold, more than to any other good work of charity commanded in the law of almighty God.

[27]

Secondly. Another error too may be noted in the papists, regarding the efficient or formal cause of good works. Although they all confess in their books, that “the grace of God truly given” is the chief and principal cause of it, and works in us “the first justification” (as they call it), yet they refer the good works *after* regeneration to other subordinate causes, under God — such as free-will, or “a habit of virtue,” or “natural integrity,” and nothing at all to faith. Whereas faith alone, next under God, is the root and fountain of well-doing. In the fruits of a good tree, even though the planter or the husbandman is the principal agent, and some cause also may be found in the good ground, yet the *immediate* cause is the root that makes the tree fruitful. In like manner, the grace of God, in a soft, repentant, and mollified heart, plants the gift of faith. And faith, like a good root, cannot lie dead or unoccupied, but springs forth, and makes both the tree fruitful, and the fruit good. They would have no goodness in them, if not for the goodness of the root from which they spring. So St. Paul, though he had certain works in him before his conversion, yet had he no good works before the grace of Christ had rooted faith in him. So too with Mary Magdalene, the sinner, and Zaccheus the publican. So the nations of the Gentiles began to bring forth fruit, and especially good fruit, when they began to be ingrafted into Christ, and to receive the root of his faith. Their fruits before that were all damnable and unsavory. Therefore, regarding the *cause* of good works, there is no other cause in man but faith. Just as it is the office of faith to justify us in heaven, so the nature of it here on earth is to work by love, just as the root works by the sap. For as a man sees and feels by faith the love and grace of God toward him in Christ his Son, he begins to love again both God and man, and to do for his neighbor as God has done to him. And from this properly springs the running fountain of all good works and deeds of charity.

Thirdly, just as they err in the *cause* of good works, so they err much more in the *end* (the purpose) of the law, and of good works. For St. Paul teaches that the law is given to this use and end: to convict us of our transgressions, to prove us sinners, to show and condemn our

Preliminary Dissertation

Difference between Roman Church Then, and Now

infirmity, and to drive us to Christ. But they take and apply no other end to the law, than to make us perfect, to keep us from wrath, and to make us just before God! And likewise, where St. Paul proves that all our good works are imperfect, and he utterly excludes them from justifying, they contrariwise teach as though the end of good works was to merit remission of sins, to satisfy God, to deserve grace, and to redeem souls from purgatory — that by these things, the regenerate man pleases God, and is made just before God. For so they teach most wretchedly and horribly, saying that Christ suffered for original sin, or sins preceding baptism; but the actual sins which follow baptism, must be removed by men's merits. And so they assign to Christ the beginning of salvation, or obtaining the first grace (as they call it), but the perfection or consummation of grace they give to works and our own strength. Neither can they bear the doctrine that we are justified freely by the mercy of God through faith alone apprehending the merits of Christ. However, all papists do not agree in this error. For some make a distinction, and say that we are justified by Christ principally; and by the dignity of our own deeds, less principally. Others hold that we are made righteous before God, not by our works that go before faith, but by our virtues that follow after. Some again expound the saying of St. Paul this way: "We are justified by faith," (they say) — that is, by faith *preparing* us, or setting us in a good way to be justified. Others expound it as faith conjoined together with other virtues. Others expound the term *by faith*, as being formed with charity, etc. Thus, all these derogate from the benefit of Christ, and they attribute to works a great or the greatest part of our justification. This is directly against the true vein of St. Paul's doctrine, against first institution of the ancient church of Rome, and against all the principles of holy Scripture.

Fourthly, as to the doctrine of the law and good works, they err in misunderstanding the nature of the law and works. For where St. Paul argues that the law is spiritual, and requires perfect obedience of us, who being carnal we are never able to accomplish, they affirm otherwise. They say that the law requires only the *outward* obedience of man, and is contented with that. And (they say) man is not only able to perform this obedience, but also to do more and greater things than the law requires. From this arise the works of *supererogation*. There are also (they say) certain works of the law which do not pertain to all men, but are counsels left for perfect men, as matter for them to gain merit, and these they call "works of perfection," or "works of supererogation." They also add new devices to these, to serve God following their own traditions outside of the word of God — such as monastical vows, willful poverty, taking on different foods and garments, pilgrimages to relics and saints, worshipping the dead, superstitious ceremonies, rosaries, etc. with other such things. And these they call "works of perfection," which they prefer before the other works commanded in the law of God. They go so far, that in comparison to these, the other necessary duties commanded and commended by the word of God (such as holding office in the commonwealth, living in the godly state of matrimony, having the office of a servant in a household) are contemned, and accounted as profane in comparison to these.

OF SIN

They do not rightly teach about sin, nor do they follow the institution of the apostles, and the ancient church of Rome. They do not consider the deepness and largeness of sin, supposing it still to be nothing else but the inward actions with consent of will, or the outward actions that are against will; whereas the strength of sin extends not only to these, but also comprehends the blindness and ignorance of the mind, lack of knowledge and true fear of God, the untowardness of man's mind to God-ward, the privy rebellion of the heart against the law of God, the undelighting will of man to God and his word. The sense of flesh

Preliminary Dissertation

Difference between Roman Church Then, and Now

St. Paul also calls an enemy against God, and feels in himself, that is, in his flesh, nothing dwelling but sin.

Also, regarding the original sin in which we are born. This is the destruction of original righteousness, and of God's image in us (remaining in us, and bringing forth in us wicked thoughts, affections, and motions of sin against the law of God, and never ceasing so long as man lives). The pope's doctrine does not deny this original sin, yet it much extenuates it, and holds that this inward concupiscence, and these vicious affections, are not mortal nor damnable sins, and that this concupiscence in us is no depravation of the higher, but only of the lower parts of man. It is an indifferent thing, and no less natural in us than the appetite to eat and drink. And it remains in the saints after baptism, to be to them an occasion of more meriting.

OF PENANCE OR REPENTANCE

This later church of Rome has made a sacrament of penance, which they say consists of three parts: Contrition, Confession, and Satisfaction. Contrition (as they teach) may be had by strength of free-will, without the law and the Holy Spirit, through man's own action and endeavor. This *contrition* must be sufficient, and so it merits remission of sin. In *confession* they require a full reciting of all sins, by which the priest, knowing the crimes, may minister satisfaction accordingly; and this recitation of sins is said to deserve remission. *Satisfactions* they call "works not due," enjoined by the spiritual father. And this satisfaction (they say) takes away and changes eternal punishment into temporal pains, which are then mitigated by this satisfaction. And in turn, these satisfactions may be taken away by the pope's indulgence, etc.

[28]

This unsavory and heathenish doctrine of penance differs much from the true teaching of holy Scripture, which says that repentance properly contains three parts: contrition, faith, and new life. Scripture calls contrition the sorrow of heart, rising upon the consideration of the sin that was committed, and the anger of God that was provoked. This sorrow drives a man to Christ for succor, from which faith arises. Faith afterward brings amendment or *newness of life*,^{Rom 7.6} which we call new obedience, bringing forth fruits worthy of repentance.^{Luk 3.8}

THE LAW AND THE GOSPEL

There is nothing more necessary and comfortable for troubled consciences, than to be well instructed in the difference between *The Law* and *The Gospel*. But the church of Rome is much to blame for confounding those two things together, which are so diverse in nature, and contrary to one another. For example, confounding threatenings (the law) with promises (the gospel) — things temporal with things eternal— sorrowful things with glad tidings — death with life — bondage with freedom, etc. The church of Rome teaches the people that whatever the law says, the gospel confirms; and whatever the gospel says, it is agreeable to the law. And so they make no distinction between Moses and Christ, except that Moses was the giver of the *old* law, and Christ was the giver of the *new* and a more perfect law. And thus they imagine the gospel is nothing else but a new law given by Christ, binding to its promises the condition of our doings and deservings, no different than the old law. Accordingly, they divide the whole law into *three parts* — to wit, THE LAW OF NATURE, THE LAW OF MOSES, and THE LAW OF CHRIST. And as for the gospel, it is revealed for no other

Preliminary Dissertation

Difference between Roman Church Then, and Now

reason (they say), than to show the world more perfect precepts and counsels than were in the old law. They attribute JUSTIFICATION to the fulfilling of this law. And so they leave the poor consciences of men in perpetual doubt, and induce other manifold errors. They bring the people into a false opinion of Christ, as though He were not a remedy *against* the law, but came as another Moses, to give a *new* law to the world.

Furthermore, not distinguishing between the nature of the law and the nature of the gospel, they confound Moses and Christ together. Nor do they keep the time of the law, and the time of the gospel apart. St. Paul, however, brings in the law as a schoolmaster, ^{Gal 3.24} and limits its time until Christ. He says that Christ is the end of the law; ^{Rom 10.4} that is, where the law ceases, Christ begins; and where Christ begins, the law ends. Those of this Roman church, on the other hand, make out the law to have no end or ceasing, but give it immortal life and a kingdom equal with Christ, so that Christ and the law reign together over the soul and conscience of man. *This is untrue*; for either Christ must give way and the law stands, or else the law (I mean the condemnation and malediction of the law) must end, and Christ reigns. For both of these, Christ and the Law, grace and malediction, cannot reign and govern together. But Christ the Son of God, who once died, can die no more, but must reign forever. This is why the law with its strength, sting, and curse must cease and have an end. And this is what St. Paul says, speaking of the triumph of Christ — that ascending up he led captivity captive, and has set man at liberty; ^{Eph 4.8} not at liberty to live as the flesh lusts, nor freeing him from the use and exercise of the law, but only from the dominion and power of the law. So that “there is now no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus, who do not walk after the flesh, etc.” Rom 8.1, 4. And in another place, St. Paul speaking of the same power and dominion of the law, says that Christ “Blotting out the hand-writing of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to the cross,” Col 2.14. So that, as the kingdom of Christ first began upon the cross, even so — upon the same cross, and at the same time — the kingdom of the law expired. And the malediction of the law was so crucified upon the cross, that it shall never rise again, to have any power against those who are in Christ Jesus. As St. Paul says, it is like a woman who is discharged from her first husband who died, and has married another man. The first husband no longer has power over her, Rom 7.2. In the same way, being espoused to Christ, (our second husband) we are utterly discharged from the law (our first husband). “We are no longer under the law, but under grace” (Rom 6.14), that is, we are no longer under the dominion and malediction of the law; but we are under grace, that is, under perpetual remission of sins, committed not only before our baptism, but after baptism as well, and all during our lifetime. For the grace of God properly consists in not imputing sin to us, so often as the repenting sinner, rising up by faith, flies to Christ and apprehends God’s mercy and remission promised in him. This is according to the testimony of the Psalmist, “Blessed is the man to whom the Lord imputes no sin,” Psa 32.2, etc.; and also of “all the prophets, who witness that through His name, all who believe in him will receive remission of their sins,” as St. Peter says, Act 10.43.

This being so, and it cannot be denied, what need is there for these private and extraordinary remissions to be brought into the church by ear-confession, by meritorious deeds, and by the pope’s pardons? For if there is no condemnation except by the law, and if this law itself, which was the first husband, is made captive, crucified, abolished, and departed, then what condemnation can there be to those who are in Christ Jesus, or by whom would it come? If there is no condemnation, but a free and general deliverance for all men, gotten once by the victory of Christ from the penalty of the law, ^{Rom 6.10} then what need is there for any particular remission of sins to be sought at various times at the priest’s

Preliminary Dissertation

Difference between Roman Church Then, and Now

hands or the pope's pardons? Whoever has a *general* pardon, needs no *particular* pardon. If remedy for sin is general and perpetual, once gotten forever for all those who are in Christ Jesus, then what need is there for any other remedy by auricular confession?

If it is *not* general and perpetual, then how is it true when St. Paul says that the law is crucified, and condemnation is abolished? Or how does redemption stand perpetual and general, if remission is not general? For what else is redemption, if not remission of sin, or sins bought out (paid for)? Or what else does it mean to kill the law, if not to discharge us from condemnation forever? The one who delivers his friend out of his enemy's hand for a time does him good; but if he kills that enemy, once out of the way, he gives his friend perpetual safety. So too, if remission of sins by Christ were for *some* sins, and not for *all* sins, then the law must still live. But the killing and crucifying of the law imports full and absolute remission, and that our safety is perpetual. But here someone will object, How is remission of sins certain and perpetual, seeing that new offences, being committed daily, require new remission daily? I answer that although sins do grow daily, by which we must daily desire God to "forgive us our trespasses," yet notwithstanding, the *cause* of our remission stands ever one and perpetual. Nor is it to be repeated anymore, nor is any other cause to be sought besides that alone. This cause is the body of Christ sacrificed once upon the cross for all sins that either have been or ever shall be committed. Besides this cause there is no other that remits sins, neither confession nor men's pardons.

Furthermore, just as the *cause* is one and ever perpetual, which works remission of sins for us, so the promise of God is ever one, once made, and it stands perpetual, offering remission to the faith of the repenting sinner. And because the promise of God is always sure and cannot fail, which offers remission to all those who believe in Christ — limited neither to time nor number — we may therefore boldly conclude that whenever a repenting sinner believes, and by faith applies to himself the sacrifice of Christ, he has by God's own promise, the remission of his sins, whether they were done before or after baptism.

Moreover, the promise of God offers remission to the repentant sinner by no other means or condition but one, which is by faith in Christ. Therefore, excluding all other means and conditions of man's own working, we say that whatever repenting sinner believes in Christ, has already in himself (and need not seek any priest) perpetual assurance of remission — not for this time or that time only, but *forever!* For the promise does not say that whoever believes in Christ will be pardoned *this* time, so he sins no more; nor does it say that the law is stayed or the sentence reprieved.

[29]

But it says plainly that the law, with her condemnation and sentence, is itself condemned and crucified, and will never rise again for those who are in Christ Jesus, and it promises remission of sins, without limitation, "To all who believe in His name," etc. Act 10.43. Likewise in another place, the Scripture, speaking absolutely, says, "Sin shall not have dominion over you." And it adds the reason why, saying, "Because you are not under the law but under grace," Rom 6.14 — thus adding this lesson: not that sinners should sin more because they are under grace, [but the promise is made] only that weak infirmities might be relieved, broken consciences be comforted, and repenting sinners be preserved from desperation, to the praise of God's glory. For just as God does not forgive sinners because they would sin, neither does our infirmity of falling diminish the grace of Christ, but rather illustrates it. As it is written, "My strength is made perfect in weakness," 2Cor 12.9. And again, "Where sin abounded, grace abounded much more," Rom 5.20.

Preliminary Dissertation

Difference between Roman Church Then, and Now

In remission of sins, therefore, these four things must concur together: *first*, the cause that works (which is the sacrifice of Christ's body); *secondly*, the promise that offers; *thirdly*, faith that apprehends and applies; and *fourthly*, the repenting sinner who receives. And although sins grow daily, which provokes us to I crave remission daily. Yet, regarding the *cause* that works the remission of our daily sins, and the means which apply that cause to us, these remain always one and perpetual. Besides them, no other cause or means is to be sought by man. So that to those who are repenting sinners, and in Christ Jesus, there is no law to condemn them, even though they have deserved condemnation. But they are under a perpetual kingdom, and a heaven full of grace, with remission to cover their sins and not to impute their iniquities, through the promise of God in Christ Jesus our Lord.

And therefore the doctrine is wicked and impious of those, *first*, who seek any other cause of remission than the blood of our Savior alone; *secondly*, who assign any other means to apply the blood-shedding of Christ to us, besides faith alone; *thirdly* and especially, who limit and restrain the eternal privilege of Christ's passion, as though it served only for sins done without and before faith, and that the rest that are committed after baptism, must be done away by confession, pardons, and deeds of satisfaction. And all of this arises because the true nature of the law and the gospel is not known, nor the difference rightly considered between the times of the one and of the other. Neither, again, do they make any distinction between the *malediction* of the law, and the *use* of the law. And therefore, whenever they hear us speak of the law (meaning the *malediction* of the law) being abolished, they maliciously slander us, as though we spoke against the good exercises of the law, and gave liberty to carnal men to live as they like. More will be said about this (by the Lord's grace) as place and time hereafter require.

OF FREE-WILL

Concerning free-will, it may perhaps be admitted that in some cases, men without grace may do some outward functions of the law, and keep some outward observances or traditions. It may also be admitted that, as to things which are spiritual and pertain to salvation, the strength of a man who is not regenerate by grace, is so infirm and impotent, that he can perform nothing well, neither *doing* nor *willing* well. After he is regenerated by grace, he may work and do well, and yet there still remains a great imperfection of the flesh, and a perpetual conflict between the flesh and the spirit. ^{Gal 5.17} And thus the original church of the ancient Romans was first instructed. From this we may see how far this later church of Rome has degenerated, which holds and affirms that men without grace may perform the obedience of the law, and prepare themselves for grace by working, so that those works may be meritorious, and obtain grace by congruity [with the law]. This grace, being obtained, men may then (they say) perfectly perform the full obedience of the law, and accomplish those spiritual actions and works which God requires. And so those works of condignity *deserve* everlasting life. As for the infirmity which still remains in our nature, they do not regard it nor once speak of it.

OF INVOCATION AND ADORATION

Besides these uncatholic and almost unchristian absurdities and departures from the apostolical faith, let us consider the manner of their invocation — not to God alone, as they should, but to dead men — saying that saints are to be called upon as mediators of *intercession*; and Christ as the mediator of *salvation*. And they affirm, moreover, that Christ was a mediator only in the time of his passion. This is repugnant to the words of St. Paul, writing to the old Romans in Rom 8.34. He speaks of the intercession of Christ, and says, "He is on the right hand of God, and also makes intercession for us," etc. And if Christ is a

Preliminary Dissertation

Difference between Roman Church Then, and Now

mediator of salvation, then why do we need any other intercession of the saints for our petitions? For once salvation is had, what more can we require? Or what more does a believer want to be obtained by other saints, who is sure to be saved only by Christ? And then in their devotions, if salvation belongs only to Christ, why do they teach us to pray to the blessed Virgin this way: “Save all those who glorify You” — unless they purposely study to appear contrary to themselves?

To this also pertains the worshipping of relics, and the false adoration of sacraments; that is, the outward signs of the things signified. Add to this also, the profaning of the Lord’s Supper by using it contrary to the use for which it was ordained — in storing it after the communion (in the *sacristy*), in selling it for money, and falsely persuading both themselves and others, that the priest derives merit for himself as the speaker, and also for the one who hears it, by merely partaking of the elements, even without having devotion in him (faith). ^{1Cor 11.29}

OF SACRAMENTS, BAPTISM AND THE LORD’S SUPPER

Regarding the sacraments, their doctrine is likewise corrupt and erroneous.

First, they err falsely in the number; for where the institution of Christ ordains but two, they have added five other sacraments.

Secondly, they err in the use; for where the word has ordained those sacraments to excite our faith, and to give us admonitions about spiritual things, they contrariwise teach that the sacraments not only stir up faith, but also that they avail and are effectual *without* faith, as we find in the writings of Thomas Aquinas, Scotus, and others.

Thirdly, they fail in the operation and effect of the sacraments, where contrary to the mind of the Scriptures, they say that the sacraments give grace, and not only signify, but also contain and exhibit what they signify — to wit, grace and salvation. ³¹

Fourthly, they also err in application, by applying their sacraments both to the living and the dead, and also to those who are absent, for remission of sins, releasing pain, etc.

They are to be reprov'd in the sacrament of baptism, not only for adding to the simple words of Christ’s institution diverse other new found rites and the fancies of men, but also where the use of the old church of Rome was only to baptize men, they also baptize bells, and apply the words of baptism to water, fire, candles, stocks and stones, etc.

But especially in the Lord’s Supper their doctrine most filthily swerves from the right mind of the Scriptures, from all order, reason and fashion, and is most worthy to be driven out of all Christian churches. Regarding this sacrament, the first error is their idolatrous abuse by worshipping, adoring, censing, knocking, and kneeling to it; also in storing and carrying the elements about with pomp and procession in towns and fields. Secondly, also their teaching is monstrous in the substance of it: they say there is no substance of bread and wine remaining, but only the real body and blood of Christ, making no distinction between *calling* and *making*. Because Christ *called* the bread His body, they say he therefore *made* it his body; and so they make a perilous idol of a wholesome sacrament.

[30]

And what the old church of Rome always took to be a *mystery*, they turn into a blind mist of mere incidentals to blur the people’s eyes, making them believe they see what they do not

³¹ The reformed view is that the sacraments are indeed a means of grace, but only through faith, not of themselves.

Preliminary Dissertation

Difference between Roman Church Then, and Now

see, and not see what they do see; and to worship a made thing as their Maker, a creature for their Creator. What was threshed out of a sheaf of wheat, they set up in the church and worship as a savior. And when they have worshipped “him,” then they offer him to his father. And when they have offered “him,” they eat him up, or else close him tight in a pit (the sacristy) where, if “he” corrupts and putrifies before he is eaten, then they burn him to powder and ashes, despite knowing full well by the Scriptures, that the body of Christ can never corrupt and putrify. Yet for all this corruption, they need to make it the body of Christ, and burn all those who do not believe what is against true Christian belief, Act 2.27.

OF MATRIMONY

The order and rule which St. Paul set for marriage is manifest in his epistle to the Corinthians where, as he prefers single life in those who have the gift of continence (celibacy) before the married estate, so again, in those who do not have the gift, he prefers the married life before the other, willing every such man to have a wife, to avoid fornication, 1Cor 7.2. Furthermore, the apostle allows a bishop to be the husband of one wife (so he did not follow the practice of the Jews, who were permitted to have many), and he vehemently reproves those who restrain marriage, as his Epistle to Timothy records, 1Tim 3.2 and 4.1-3. Moreover, what degrees (blood relations) are permitted by the law of God to marry, is to be seen in Lev 18.6-20. Also, it is apparent by manifest examples in the Scriptures, how children ought not to marry without the consent of their parents.

Contrary to these ordinances of the Scripture, the new catholics of the pope’s church repute and call marriage a state of imperfection, and prefer single life, however impure, pretending that where the one replenishes the earth, the other fills heaven. Furthermore, through compulsory vows they keep nearly a third of Christendom from marriage (if not more), both men and women, having no respect whether they have the gift of continence or not. Those ministers and priests who are found to have wives, they not only remove from office, but also pronounce sentence of death upon them, and account their children illegitimate. Again, they exempt and suspend as much as a third of the year from the liberty of marriage; they extend the degrees of forbidden marriage further than the law of God ever did, even to the fifth or sixth degree. Notwithstanding, they waive this degree whenever they choose, in return for money. Over and besides all this, they have added a new-found prohibition of spiritual kindred — that is, those who as have been gossips, or are godfathers and godmothers together in christening another man’s child, must not marry together. And finally, in this doctrine of matrimony, they gain and rake in much money for themselves from the people; they augment horrible crimes; they nourish adultery; they fill the world with offences; and give great occasion for murdering infants [of banned marriages].

OF MAGISTRATES AND CIVIL GOVERNMENT

We have seen before what rules and lessons St. Paul gave to the old Romans concerning magistrates, to whose authority he would have all human creatures be subject, and how they are the ministers of God, having the sword given to them, with which they ought to repress false doctrine and idolatry, and maintain what is true and right, Rom 13.1-7. Now let us survey a little the pope’s proceedings, and mark how far he transgresses in this (as he does in almost all other points) from true Christianity.

1. The pope, with all his clergy, exempt themselves from all civil obedience.
2. They arrogate to themselves authority to ordain and constitute, without leave or knowledge of the magistrate.

Preliminary Dissertation

Difference between Roman Church Then, and Now

3. Indeed, they take it upon themselves to depose and set up rulers and magistrates whom they choose.

OF PURGATORY

The paradoxes, or rather the fancies of the later church of Rome concerning purgatory, are monstrous; they are neither old nor apostolical.

1. They say there is a purgatory, where souls burn in fire after this life.
2. The pain of purgatory does not differ at all from the pains of hell, except that it has an end; the pains of hell have none.
3. The painful suffering of this fire frets and purges away the sins committed before in the body.
4. The time of these pains endures longer in some, less in others, as their sins deserve.
5. After the time of their pains is expired, the mercy of God translates them to heavenly bliss, which the body of Christ has bought for them.
6. The pains of purgatory are so great, that if all the beggars in the world were seen on the one side, and but one soul in purgatory on the other side, the whole world would pity that one more than all the others.
7. The whole time of punishment in this purgatory must continue till the fires have thoroughly fretted and purged away the rusty spots of every sinful soul burning there, unless some release comes.
8. The helps and releases that may shorten the time of their purgation are the pope's pardons and indulgences, sacrifice of the altar, dirges and trentals, prayer, fasting, meritorious deeds out of the treasure-house of the church, alms and charitable deeds of the living, in satisfying God's justice for them, etc.
9. Lack of belief in purgatory, will bring that person to hell.

Many other false errors and great deformities, heresies, absurdities, vanities, and follies, besides their blasphemous railings and abuses, may be noted in the later church of Rome, in which they have manifestly departed from the old faith of Rome. These include depriving the church of one kind of sacrament; in taking from the people the knowledge and reading of God's word; in praying, speaking to the people, and administering the sacraments in an unknown language; in mistaking the authority of the keys; in their unwritten tenets; in making the authority of the Scripture insufficient; in the untrue judgments of the church and the wrong notes of those proceedings, in the supremacy of the See of Rome, and in their wrong opinions about antichrist.

But because these, with all other parts of doctrine, are comprehended more copiously and at large in other books which are published in our days, both in Latin and English, I will not travel further in this. Especially seeing that the contrariety between the pope's church and the church of Christ, between the doctrine of the one and the doctrine of the other, is so evident, one must be blind not to see it, and have no hands not to feel it.

For the doctrine of Christ is altogether spiritual, consisting wholly in spirit and truth, and it requires nothing outward to make a true Christian man, except baptism (which is the outward profession of faith), and receiving the Lord's Supper. Let us examine the whole religion of this later church of Rome, and we will find from top to toe, that it consists in nothing but outward and ceremonial exercises — such as outward confession, absolution at

Preliminary Dissertation

Difference between Roman Church Then, and Now

the priest's hand, outward sacrifice of the mass, buying pardons, purchasing obits (burial rites), worshipping images and relics, pilgrimages to this place or that, building churches, founding monasteries, outward works of the law, outward gestures, garments, colors, choice of foods, observing times and places, ^{Gal 4.10} peculiar rites and observances, set prayers and a prescribed number of prayers, fasting vigils, keeping holidays, coming to church, hearing a service, external succession of bishops, and of Peter's See, external form and notes of the church, etc

[31]

Summation

So that, to make a true Christian and a good catholic by this religion, no working of the Holy Spirit is required. For example, to make this matter plainer, let us here define a Christian man according to the pope's making, by which we may better see what is to be judged from the scope of his doctrine.

According to the pope's catholic religion, a true Christian man is thus defined: first, it is to be baptized in the Latin tongue (where the godfathers profess they know not what); then confirmed by the bishop; the mother of the child is to be purified. After the child is grown in years, he is to come to the church to keep his fasting days; to fast during Lent; to come under the priest's blessing (confess to the priest); to do his penance; to take his rites at Easter; to hear mass and Divine service; to set up candles before images; to creep to the cross; to take holy bread and holy water; to go on procession; to carry his palms and candle, and to take ashes; to fast in the ember days, rogation days,³² and vigils; to keep the holidays; to pay his tithes and offering days; to go on pilgrimage; to buy pardons; to worship his Maker over the priest's head; to receive the pope as his supreme head, and to obey his laws; to have his beads, and to give to the high altar; to take orders if he will be a priest; to say his matins, to sing his mass; to lift up fair (the vestment); to keep his vow, and not to marry; when he is sick, to be absolved and anointed, and take the rites of the holy church; to be buried in the church-yard, to be rung for; to be sung for; to be buried in a friar's cowl; to find a soul-priest, etc.

All of these things being observed, who can deny that this is a devout man, and a perfect Christian catholic, and sure to be saved, as a true, faithful child of the holy mother church?

Now, look at this definition, and tell me, good reader, what faith or spirit, or what working of the Holy Spirit is required in all this doctrine? May the grace of our Lord Jesus give the true light of his gospel to shine in our hearts. Amen.

³² *Rogation days: one of the three days before Ascension Day; observed as days of supplication.*