

Monergism

THE LAW AND THE GOSPEL RECONCILED

THE EVANGELICAL FAITH AND THE MORAL LAW:
HOW THEY STAND TOGETHER IN THE STATE OF GRACE

HENRY BURTON

Monergism

THE LAW AND THE GOSPEL RECONCILED

THE EVANGELICAL FAITH AND THE MORAL LAW:
HOW THEY STAND TOGETHER IN THE STATE OF GRACE

HENRY BURTON

The Law and the Gospel Reconciled

or The Evangelical Faith and the Moral Law:

How They Stand Together in the State of Grace

A treatise demonstrating the perpetual relevance of the Moral Law under the Gospel for believers, in response to a letter penned by an Antinomian, a faithful Christian. Additionally, it establishes how the moral essence of the 4th Commandment endures in the Lord's day, affirming the Christian Sabbath through divine institution.

Preface: In this catalogue, we delve into the doctrines of the Antinomians, authored by Henry Burton.

1 TIMOTHY 1:5 The objective of the Commandment is charity stemming from a pure heart, a good conscience, and genuine faith.

"As the wheel turns within a wheel, so does the law exist within Grace, and adherence to the law forms part of the divine path of mercy."

Ambrose, De Jacob, etc., Book 2, Chapter 11.

LONDON, Printed by J. N. for Thomas Slatter, and available at his shop in Blackfriars. 1631.

Table of Contents

[To the High and Mighty Prince, Charles](#)

[To the Reader](#)

[The Law and the Gospel Reconciled](#)

[Positions held by the Antinomians and similar Libertines and sectaries, along with their usual evasions and distinctions.](#)

To the High and Mighty Prince, Charles,

by the grace of God, King of Great Britain, France, and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, etc.

Gracious Sovereign, this small treatise humbly seeks your Royal Patronage on two grounds: firstly, from its author, your long-standing servant who owes all he is to your Majesty, and secondly, from the work itself. This work serves as a defense of God's Moral Law against the Antinomian Libertines of our time, who deny believers any further use of it. What subject can more justly claim your Majesty's protection than the Moral Law, given your title as Defender of the Faith and your entrusted role as the keeper of both

Tables? Fulfilling this trust not only brings honor to the Supreme Lawgiver, who has appointed you as His Vicegerent to ensure His laws are upheld but also acts as the main support for the safeguarding and stability of your royal Throne.

The contemplation of this responsibility, especially when I witnessed these lawless individuals undermining the King's Throne, stirred my zeal for both God and your Majesty, compelling me to write this simple treatise. Denying the continued relevance of the Moral Law for believers, or that it serves as a guide for their conduct, or that they owe it obedience as a matter of duty and conscience, strikes at the very core not only of Christian charity but also of civil society and the harmonious relationship between King and Subjects, Head and Members.

Firstly, it removes the guidance for the proper worship of God, as commanded in the first Table. Secondly, it eliminates the framework for all Christian and civil duties among individuals, regardless of their social standing, as mandated in the second Table. All this is accomplished with a single stroke by severing the connection between believers and the Moral Law. In particular, these Antinomians nullify the requirement of dutiful and conscientious obedience to Princes, as grounded in the fifth Commandment. In this commandment, Kings, as the principal Parents of our Country, are accorded the highest honor and obedience in the Lord, just as children show respect to their Father.

On the other hand, they dismantle the boundaries that God Himself established to contain the authority of Kings. When their hearts, like rivers of water in the hand of the Lord, are kept within these boundaries, they refresh the land on every side with their benevolent rule. However, if they were to step outside the confines of God's

sacred laws, how swiftly might they overflow and inundate all? Thus, the wise and benevolent God, mindful of the well-being of both Kings and their people, charged the King of Israel to always have a copy of the Law by his side, to read it day and night, to learn from it the fear of the Lord his God, to walk humbly among his brethren, and to administer justice and judgment. This was done so that his days in the Kingdom, as well as the days of his descendants, might be prolonged in the midst of it.

However, these lawless Antinomians, enemies to God, Kings, and States, seek to deprive Christian Kings of this blessed Book of God's Law. Their aim, if they could strip Kings of the grace and fear of God in their hearts and loosen the reins of honesty and conscience, would be to establish a government according to the desires of man rather than the laws of God. This would inevitably lead to the downfall of Princes and Commonwealths. Remove God's Law, and what human law can bind the conscience, either in matters of obedience or command?

Even among the heathen, it has been a fundamental principle that human laws, particularly those ratified by solemn oaths and covenants between Prince and people, were considered sacred and inviolable. The Medes and Persians had such a law, exemplified in the case of Daniel, where the King's writing and seal were held unalterable. The foundation of all these laws, however, rested on the innate knowledge they possessed of God's eternal Law, which was inscribed in their hearts, either accusing or excusing them. They understood that God would punish those who violated laws, oaths, and covenants that aligned with His Law.

This innate understanding was the strongest bond that united the political Head and Body, making the society invincible, perpetual,

and glorious. However, these lawless individuals seek to disband it. They reveal their true parentage, aligning themselves with that lawless one whose motto is "We will and command" (Volumus et iubemus). This motto was first adopted by Boniface III, who usurped the Papal Headship over the Church, rejecting all laws of God and man, and becoming the great Beast described in the Book of Revelation. Such a ruler recognizes no bounds or limits set by law or reason, considering it beneath his tyrannical greatness to be constrained by any laws, oaths, or covenants, no matter how just or sacred.

May the Lord Jesus bless your Majesty, enabling you to trample this Antinomian heresy, both its progenitor and its followers, beneath your sacred feet. May you reign over your people tenderly, like a caring father over his children. Your primary concern should be the maintenance of God's pure worship without contamination and the administration of justice and judgment. These two principles constitute the essence of both Tables and serve as the foundation of the King's Throne. May the Lord defend your Throne against all Antinomian and Anomian influences.

In this treatise, I have also occasionally proven the divine institution of the Lord's day, our Christian Sabbath, which has been denied by some. Your reign has been graced with a righteous law for the observance of this sacred day of Christ. I trust that my defense of its divine institution will contribute significantly to the better enforcement of this Christian law in both the Court, City, and Country. This will purify our society from profanity and enhance the development of Christian virtues in Your Majesty and Your people. It remains, and shall always be, my daily and dutiful prayer.

Your Majesty's loyal subject and devoted servant, Henry Burton.

To the Reader:

Christian reader, although this treatise may appear superfluous to some, as it defends what no good Christians deny, it is worth considering the prolific rise of various heresies in these recent times. Among them, the Antinomian heresy, a most pernicious sect, is not the least. This heresy denies any further use of the Moral Law to believers, not even as a guide for their conduct or as a duty to be adhered to. Moreover, many pseudo-Christians readily embrace this libertine doctrine, which unleashes licentiousness, as both the proponents and followers of this Antinomian heresy, the Sons of Belial, clearly demonstrate in their lawless and graceless lives. Finally, it is essential to recognize that this Antinomian faction, as an enemy of true faith and the power of religion, is a friend to all other heresies currently in circulation, particularly to Popery. It serves as a pathmaker for them by tearing down the walls of the City of God, thus providing an easier entry for Rome's Trojan Horse, filled with treacherous devices and cunning engineers, to replace God's Ark. I hope you will not consider my efforts in writing this brief treatise to be in vain, nor your time wasted in reading it. Although there is little hope that those deeply immersed in this sweet yet deadly poison will readily accept any antidote or preventative measure, as they are intoxicated with the spirit of delusion, and many of them may have been justly abandoned by God to a reprobate mind, having turned away from the truth of the Gospel that they once acknowledged, I am confident that, by God's grace, this treatise will serve to preserve sound and sincere-hearted Christians in the true faith of Jesus

Christ. They will not be led astray by these purveyors of error, and perhaps it may even lead back to the path of truth those honest-hearted, unsuspecting souls who have been deceived by them.

I must, however, forewarn you that I have altered my initial intention mentioned on the fourth page of this treatise. I had promised to provide the full copy of the letter that prompted this treatise. I have since changed my mind for several reasons. Firstly, the copy is quite lengthy. Secondly, I have already presented the substance of that letter in detail throughout this tract. Thirdly, in its place, I have added, as a related topic, a short discourse on the Sabbath day. Some have recently challenged the morality of the Sabbath, arguing that it is not binding on Christians for the observance of the Lord's day and that its divine institution is denied. Therefore, if I have not fulfilled my promise regarding a matter of little necessity and of minor significance, please forgive me. I believe I have made amends by adding something of far greater importance and benefit. If in some respects, I have not fully satisfied your judgment concerning the Sabbath law and the divine institution of the Lord's day in place of the Jewish Sabbath, I intend to provide further clarification shortly, by God's grace. I will present a more comprehensive treatise specifically written in response to a recently published book that seeks to negate the Lord's day as the Christian Sabbath and return us to the Jewish Sabbath day. This work will be all the more necessary because this advocate for Jewish Sabbatarianism has already found many idle and easily swayed Christians to embrace his book. He writes with a confident and assertive spirit, as if his arguments are invincible. In the meantime, please enjoy this treatise and pray for me. Pray that God will assist me in that greater work and in all matters that concern His glory and the welfare of His Church. Farewell.

Yours in Christ Jesus, Henry Burton.

The Law and the Gospel Reconciled

The Evangelical Faith and the Moral Law in the State of Grace, in response to a letter from an Antinomian to a faithful Christian.

That which holy Jude considered so crucial to write and exhort believers to embrace, all true Christians should readily receive: the earnest defense of the faith that was once delivered to the Saints. This is what the Apostle emphasized to the Philippians when he said, "Only let your conduct be worthy of the Gospel of Christ, so that whether I come and see you or am absent, I may hear of your affairs, that you stand fast in one spirit, with one mind, striving together for the faith of the Gospel." Indeed, this is the only thing worth contending for, and it should be done with fervor. Just as the two mothers before King Solomon pleaded over the living child, though it was mortal and a sinful offspring, so should the true Church of God assert her rightful claim to that which brings immortality—the blessed fruit and offspring of living faith.

But how can we determine who has the true living faith? One says, "Mine is the living faith, and yours is dead." Another argues, "No, yours is dead, and mine is living." Therefore, just as Solomon's wisdom resolved the dispute by giving the living child to the true mother, the true Church, to whom living faith rightfully belongs, can only be determined by the sword of the Spirit, Christ's Word, who is greater than Solomon. This faith is delivered to none but the Saints.

It is not surprising to hear the whore of Babylon, the old Romish beldame, claim the living faith as her natural child. She has long obscured it in the night of profound ignorance and complacency, burying it under her unwieldy body, swollen with countless human traditions that have replaced divine truth. As a result, it has become lifeless and strangled. On the other hand, she accuses the reformed Church of possessing dead faith because she teaches justification by faith alone, without works. Yet, it is truly astonishing that some sons of our mother Church would be so unnatural and unreasonable. They impudently, though cunningly, pretend to align with the doctrine of the Church of England while accusing her of having dead faith. They do this despite the fact that the Church of England teaches not only justification by faith alone but also the doctrine and practice of sanctification, viewing it as both a fruit and a duty springing from the same faith.

In addressing this impious and senseless reproach against our mother Church, we can simultaneously silence the wide mouth of Mother Babylon, which accuses us of destroying sanctification by teaching justification by faith alone, and the impudent voices of those who claim that we undermine the justification of true living faith. By God's grace, we will either convince these individuals to abandon their dead faith or make it clear to everyone that the dead faith of Belial or Baal is with them, while the living faith is exclusively on our side.

Now, the reason we have taken on this task is as follows: there is a newly arisen opinion, which, not only in this city but also in some parts of the country, is spreading like a cancer or gangrene, infecting many with a schismatical spirit. It not only turns their minds away from our congregations and ministers but also opens their mouths against them. They ridicule and discredit even the most sound and

sincere preaching of the word of God. They deny any use of the moral law as a guide for life and Christian conduct once a person becomes a believer in Christ. They allow the law no further purpose than to serve as a schoolmaster to bring us to Christ, and then they bid farewell to the law. When ministers preach and emphasize the duties of sanctification, these Antinomians oppose them and even insult them to their faces. They call them Anabaptists and accuse them of preaching a dead faith, asserting that such teachings are good for nothing but leading people to Hell.

For my part, I would not have believed that such blasphemy existed in the world if I had not heard it with my own ears. To provide further evidence of this, so that it becomes evident to others (in addition to other writings that the leaders of this Antinomian or lawless sect of Belial convey and distribute among their disciples), a letter written by the chief ringleader's hand, but signed with the name of one of his prime female disciples and sent to a certain Mr. T., should suffice to reveal their malicious intentions to the world. The copy of the letter is included here verbatim, although I have chosen not to mention the party's full name, only using the first letters of her name. I am withholding the Master's name, who is the originator and writer, altogether. I follow the example of Holy Jerome, who, when writing against the Pelagians, said, "No man's name is particularly touched in this small work; we have spoken against the Master of a perverse opinion. If he shall be angry and write again, he shall, like the mouse, be betrayed by his own discovery and expose himself to even greater criticism in a well-prepared confrontation." I would also like to warn the reader regarding this letter, as well as others of a similar nature that I have seen. While it contains poison, it is administered in a golden cup, concealed beneath obscure and cloudy words, and sweetened with scriptural phrases. This enables the disciples to drink it down with

less suspicion and more delight, and it gives just adversaries less reason to object or quarrel, and cast blame on the author.

This approach, where heretics use obscure language and private teaching to propagate their ideas, was also noted by Jerome. In addressing the Pelagians, he said, "Thou knowest what thou teachest thy disciples privately, expressing one thing with thy mouth and concealing another in thy conscience. To us, who are strangers and none of thy disciples, thou speakest in parables. But to thine own scholars, thou unfoldest thy mysteries." He further stated, "This only is heresy, which blushes to speak in public what it fears not to teach in private. The rage of the scholars reveals the silence of the Masters. That which they have heard in the chambers, they preach on the house tops. If it pleases their hearers, it may be attributed to the praise of their Masters. If it displeases, the fault may lie with the scholars, not the masters." Therefore, Jerome argued that heresy thrives when it is spoken plainly, allowing its true nature to be revealed. To disclose one's opinions is to subdue them.

Now, let me appeal to the consciences of the disciples of such Masters as we speak of. Do they not deliver their teachings and lessons more plainly and clearly in their private sessions or chambers, verbally, than they do or dare to do publicly in their loose papers and pamphlets? Let them tell me how they differ from the Pelagians in their manner of introducing and propagating their beliefs, as noted by Jerome. This is the nature and practice of all heresy, which moves with a double gait, like a serpent, and, like a snail, extends its horns slowly to test the waters but quickly withdraws them at the slightest resistance. It acts like a juggler, playing tricks before an audience, or like false fame, which, for fear, is cautious at first but, once it spreads, finds credibility and acceptance in the world.

However, the discerning reader shall discover that this letter is not entirely smoothly woven; it has many knobs and knots of gross error. Such unevenness exposes a poisonous mind and a virulent spirit in the author. He belongs to the category of those who, having a form of godliness, deny its power. From such people, one should turn away. They are the kind who creep into households and captivate foolish women laden with sins, led astray by various lusts, always learning but never able to come to the knowledge of the truth. Just as Jannes and Jambres resisted Moses, these individuals also resist the truth. They are men of corrupt minds, reprobate concerning the faith. But they will not proceed any further, for their folly will be evident to all, just as it was with Jannes and Jambres. The full verification and exemplification of all this in the author we are dealing with will be abundantly evident in this discourse, reinforced by his own handwritten work.

Because the letter is lengthy, responding to every detail would burden our discourse with many unnecessary and unprofitable matters. Therefore, I will summarise the entire content into a concise overview and focus on the key points that the author emphasises and where he places the main strength of his argument. First, I will gather his scattered skirmishes and bravadoes, which I find divided into two distinct categories.

The first is his boast, where he presents his cause with many specious and glorious titles. He attributes it to God's gracious calling, claims it as the true lively justifying faith (a phrase he repeats often), describes it as of the household of true faith, calls it the most holy and heavenly calling into the true lively justifying faith, refers to it as the gracious leavening of the Gospel, considers it the effectual calling to true Christianity and assured free salvation, calls it the leaven that represents Christ's perfect holiness, and asserts that it is the good

and old way walked by Abraham. He claims that it is the established Protestant doctrine of the Church of England, grounded upon the Word of God, and states that everyone should embrace it to be a loyal subject to the Protestant King. He insists that it is the Protestant faith and the established doctrine of the Church. He likens himself to a true Prophet amidst a multitude of false Prophets. He claims that he and a few others adhere to the right path to the truth of the Gospel. Those who call people to a cheerful, zealous, godly life solely through the joy and excellence of free justification belong to this group. He emphasizes that they deeply consider the application of the law purely and truly. These are the true ministers of Christ, and those who follow them are the true believers. They are the ones who bring in the true means of true sanctification and the performance of all good works. These are the true teachers who genuinely establish the law. They are the only true ministers, and their followers are the only true people of God. He claims that every point of this doctrine can be proved with two or three plain scriptures and two or three plain testimonies of Orthodox Protestant writers. These glorious embellishments adorn his leaden cause, which will soon be put to the test.

The second company that the author engages with throughout his letter consists of the reproaches he hurls at all those who oppose his opinion. I will present them in order as they appear:

1. He accuses those who assert the contrary of having a sinful prejudice against God's truth.
2. He labels it as blasphemous to challenge the true lively justifying faith.
3. He claims that such individuals are overly influenced by the sour leaven of devout Pharisees, similar to the false brethren among the Galatians who corrupted the faith of the Galatians.

4. He argues that their supposed conceited holiness in keeping the moral law is actually a dangerous Pharisaical leaven, disguised as sincerity and obedience to God, but essentially hypocrisy.
5. He asserts that Christ's wedding garment is now under fierce opposition and sly betrayal, akin to Judas' kiss.
6. He characterises these times as perilous when people are constantly learning but unable to attain true assurance of their free salvation. He even suggests that there is almost no faith left on Earth because, before God, dead faith is not considered faith. It may be adorned with a zealous but misguided zeal and an opinion of obedience to God's commandments, which, according to the author, is nothing more than hypocrisy.

Furthermore, the author contends that the opponents of his opinion are promoting another Gospel. He claims that this blind, zealous dead faith thinks it possesses knowledge, yet it truly knows nothing as it should. He insists that many false teachers, especially in times of God's punishment, proliferate. These individuals not only advocate for their own obedience, works, and good deeds but also malign and accuse those who preach another Gospel. According to the author, there are two kinds of these bad teachers:

1. The first type, he describes as evil beasts and sluggish gluttons. They preach primarily for their livelihoods and their own comfort and worldly esteem. They produce believers who, trampling on free justification and the Gospel's precious pearls, care only for earthly matters, prioritising their own desires and appetites.
2. The second type, while deluding themselves and others in dead faith, have a stronger sense of natural morality. He draws from Romans 2:14-15, which speaks of Gentiles who, without the law,

do by nature the things contained in the law. These teachers varnish their natural morality with Gospel terminology, leading to a preposterous zeal for God's glory but a disregard for faith and free justification. They preach neither true law nor true Gospel, but a blend of both, causing many to rely on their holiness, works, and deeds. This, in turn, results in constant turmoil in people's consciences.

The author argues that these misguided teachers either burden people with a false sense of sanctification or lead them towards Anabaptistical practices, making them falsely believe in obedience to the law. Such individuals, driven by vain glory, attack true ministers and believers with calumnies, slanders, and persecutions, falsely accusing them of being against sanctification and good works. In the author's view, these false teachers are akin to Christ's "dog-Christians." He asserts that they are, in words and deeds, the greatest destroyers of the law and that their self-righteousness is grievous disobedience, their sanctification leads to double sin, and their worship, highly esteemed by men, is idolatrous and an abomination before God. The author concludes by warning readers to beware of this blind, zealous, dead faith and not to settle for a mere intellectual understanding of free justification.

So far in his skirmish, you may observe how he magnifies himself as the only true Prophet, opposed by many hundreds of false Prophets. He categorizes these adversaries, along with their followers and various congregations, into two groups: one as a herd of hogs and the other as a kennel of dogs. He constructs the universal body of the Church of England from these two groups, asserting that God has allowed such ministers of the blind dead faith to plague it, as is his habitual manner of expression. In summary, he portrays the Church and nation of England as an accursed Isle of hogs and dogs.

Additionally, despite these allegations, notice how subtly he attempts to validate his doctrine by insinuating its alignment with the established doctrine of the Church of England and its consonance with that doctrine. Consequently, he places it under the King's protection (a nefarious piece of policy and practice), even though it necessarily implies that the Defender of the faith is no better than one of his hoggish or doggish Christians. On the contrary, he strives to vilify all his opponents, branding them as enemies of the King and State in their teachings (a common tactic employed by heretics throughout history). This includes all Ministers in the Court, City, and Country, as well as Courtiers, Citizens, and Countrymen who do not follow this man and his presumed true lively faith.

Let's proceed to his main battalion, which he organizes into three squadrons. He formulates the state of the doctrine as three Propositions, referring to them as his three Protestant positions:

The first position asserts that the repulsiveness of sin to God's infinite, pure, and righteous nature is so profound that God cannot help but abhor, curse, and detest any creature tainted by sin, as taught in scriptures such as Deuteronomy 27:26, 2 Peter 2:4, Romans 5:12,15, Isaiah 59:2, and Job 15:16.

The second position declares that, to remedy this misery caused by sin, God mystically but genuinely clothes the believer with the wedding garment of His Son's perfect holiness and righteousness. Through this imputation, all sins, both personal and in works, are truly abolished, not from the believer but from God's perspective. This allows room for faith, and all believers are rendered just and righteous in God's sight, free by faith alone, without works. Faith alone sees and enjoys this. Healing comes through Christ's stripes, and believers find favour and peace with God. They are truly blessed

and shall ultimately be glorified. These teachings are supported by scriptures like Isaiah 43:25, 44:22,23, John 1:29, Hebrews 1:3, 9:26, 1 John 1:7, Revelation 1:5,6, Daniel 9:24, Romans 3:21,22, Romans 5:17,18,19,21, Ephesians 5:26,27, Revelation 3:18, Colossians 1:22,23, Romans 8:4, Colossians 2:10, Romans 9:30, Hebrews 10:14, Isaiah 62, Philippians 3:8,9, Titus 1:15, and Hebrews 11:4.

The third position asserts that this true faith in free justification infallibly kindles the heart with genuine love, leading the true believer to abandon and mortify their former corrupt and profane conduct. This faith produces declarative obedience, readiness for every good work, and a free and joyful adherence to all of God's commandments in dealings with others, constituting true sanctification. These teachings are corroborated by scriptures like 1 Timothy 2:11 to 15, 1 John 3:5,6,9, Ephesians 2:10, Romans 6, Ephesians 4:22,23,24, and Matthew 5:16. This is the Protestant faith, and it aligns with the established doctrine of our Church. These are the three positions that, in his own words, the woman-Disciple received recently, causing her transformation from blind zealous dead faith into true lively justifying faith.

You now have his three Protestant positions, as he calls them, presented word for word. An impartial reader, even a sound Protestant, perusing this text without knowledge of the author's intentions beyond what is expressed here, might initially consider it harmless and sound doctrine. However, upon considering how all these positions, though Protestant in nature, stand in opposition to the doctrine generally taught by the most sound, learned, and orthodox Divines in England, and indeed, around the world, one may begin to suspect that there is more to it than meets the eye.

Regarding the first position: Which Protestant Divine does not affirm and teach that sin is profoundly abhorrent to God's infinite, pure, and righteous nature, and that it renders a person detestable in God's sight? Witness the bitter and cursed death of God's Son, which He endured for the sake of sin. Without this sacrifice, we would all remain under the curse, condemned to eternal perdition as just punishment for sin. So, in this regard, the author's accusations against his adversaries, his hogs and dogs, lack substance. This first position serves merely as an introduction to the rest or as a prelude, shaping the reader's expectations for the subsequent content. However, we shall soon discover that the author is merely deceiving, much like a person showing a single piece of genuine gold from their purse to convince someone that it is filled with such treasures when, in fact, the rest consists of counterfeit coins.

As for the second position: Which Protestant Minister of the Church of England, regardless of their rank, whether counted among his hogs or dogs, does not uphold and teach that the only remedy for man's sin-induced misery is found in Jesus Christ, His death, passion, active and passive obedience, and His entire righteousness freely imputed by God to every true believer? Who among them does not believe in justification by faith alone, apart from works? They all affirm that those whom God justifies, He acquits by completely abolishing their sin. He no longer remembers it, casting it behind His back, and not imputing it to them, all through His grace for His Son's sake. So, what need is there to accumulate so many scripture references, as if no one else had ever noticed them? Or as if his doctrine were so obscure or doubted that it required such an array of proofs.

However, some aspects of this position require further discussion. Firstly, where he claims that all sins in believers are utterly abolished

from God's sight because they are not imputed. This is indeed true. Yet it reminds me of something I heard long ago attributed to this very author, namely, that God sees no sin in His children. This aphorism, when adopted by the general populace, may instill presumptuous thoughts and resolutions devoid of a sense of sin in those who do not believe. Therefore, this point warrants further clarification. It is true that God does not see any sin in His believing children for which He imposes the curse or any punitive penalty upon them. For instance, when Balak sought to have Balaam curse God's people, Balaam responded, "How shall I curse whom God hath not cursed?" He then referred to God's immutability, stating that He is not like a man who would lie or change His mind. Balaam continued by explaining that God had not seen iniquity in Jacob nor observed perverseness in Israel. The Lord their God was with them, and the shout of a King was among them. There was no enchantment or divination against Jacob or Israel because Christ had borne Israel's sin, and God, as the Judge, had fully punished it. His justice had been satisfied for all of Israel's debts. Consequently, now that everything had been satisfied and discharged in our surety, with Christ's righteousness and satisfaction made ours, God no longer sees sin in His believing children in the role of a judge who must punish them. Nevertheless, He may be said to see it as a father who disciplines them. When God disciplines His child, it might appear as though He perceives their sin, even though it has been obliterated in Christ and forgiven in God's court. The purpose of this discipline is to allow the child to acknowledge their sin, thereby receiving the assurance of pardon sealed within their conscience's court. This understanding aligns with the teachings and beliefs of all sound Protestant Ministers.

A second thing I notice in his second position is, if not an absurdity, yet an obscure speech: his words are, "All my sins, both of my person

and works, are truly abolished, not out of me: that there may be a place for faith." Why? Are sins abolished actually by imputation, before faith is wrought, that the abolishing of sin makes way for faith? True it is, Christ has taken away our sins and by death abolished death, before we have faith to apply it; for our faith is from the merit and virtue of his death. Otherwise, I know not what sense to make of his words; unless he means that faith alone takes place in the believer, working and doing all infallibly and freely (as he expresses elsewhere) without the Law of the Ten Commandments.

I note a falsehood in it: for he says, "All my works are unjustly made just before God." What these works are, I find in other of his scattered pamphlets: namely, all natural, civil, religious, sanctified actions, which being in themselves (as he says) foul and filthy, are made perfectly holy and righteous by free justification. Now, this is a thing both impossible and unjust for God to do. It is impossible for God to make a work that is unjust to be just. Indeed, Antichrist arrogates this omnipotent, or rather impotent power, as derived from God, to make *ex iniustitia iustitiam*, righteousness of unrighteousness. But God's omnipotence does not stretch to making an unjust work to be just. For then, he might seem to be both improvident and unjust in appointing his Son to take away sin by the sacrifice of himself, in case God could have made sin no sin by his mere omnipotence. Indeed, God can make a thing cease to be, or he can make a thing be, which had no being, as he did the entire world. But he cannot so abolish a thing as to cause its former existence not to have been after it has once actually been. So, of a wicked work; God is so powerful, so good, so just, that he cannot make wickedness to be good, for that implies a contradiction. But he can and does abolish the wickedness of our works by Christ, by not imputing them, as if it had never been. But to say, "our works are unjustly made just," this is a phrase not used in scripture, and in the Antinomian's

sense, it tends to the introduction of a heavenly state of perfection in this life. For he would infer from this that a man once in Christ, justified, is altogether without sin in God's sight, abusing that passage from John, 1 John 3:6, 9, where he concludes that the justified man not only cannot sin but also abstains from all appearance of evil. These are his very words. And hence, that cursed heresy of the Pelagians and Pontificians is revived by the Antinomians, that there is such perfection in this life, that a man may live altogether without all sin: for all his sins of unrighteousness are made just, says he. The nomination of which is a sufficient refutation. For in many things, we all sin (James 3:2). And if we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us (1 John 1:8).

I note another falsehood when he says, "By faith only, without works, freely, I am perfectly holy and righteous from all spot of sin in the sight of God." And why? Because "only true faith sees this, and only true faith enjoys this." How? Are we justified by faith freely because only true faith sees this? What if true faith, while during the time of some temptation, the exercise of it is suspended, do not see, nor enjoy the fruit of justification? Must we, therefore, pass sentence upon ourselves that we are not justified? No, certainly. We are, therefore, justified from all sin because God, not imputing sin, sees no sin in us, and not because we see and enjoy our reconciliation and peace with God. For though God is continually pacified towards his faithful children in Christ, yet they do not always, by the act of faith, see and enjoy God's favour towards them. This was David's case, and is and may be the case of every child of God. Yet whenever we do see and enjoy our justification, by having peace with God through Christ, we do, by the eye and apprehension of faith, see and enjoy it. But our seeing and enjoying it is not the cause that we are justified but the consequent effect and fruit of it, being apprehended by faith.

For his 3rd Position, therein stand his Trinitarian forces; here his files are so doubled, and the ranks are so close, that it seems to be impregnable, impenetrable. But however, they stand thick without, yet they are thin and hollow within, so that being but once divided by a wedge, they are no longer able to hold the field. Therefore, observing it well, I find several advantages to be taken. First, from his commendation of faith in its efficacy, that it infallibly inflames the heart with true love, making the true believer break off his former corrupt conversation, etc. Secondly, that he uses one word twice, namely, Declarative, obedience Declarative, and a free and cheerful walking in all God's will and Commandments declaratively toward mankind. This may seem to some to be either idle or a riddle, but we shall explain the mystery of it shortly. In the meantime, all this in his 3rd position appears to be nothing more than sound and orthodox doctrine, in accordance with the Scriptures and, therefore, with the doctrine of our Church if there is no more to it than what the outer surface suggests. For what Protestant Church, or what sound Protestant in our Church, does not teach or believe that the most noble and divine grace of true, saving, and living faith infallibly (to use his own word) inflames the heart with love, leading the true believer to renounce and mortify his former corrupt and profane conduct and producing a declarative obedience and readiness for every good work, as well as a free and cheerful walk in all God's will and Commandments declaratively toward mankind, which is true sanctification? In this, we all agree. So where is the difference then? Yes, but the author comes later in the same position, and (although he claims that these positions are the Protestant faith and the established doctrine of our Church) he proclaims a defiance against the blind, zealous, dead faith as being entirely opposite to his true, lively, justifying faith. And whose is this dead faith? Who teaches it? Who embraces it? It is embraced by the universal body of our Church, which he divides into two sides, the left side consisting of

profane, sensual individuals, and the right side of zealous Anabaptistical individuals, as he calls them. Now, if it is the case that generally, all those Protestants he labels as dogs and hogs actually hold the very same doctrine in truth as the author sets down in words, and yet theirs is the blind, zealous, dead faith, and his is the truly lively, justifying faith: it is essential for us to examine his words more closely to see if some hidden meaning is concealed within them. It is worth considering whether he has not been entirely candid or ingenuous (as may be reasonably suspected from his vehement and erratic language), but has kept certain reservations as precious pearls. If he were to reveal them among so many hogs and dogs, as he lives among, he might justly fear that one group would trample them underfoot, and the other would turn against him and tear him apart. But now, it has come to the point of determining whether he or we possess the true, living, justifying faith. He must allow us, by necessity (since we have a warrant from God), to conduct a thorough search and examine his hidden treasures to determine whether he possesses this Pearl of the Kingdom or not. We are not engaged in this merely out of faith towards God as Christians, but also out of fidelity and loyalty to our King, the Lord's Anointed, as subjects, because he challenges all men to embrace this doctrine of faith, which he alone, the Doctor per se, teaches.

So, what is the main difference between us that makes his faith the only true, lively, justifying faith, and ours the blind, zealous, dead faith? Certainly, it lies in this; his faith is so lively, active, vigorous, potent, perfect, and complete that it produces all the fruits of sanctification by itself, without having any association with the Word of God, especially the moral law, as a guide for our actions or as a mirror of our imperfections. On the other hand, we acknowledge that our faith, even at its best during this life, is not so perfect and complete but requires the continual supply of the holy oil of God's

Spirit of grace to make it shine even brighter in the works of sanctification. This grace of the Spirit is administered and supplied to us through the Ministry of the Word of God, like the oil pipe through which it flows. Since, in the state of grace and faith, we only know in part and prophesy in part, and thus our faith is imperfect, mingled with ignorance, we have need of the Moral law. Both the Old and New Testaments serve as a comprehensive commentary on this law. It serves as a rule to shape our thoughts, words, and actions, as well as a mirror in which we can see the imperfections of our souls. Through this, we can cleanse ourselves in the fountain of Christ's blood and make straight paths for our feet, so that which is lame is not turned out of the way but is healed. This is the perfect law of liberty, and whoever continues in it and does not forget it but acts upon it will be blessed in their actions (James 1:25). This is the mirror in which we behold the glory of the Lord and are transformed into the same image, from glory to glory, by the Spirit of the Lord. So, we do not hold that there is a state of perfection in faith during this life, as if our faith could accomplish everything by itself and did not require a daily supply of grace, which is obtained through the Word of God, whether it be preached, read, meditated upon, or discussed. It is also obtained through prayer, as we pray, "Lord, increase our faith." However, our adversary completely disregards the law, deeming it irrelevant to a true believer and of no use whatsoever, not even as a guide for life and conduct. According to him, his lively faith does everything and has no need for the Word of God to direct or assist it.

Now, this is the essence of his doctrine concerning his lively faith, as you can gather from his own words: "faith infallibly inflames the heart with true love, making the true believer break off his former corrupt conversation," and so on. The word "infallibly" implies that faith continuously and uninterruptedly inflames the heart with love

to perform all works of sanctification, and thus, it has no need for God's word as a guiding rule. Instead, the spirit takes the place of the word. However, you might say that this is not explicitly stated in the letter. True, but you must understand that this is the doctrine he privately imparts to his disciples. In one of his scattered writings, I found these words: "This faith of free justification causes us to walk infallibly in the steps of the works of our father Abraham, whereby, like Abraham, freely without the law of the Ten Commandments, we walk holily, righteously, and soberly in all God's Commandments declaratively to mankind." He even contested with me on this matter and accused me of preaching dead faith. He asserted to me that after a person is enlightened by faith, the spirit guides them so that they have no need for the word or the Moral law as a rule to direct them. This doctrine is so commonplace among his disciples that they openly profess it and take pride in it, showing no hesitation or reservation. This is one of the characteristics of his lively faith, that it has no need for the Moral Law to guide its conduct or in the works of sanctification. Otherwise, it cannot be considered true lively faith, nor can this be true sanctification.

A second characteristic and privilege of his lively faith is that it owes no obedience to the Moral Law in terms of duty. He denies that the works of sanctification are duties. So, what are they then? Fruits, he says. We agree that they are fruits, but also duties. Here lies the difference. Because we assert that the fruits of faith are duties, he claims that our faith is dead. He has vehemently declared this to my face, as is his manner. Although he has not expressed this explicitly in this letter, perhaps being cautious about what he reveals publicly, especially after being challenged by me and others and finding it difficult to answer certain arguments (promising to answer them when they are put in writing), you can still infer this from his writing. He only calls the obedience of a believer "declarative" and to be done

"declaratively" towards mankind. Take note of this. The term "declaratively to manward" excludes any duty towards God. Otherwise, why use the terms "declarative" or, even more so, "to manward"? All obedience in conduct is declarative, and all declarative actions are directed towards mankind. Thus, all this man's obedience is directed towards mankind in terms of declaration but not towards God in terms of duty. If it were an obedient response to God's law, then his faith would also be considered dead. The prerogative of his true lively faith lies in the fact that it neither turns its gaze to the moral Law to learn obedience from it nor acknowledges any obligation to obey it as a duty to God.

On the contrary, because we maintain and teach that the Moral Law, and therefore God's word, serves not only as a guiding rule for sanctified obedience but also demands a cheerful yet dutiful conformity from the faithful, we are called "Hogs" or "Dogs," "Hogg-Christians," or "Dogg-Christians," accused of holding blind, zealous, dead faith. This is the state of the debate between us regarding living and dead faith, and we are now ready to engage in this discussion.

First, we all agree on both sides that the true lively faith is none other than what the Scriptures teach and approve as genuine justifying faith. Having established this agreement, I argue as follows:

That faith, which the Scriptures teach and approve as genuine justifying faith, is the true, lively, justifying faith, and nothing else.

But the Scriptures teach and allow only this for the true, lively, justifying faith: the one that rests solely on Christ for justification through the imputation of His righteousness. Nevertheless, it regards the Moral Law of God as a rule for Christian conduct and sanctification. It acknowledges conformity to it as a duty that God requires from every true believer. This is in accordance with Luke

1:74-75, which states, "That we, being delivered from the hands of our enemies, should serve Him," and so on.

Therefore, this faith, and no other, is the one that the Scriptures teach and approve as the true, lively justifying faith.

The Proposition is undeniable. I prove the Assumption. First, from the very giving of the Moral law on Mount Sinai. It was given in, by, and under Christ the Redeemer. As the Apostle says, it was given "in the hand of a Mediator," which Mediator was Moses in person but typified Christ. Moses served as a type and figure of Christ. Christ was the heavenly Pattern or Antitype according to which all those things were delivered to Moses on the Mount. This includes not only the Ceremonial Law but also the Moral Law given by Christ Himself. When He said, "I am the Lord thy God, which hath brought thee out of the Land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage," He established the Law. The words, "I am the Lord thy God, which hath brought thee out of the Land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage," serve as a preface to the entire Decalogue or Ten Commandments. They introduce the Author of these commandments to us not only by His name Jehovah but also through the close relationship of the Covenant of grace made to us in Christ. It says, "Thy God." This Covenant of grace made in Christ underlies the giving of the Law. It's evident because the words in the preface not only recount the temporal deliverance of that people from Egyptian bondage but, more importantly, the mystery of the Redemption of all the true Israel of God through Christ. This includes their spiritual liberation from the bondage of sin and Satan. This is clear, though few observe it. The Paschal Lamb was slain, and its blood was sprinkled on the doorposts of every Israelite. The Angel passed over them, the first-born of Egypt were slain, and God's first-born were delivered. All of this prefigured Christ as the Lamb slain from the foundation of the

world. The passages of God's people from Egypt to Canaan came to them in types, as the Apostle says. Among other types, two significant ones are relevant here: first, Christ's ascension, and second, the sending of the Holy Ghost. In the Exodus story, it is noteworthy that on the 40th day after their departure from Egypt, Moses, Aaron, and Hur ascended the Mount. Moses, the Prophet; Aaron, the Priest; and Hur, the Prince (interpreted as such), together represented Christ, who, on the 40th day after His resurrection, ascended to the Heavenly Mount. There, as our Prophet, Priest, and Prince, He upholds the hands of His intercession for His Church while she battles spiritual Amalek—Sin, Satan, Antichrist, the World, the Flesh, and more. The other type I note occurred just 10 days later, making it 50 days in total, counting from Egypt. This event was the giving of the Law on Mount Sinai and was celebrated by the Jews as Pentecost. On the day of Pentecost, exactly 50 days after Christ's Resurrection and 10 days after His Ascension, the Father and Christ sent the Holy Ghost with His manifold gifts and graces. The Holy Spirit was sent to guide His people into all truth and to fully reveal the Law of Christ to them. Thus, the type and the reality are one and the same thing for the faithful people of God, serving the same purpose. Although they differ in the manner of administration and the extent of revelation, they do not differ in the substance itself. Christ is the substance of both. Consequently, we clearly see that the Moral Law given on Mount Sinai was given by Jehovah our God in Christ the Redeemer and under the Covenant of grace. It was given to the Israel of God in the Old Testament, and the descent of the Holy Ghost in the New Testament fully corresponds to it. In essence and use, they are one and the same Law. Although they differ in administration and extent of revelation, they do not differ in substance. Christ is the substance of both. Therefore, the Moral Law given on Mount Sinai, as given by Jehovah our God in Christ the Redeemer under the Covenant of grace, and provided to the Israel of

God in the Old Testament to which the descent of the Holy Ghost in the New Testament fully corresponds, remains a perpetual rule for a holy life for all of God's people until the end of the world. By the way, an irrefutable argument is derived from this to prove the perpetual observance of the Sabbath until the end of the world, against all those who oppose it. This is because the Sabbath was given under the Covenant of grace to be observed. However, we will leave further discussion of this point to the choice of all, as bringing it up here may interrupt the main matters at hand.

Objection: But the Apostle says, "The law is not of faith." How then can the Law be given under faith?

Answer: In that context, "the Law" refers to the first Covenant, namely, the Covenant of works given to Adam in Paradise during his state of innocence. This Covenant has no connection with the faith associated with the second Covenant, which is the Covenant of grace. However, when we speak of the Law as given on Mount Sinai, with the literal veil removed, it was not presented as the first Covenant but as a guide for the conduct of the faithful under the second Covenant.

Objection: But the Apostle describes the giving of the Law on Mount Sinai as the first Covenant in contrast to the second, just as Hagar is contrasted with Sarah, the bondwoman with the free, Sinai with Zion and Jerusalem.

Answer: The Apostle makes this comparison only in terms of the literal and deadly understanding of the Law, to which the carnal Jews were enslaved. Those who did not look to Christ the Redeemer, the One who led His people out of spiritual Egypt and bondage, sought to justify themselves through the works of the Law. This is a position that Saint Paul vehemently opposes in his letter to the

Galatians. However, to believing Jews, the Moral Law was nothing other than the gentle yoke and light burden of Christ. They saw Him as the Redeemer of His people through His innocent blood, which atoned for all their violations of the Law and fulfilled the Law on their behalf. The contrast between the Law given on Mount Sinai and that on Mount Zion exists only in terms of the letter versus the spirit, as explained in 2 Corinthians 3:6. The carnal Jews were unable to discern the essence of the spirit beneath the external letter. Alternatively, one could view this contrast as a comparison of the two Laws, with one excelling the other in terms of manner and extent of revelation, as mentioned in 2 Corinthians 3:10. The learned and discerning Calvin commented on Galatians 4:24, stating that the freedom of the Jews was concealed beneath the veil of ceremonies and the entire system of the Law by which they were then governed. While it may have seemed that only servitude was apparent in external appearances, the godly fathers who lived under the Old Testament had, as their true mother, the spiritual Jerusalem, which is free. Hence, it was the blindness of the Jews, combined with the veil covering the mysteries of the Mosaic Law, that made the Law given at Sinai appear to be nothing more than the Covenant of works established with Adam in his state of innocence.

Question: Here, it may be asked, what are the primary differences between the first Covenant and the second?

Answer: There are several fundamental differences between the two Covenants.

1. The first Covenant relied on human works, while the second depended on God's grace. These two, in terms of justification, are diametrically opposed to each other (Romans 11:6).

2. The first Covenant was established with Adam and all his descendants universally, whereas the second was made exclusively with Abraham's seed, often referred to as the woman's seed in Genesis 3:15. This includes Christ and all the Elect (Romans 4:1).
3. The first Covenant was built upon human righteousness, while the second is based on another's righteousness, namely, Christ's righteousness, which becomes ours through imputation.
4. The first Covenant relied on the changeable will of humanity, leading to its swift violation. In contrast, the second Covenant is grounded in the unchanging will, good pleasure, and eternal purpose of God Himself. Therefore, it can never be broken, as it is an everlasting Covenant.
5. The first Covenant was purely a covenant of justice without mercy, whereas the second is a covenant that combines justice and mercy. Justice is fulfilled by Christ, and mercy is extended in and through Christ to all the Elect.
6. The first Covenant revealed no other reward to the first Adam, who was of the earth, except for what was confined to the earthly Paradise. Conversely, the second Covenant opens the gates to the Kingdom of Heaven in Christ, the second Adam, who is the Lord from Heaven, for all the Elect.

These and similar differences between the first Covenant and the second, when carefully considered and compared, will clearly demonstrate that the Law given under Christ the Redeemer on Mount Sinai was not the first Covenant of works. In addition to the aforementioned reasons, there is mention of God's mercy in the second Commandment and the promise of the land of the living,

symbolizing the Kingdom of Heaven in Canaan, in the fifth Commandment. Such mercy and the promise of the kingdom were not included in the first Covenant of works. Therefore, the first proof of our Assumption, which states that true justifying faith, although it relies solely on Christ's righteousness for justification, regards the Moral law as a rule of Christian conduct and acknowledges obedience to it as a duty required of every true believer.

The second proof can be found in Matthew 5, where our Master Christ, in His divine sermon on the Mount, expounds upon the Moral law. He provides a commentary to His disciples and all faithful listeners, offering guidance on the duties of sanctification and Christian conduct. He presents this law as a rule to be followed and states that their righteousness must exceed that of the Scribes and Pharisees for them to enter the Kingdom of Heaven. However, it remains a mystery how Christ can be accused of preaching a dead faith, while His faithful Ministers, who preach the same doctrine, are censured for promoting the blind, zealous, dead faith and are labelled as dogs.

Although Christ preached and emphasised the Moral Law as a guide for Christian obedience and even referred to it as righteousness, He did not teach or imply that this righteousness would justify believers in the sight of God. He also stated that, after fulfilling all the commandments, believers should still consider themselves unprofitable servants merely doing their duty. Despite preaching the same doctrine as our Master Christ, we are unjustly criticised as "Doggs" for preaching a dead faith.

The third proof comes from the exquisite form of prayer prescribed by Christ in Matthew 6:12, where He teaches us to pray, "Forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors." All sins are debts to God, and

all sins are violations of the Moral Law. Therefore, keeping the Moral Law is a debt we owe to God. This proposition is Christ's, and the assumption is the Apostle's. There remains nothing for the Adversary to deny but the conclusion.

The fourth proof is derived from the Apostle's words in Galatians 5:6, which the adversary also uses as evidence for his third position: "In Jesus Christ, neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but faith which worketh by love." Love for God and our neighbour is a duty we owe to both. The Moral Law serves as the rule for this love. Therefore, faith working through love regards the Moral Law as a guide for the duties of love we owe to God and our neighbour. The Apostle establishes that love is a debt in Romans 13:8: "Owe no man anything, but to love one another." If love is a debt to man, it is even more so to God. Furthermore, the Apostle proves that the Moral Law is a guide for this love in the same chapter (Romans 13:9) by referencing commandments such as "Thou shalt not commit adultery," "Thou shalt not kill," "Thou shalt not steal," "Thou shalt not bear false witness," and "Thou shalt not covet." He concludes that love fulfils the Law, affirming that faith working through love regards the Moral Law as a guide for the duties of love we owe to God and our neighbour.

The fifth proof is based on the Apostle's words in Romans 12:1 and onwards. Here, he exhorts believers to present their bodies as a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God, which is their reasonable service. He urges them not to conform to the world but to be transformed by the renewal of their minds, so they can discern the good, acceptable, and perfect will of God. The Apostle then proceeds to enumerate specific duties that flow from their reasonable service to God. I argue accordingly from this general exhortation to the specific duties outlined in the rest of the Epistle.

All Christian duties of love to God and to man are branches of our reasonable service to God.

The Moral Law encompasses all Christian duties of our love to God and our neighbours.

Therefore, the observance of the Moral Law constitutes our reasonable service to God.

The proposition is evident from the entire context of the Apostle's epistle mentioned earlier. The assumption is irrefutable and has been proven previously.

The sixth proof is found in 1 Thessalonians 4:1 and onwards. The Apostle passionately exhorts the brethren, appealing to them by the authority of the Lord Jesus. He reminds them of the instructions they had received on how they should conduct themselves to please God. He highlights the commandments given to them by the Lord Jesus, emphasizing that sanctification, which includes abstaining from fornication, is the will of God.

Now, the Apostle's primary focus here is to urge them to abstain from fornication. Therefore, I argue as follows:

Abstinence from fornication is a component of obeying the Moral Law.

However, this act of refraining from fornication is not only a part of keeping the Moral Law, but it is also a duty that pleases God, a teaching of Christ's Ministers, a precept received by God's people, a command from the Lord Jesus, the will of God, and a manifestation of our sanctification or a consequence thereof.

Consequently, the observance of the Moral Law is mandated by God and Christ as a duty for all genuine believers.

To which part of this argument will the adversary respond? To the Proposition? He dares not, for the Law states, "Thou shalt not commit adultery." To the Assumption? He cannot, for that belongs to the Apostle, as mentioned earlier. Therefore, I will conclude with this statement: The observance of the Moral Law is commanded by God and Christ as a duty for all true believers. When I presented this argument, or a similar syllogistic form of it, from the very place in the Apostle's writings, to our adversary in person, he could not provide an immediate response. Instead, he requested to have it written down. However, I do not expect an answer, as none can be given to what is presented here.

Nor can he find an answer within his collection of books, despite carrying his trunk-hose filled with Protestant Authors such as Luther, Zanchius, Pareus, and others of high repute. He uses their respected names and authority to more easily convince his credulous and uninformed disciples, who tend to admire what they understand the least. Can he not extract an answer from any of these sources? He boasts of them in the conclusion of his letter. Yet, until he can provide one, I will suffice with citing his leading authority, Luther, whose powerful and eloquent words will utterly refute all that he has said in support of his fabricated, false, heretical, scandalous, Anabaptist, and libertine faith. Luther's words are as follows: "We indeed admit of Moses to be read and heard by us as a Prophet and witness of Christ. We also seek from him examples of good laws and morals. However, we by no means yield dominion over the conscience to him. Let him be dead and buried there; and let no one know where his sepulchre is." Thus, Luther speaks. In his argument upon the Galatians, he says, "I am indeed a sinner according to this

present life and its righteousness, as the son of Adam when the Law accuses me. Death reigns and will devour me. But above this life, I have another righteousness, another life, which is the Son of God, who knows no sin and death but is righteousness and eternal life. For which also this dead body of mine shall be raised up again and freed from the bondage of the Law and of sin, and together with the spirit, it shall be sanctified. Both these realities coexist while we live here: the flesh is accused, exercised, made sad and contrite by the active righteousness of the Law, but the spirit reigns, rejoices, and is saved by passive righteousness. It knows it has the Lord sitting in heaven at the Father's right hand, who has abolished the Law, Sin, Death, and has trampled all evil things underfoot, led them captive, and triumphed over them all." So speaks Luther.

"Now, may I never boast except in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, through which the world has been crucified to me, and I to the world.

For in Christ, neither circumcision nor uncircumcision avails anything, but a new creature.

And as many as walk according to this rule, peace be on them, and mercy, and upon the Israel of God."

I thought this should have been the end. But as the proverb goes, one absurdity begets a thousand, like one head of the Lernaean Hydra being cut off, three more grow in its place. Such is the nature of heresy, which, from a small seed, can grow into a hideous monster if not strangled in its early stages. It's like a rumour, starting small but growing larger as it finds a welcome reception with Lady Credulity and her penchant for gossip. Or it's like a tiny leprous spot at first, quickly spreading across the entire body. Or it's akin to a drop of sweet poison, initially going down smoothly but gradually infiltrating the vital spirits, causing its deadly effects. Or it's like gangrene or a

canker, as the Apostle compared it. This Antinomian leprosy spreads, gains strength, and grows bolder every day, even to the point of shamelessness and madness.

The reason it finds so many disciples willing to embrace it is that by cutting off sanctification, denying it as a duty (as one of their disciples said, "Away with this scurvy sanctification"), and placing everything on an imaginary faith and perfection in Christ, it becomes more appealing to the flesh and blood. Human nature is inclined to listen to any doctrine that offers license to unbridled desires. So, when such disciples hear their teachers say, "Just believe and be merry in Christ, sing your cares away; forget about the duty of sanctification, mortification, or repentance, for you are perfectly justified, God sees no sin in you, and you are perfectly saved," it's no wonder that, being carnal themselves, they eagerly latch onto such doctrines that allow them to indulge their fleshly lusts. The fruit that inevitably grows from such a bitter root is all too evident, as many are defiled by it.

For when a man is convinced that, in Christ and justified from all his sins, he no longer needs repentance, it opens a floodgate to all impiety. When there's no more conscience of sin, what happens? This revival of the Montanist heresy, which denied the need for repentance, is based on Hebrews 6:11, where it speaks of not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works. From this, they conclude that believers have nothing more to do with repentance. However, the Apostle here is speaking about the doctrine, not the practice of repentance. He's reproving the Hebrews for not progressing in Christ's school, still needing to be catechized in the very basic and well-known principles of religion.

Furthermore, they claim to be as pure from all sin in Christ and as perfect in righteousness and holiness as Christ Himself. They cite 1 John 4:17 as evidence: "Herein is our love made perfect, that we have boldness in the day of judgment: because as he is, so are we in this world." They conclude that believers have absolute perfection equal to that of Christ now glorified in heaven. They boldly assert that a believer is perfectly saved in this life, meaning that a believer is perfectly glorified in this life, with the only difference being in our sense and apprehension.

I must admit that I wouldn't have believed that anyone endowed with common sense and reason would even conceive, let alone utter, such a senseless and monstrous paradox. Yet I have heard one of their Antinomian ministers affirm this to me and others. When I asked him about the difference between the state of grace here and that of glory hereafter, he answered that there was none at all, except in our sense and apprehension. Another minister then asked him whether we were perfectly glorified in this life, to which he replied in the affirmative. Appalled by such an insolent and Luciferian statement, I promptly avoided his company and further conversation.

This level of pride is reached by those who teach the empty and vain faith of justification against sanctification, which is the fruit of a true, living faith. But if we are perfectly glorified in this life, so that it doesn't differ from the state in heaven except in our sense and apprehension, then when a justified person sins, it's merely in their sense and apprehension, if at all. They lack any sense or apprehension of sin in this matter. When we experience affliction, disease, and the like, it's not real, only in our sense and apprehension, because a perfectly glorified person can neither sin nor suffer any sorrow, disease, or death. Our faith is no longer the

foundation of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen, and we no longer have hope of eternal life except in our sense and apprehension. After all, we are already in possession of what we hope for; we are already perfectly glorified. This is senseless stupidity!

They argue that as Christ is, so are we in this world – pure, perfect, and undefiled. Thus, they claim to be as perfect as can be. However, St. Paul clarifies St. John's meaning, saying: "But we all, with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord." While they may infer that we have the same image of Christ's glory in full perfection, the next words, "from glory to glory," plainly show that the state of grace is glorious but is a perpetual growth. We go from one degree of glory and grace to another, never attaining full perfection until mortality puts on immortality, and corruption puts on incorruption.

The image of Christ that we bear upon us here is a conformity to Christ our Head in the participation of His glorious graces, but only in a proportion that we are capable of here and as God has distributed the measure of faith to each one. The state of grace is in a perpetual growth here, as evident in passages like 2 Peter 3:18, Ephesians 4:12-13, and Psalm 84:7, where the path of the righteous is a perpetual progress, shining more and more unto the perfect day (Proverbs 4:18). Why do I even bother presenting arguments against those who deny undeniable principles?

This reveals how a false and imaginary faith, which these men dream of, leads to damnable imaginings and dangerous presumptions, even to the point of undermining grace as they attempt to stretch it beyond its limits. It's no wonder they abolish any further use of the moral law, as they deny sanctification itself as a duty prescribed and

commanded by the law (Exodus 19:5-6). If the doctrines of these men were to prevail, what could be expected but a deluge of atheism, profanity, lawlessness, and licentiousness overflowing the world? They reject and abolish all duties commanded in the Moral Law, both towards God and towards fellow human beings.

Can we expect these men to be loyal subjects to their prince when they deny owing him any honour as a duty prescribed by the commandment, "Honor thy Father and Mother," one main branch of which is "Honor the King"? If they do not honour their earthly king out of duty, how will they honour their King in heaven? Take the fourth commandment as an example: they completely abolish the Moral Law for believers, including the fourth commandment, which pertains to the sanctification of the Sabbath day.

They argue that the Jewish Sabbath day is abolished, and therefore Christians have nothing to do with this commandment, just like the rest of the Decalogue. I respond that this does not necessarily follow. Although the Jewish Sabbath day is abolished, there remains a Sabbath to be observed by Christians, as the commandment regarding the Sabbath is moral and thus as perpetual as the others. If none of the other commandments are abolished, then neither is the fourth commandment. Therefore, while the ceremonial aspect of the Jewish Sabbath is abolished, its moral aspect remains.

Objection: How and in what way was the Jewish Sabbath day ceremonial?

Answer: There are two reasons. First, it was appointed as a memorial of their deliverance from Egypt, as stated in Deuteronomy 5:15: "And remember that thou wast a servant in the Land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand, and by a stretched out arm: therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to

keep the Sabbath day." The Jews were commanded to observe the Sabbath day as a way to gratefully remember their liberation from Egyptian bondage. Thus, the Lord commanded them to keep the Sabbath day.

Objection: In Exodus 20:11, the Sabbath day is related to the creation.

True, but in Deuteronomy, Moses tells them that even when this commandment was given, the Lord had a special regard for the deliverance from Egypt. Therefore, he says, "the Lord commanded thee," referring to the past time when the Law was given. In that sense, the Sabbath day was ceremonial to them. Secondly, some argue that certain ceremonies were specific to that nation, given that they inhabited the land of Canaan, a hot climate. Examples include not kindling a fire on the Sabbath and not dressing meat on that day, which was a remembrance of the Manna in the desert. They gathered enough Manna on the day before the Sabbath because God provided it miraculously and abundantly.

However, I believe that the observance of not kindling a fire or not dressing meat on the Sabbath was not primarily due to their hot climate but rather a result of the Mosaic pedagogy and dispensation under which only that specific people and Church were placed. In this sense, not kindling a fire and not dressing meat were purely Mosaic ceremonies, symbolizing the eternal Sabbath brought about by Christ's resurrection, which brings an end to all sabbatical ceremonies. In the everlasting Sabbath, there will be no need for bodily provisions, such as kindling fires or cooking meat, as it is in heaven. Isychius, in Leviticus, speaks of the Omer of Manna and teaches that it represented the rest and end of the world when it was impossible to boil, work, or gather.

Some argue that the prohibition of dressing meat applied only during their 40 years of travel in the desert when they had Manna and did not extend to the Land of Canaan, where the Manna ceased. While this may be plausible, as their wilderness journey symbolized the heavenly Country where all bodily provisions would cease, others limit the prohibition of kindling a fire to work related to the Tabernacle alone. However, I see little evidence for this, given that the priests around the Tabernacle were permitted to perform their rituals, such as sacrifices, on the Sabbath.

Nevertheless, the cessation of these ceremonies should not lead Christians to indulge excessively in feasting, thereby abusing their Christian liberty. Instead, they should exercise moderation, ensuring that their bodily refreshment does not hinder but aids in the spiritual duties of the day, providing what is necessary, not superfluous.

While these ceremonies have ended with the entire Mosaic economy, which relied on types and ceremonies, the morality of the Sabbath remains a perpetual survivor under the Gospel. If the morality of the Sabbath were to be abolished, it would imply the abolition of the entire Decalogue or Ten Commandments. However, the Decalogue, or the Ten Commandments, remains in force not only in its curse and full rigour for all unbelievers outside of Christ but also as a rule for holy living for all true believers.

The fact that the Moral Law continues as a rule of Christian obedience for every true Israelite is evident in the way it was given on Mount Sinai. It was given by the Lawgiver, Christ, the Redeemer of His people, who declared, "I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the Land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage." This deliverance from Egyptian bondage was a type of our spiritual deliverance from sin and Satan through Christ. Therefore, by Christ's

own argument, it follows that the same Moral Law given by and under Christ to the Jews in the Old Testament is extended and perpetuated to all Christians in the New Testament, including the Sabbath, in terms of its morality.

Thus, the Moral Law serves as a rule for believing Christians, just as it did for believing Jews, who were all part of the spiritual seed of Abraham, to whom this Law was given. Therefore, by the same logic, the fourth Commandment regarding the sanctification of the Sabbath remains applicable to the Christian Church, along with the other nine commandments. Unless, of course, we follow the example of the Papists, who have removed the second Commandment from their vulgar Catechism through sacrilegious practices and distorted its meaning in their Douay Bibles.

In such a case, we would join them in polluting and profaning the Sabbath by denying its perpetual morality. This would leave only two Commandments in the first Table according to the Popish reckoning, or even none at all when there is no day set aside for God's service, and no means to teach the true worship of the one true God and the honour due to His name. This means the public ministry of His Word, both in public gatherings and private prayers, is compromised.

Therefore, since the entire worship and service of God, as well as the knowledge necessary for human salvation, depend on the proper observance of the fourth Commandment in its moral aspect, denying the morality of Sabbath-keeping is akin to declaring open enmity against God's worship and human salvation.

Objection: But since the Sabbath day of the Jews has fully ceased, as Christ rested in the grave on that day, observing it entirely, what

relevance does it hold for Christians now? What moral aspect of it is to be observed by us?

Answer: The Jewish Sabbath, indeed, was a specific seventh day, which, without a doubt, was observed in successive generations from the seventh day of Creation, sanctified by God's own rest. We read of it in Exodus 16, which predates the giving of the Law on Mount Sinai. However, it acquired an additional layer of significance tied to the typological redemption from Egypt, as mentioned earlier, which makes it ceremonial in that regard. Therefore, being of a ceremonial nature, it was subject to abrogation and transformation from a legal observance into an evangelical Sabbath, known as the Lord's day. Some assert that the Sabbath was not observed by the Old Church until the time of Moses and the giving of the Law at Sinai. This, however, seems to be an unfounded opinion and even impious. Although the Scriptures do not mention the observance of the Sabbath until Exodus 16, it is reasonable to infer that it was in use before that time, as it was first instituted in Paradise. It would be absurd for anyone to prepare something 2,000 years in advance of its use. Exodus 20:11 provides the very reason for man's observance of the Sabbath, which is God's own institution of it through His act of sanctification and blessing on that day by resting from the works of creation. Although the fourth Commandment, being a part of the Law written on Adam's heart, did not require any additional commandment beyond the rest, it carried a reminder with it due to its susceptibility to neglect and profanation. Proceeding further, one may ask what morality of the fourth Commandment is still applicable to Christians. It is not questioned by anyone (except the Antinomian who denies the entire Moral Law as a rule for believers under the Gospel) that the morality of the Sabbath is still in force and use among Christians. However, there are differences in understanding the manner in which it is imposed and exacted from Christians and

the matters to which it applies. Some deny that the fourth Commandment has any relevance to the Lord's day, which is the Christian Sabbath. They also argue that the fourth Commandment applies only to heads of households, exempting servants from sin if they work at their master's command. Furthermore, they assert that the Lord's day is of human institution rather than divine, thus lacking the same force as the fourth Commandment. Concerning the matter, they deny that abstaining from servile labour or ordinary worldly work is any part of the morality of the fourth Commandment, considering it a mere ceremony and therefore abrogated. They even argue that while the generality of the Commandment, which requires a Sabbath for the honour of God, is moral, its specific details – such as observing one day in seven, the seventh day, a full day, and ceasing from all work – are purely ceremonial. Thus, the special aspects of the Commandment have disappeared, although its generality remains, being a law of nature. In light of these arguments, there are several points to consider. First, regarding the extreme interpretation of bodily rest observed by the Jews, which they claim Christians have no obligation to follow, this appears to be a scare tactic used to deter Christians from even contemplating the fourth Commandment's relevance on the Lord's day. It should be noted that the Jewish Church did not demand extreme rest, as in cases of urgency or necessity, work was permitted, even to save the life of an animal, such as pulling an ass out of a pit on the Sabbath, as our Saviour pointed out to the critical Jews.

How much more in matters of greater importance, such as extinguishing a dangerous fire or defending their city or country against invading or besieging enemies? In such cases, refusing to act and to use their utmost effort and skill, not only turned into superstition but often led to their harm and downfall. As an example, when the Jews were attacked on the Sabbath, they neither resisted

nor even closed the entrance to their hiding places to protect themselves. Consequently, their lives fell victim to their enemies' cruelty. They observed the Sabbath so superstitiously as if God had set it as a trap for them, to be exploited by crafty enemies whenever the opportunity arose. Therefore, in cases of extreme necessity, even to save a life, including that of an animal, the Commandment was not strictly binding, especially in spiritual matters relating to God's worship, such as the priests' sacrifice of animals. Extreme cessation from work was not required of the Jews during their observance of the Sabbath.

Additionally, we previously explained how the prohibition for Jews to kindle a fire or prepare food on the Sabbath was specific to that nation, or rather, that Church, and was a type and ceremony. It was not extreme because they lived in a hot climate where there was no extreme need for fire for one day, which they were to replace with their spiritual fervor of holy zeal in the proper observance of the Sabbath. Some argue that this prohibition against kindling a fire only applied to fires used for labour and not for preparing necessary food. However, I won't fuel this debate further at this time, as I've already provided ample reasoning for this restriction. I'll only add that if it was a burden placed on the shoulders of that Mosaic pedagogy, it was to teach them and us to distinguish between the heavy yoke of the Ceremonial Law and the gentle yoke and light burden of Christ.

Furthermore, when they claim that observing one entire day for the Sabbath, or one seventh day, or one day out of seven, was purely ceremonial, I must ask them how the Commandment's memorial could be preserved without a specific time or day? Unless they argue that the morality, being perpetual, is not tied to any particular day. However, since the Moral Law cannot be upheld by the Church in this world without time (as the Preacher said, "There is a time for

every purpose under the sun"), and this time for observing the fourth Commandment is specified by God as the seventh day, how can this day be separated from the Sabbath when it is an inseparable part of the Commandment's essence? Indeed, it is so inseparable by divine appointment that God's wisdom recognizes that the Sabbath cannot be solemnly observed unless it falls on one of the seven days. I don't mean that it must always be the same fixed day of the week, as it was in the Old Testament, as that would be ceremonial. Instead, it's the proportion of one-seventh of our time, established by God's own ordinance and perpetually connected to the moral aspect of the commandment. The Lord, who designated the seventh day for rest and sanctification, did not leave it open to humanity to select any other day or proportion of time beyond seven. Just as God has reserved one-tenth of our possessions (though we owe Him everything) as sacred to Him, thereby sanctifying the other nine parts for our use, so too has He set aside one-seventh of our time (although our entire lives are meant for His honour) for the sanctification of our whole lives. Both of these serve for the more convenient, complete, and solemn administration of His worship and service, which benefits us not only temporally but also spiritually and eternally. It is now beyond human power to change the Lord's day to any other seventh day of the week, as it is Christ's own ordinance and therefore indispensable.

The learned Junius, regarding the Sabbath in Genesis 2:2, speaks as follows: "This Law (of the Sabbath) is natural, having a ceremonial designation of one day affixed unto it. This seventh day, added of God, is not natural but positive. A seventh day is natural and remains, but the seventh day appointed by God from the creation is positive. In place of it, the Lord's day succeeds in the Christian Church, called the first day of the week and the Lord's day, celebrated in Revelation 1:10, Acts 20:7, and 1 Corinthians 16:2. The

reason for this change is Christ's resurrection and the benefit of restoring the Church in Christ. The commemoration of this benefit replaced the memory of creation, not through human tradition but through Christ's own observance and institution. He appeared to His disciples on the day of His resurrection and on every eighth day until His ascension into Heaven, during their gatherings. The same practice was maintained by the apostles, disciples, and the Church of Christ, to whom the apostles passed on the observance of the Lord's day. This is well explained by Cyril in Book 12, in John, Chapter 58, by Augustine in his letter to Casulanus, Letter 86, and to Januarius, Letter 119, Chapter 13. Therefore, as Chrysostom writes in his fifth sermon on the Resurrection, this day in the Primitive Church was called by three names: The Lord's day, The day of bread, and the day of light. The Lord's day, because it was a solemn memorial of Christ's resurrection, dedicated to His word and worship; the day of bread, because the Lord's Supper was administered on it; and the day of light, because Baptism was celebrated, and Baptism was referred to as illumination by the ancients. The day of Baptism was called the day of lights, and the baptized were referred to as new illuminates. Therefore, since the Lord's day, through Christ's actions, example, and institution, through the unwavering observance of the apostles and the early Church, and through the testimony of Scripture, has been observed and substituted for the Jewish Sabbath, those who claim that the observance of the Lord's day continues in the Church through tradition and not through the authority of Holy Scripture are mistaken."

Thirdly, when they argue that only the generality of observing a Sabbath was moral, this generality or morality must either have been entirely lost by now or must necessarily imply a specific day for Christians to solemnly observe this morality, just as for the Jews of old, in accordance with God's own prescription.

Fourthly, they assert that the cessation from servile labour or from ordinary worldly work is not a part of the morality of the fourth Commandment but a mere ceremony, and thus abolished. This is a strange paradox. If the vacation and rest from bodily labour were mere ceremony, what would be left of the morality of the Sabbath? Does not the morality consist of bodily rest and spiritual devotion? Otherwise, what is the essence of it? Resting from labour cannot be a mere ceremony if it endures forever, even in Heaven, during the observance of the eternal Sabbath, as stated by the Apostle in Hebrews 4:9-10 and Revelation 14:13. In Heaven, there is no place for mere ceremonies. Therefore, resting from labour on the Sabbath is not a mere ceremony but a specific aspect of the morality commanded in the Sabbath. Thus, resting from labour is an integral part of the Sabbath's essence, and it is called the Sabbath or rest because a significant part of its observance is the act of resting.

Objection: They object that the Commandment of the Sabbath is not moral because it does not bind at all times and every day as well as one day in the week.

Answer: Although the external solemn rest of the Sabbath binds only for one day in the week, the proper sanctification of it extends to the sanctification of our entire lives, including our persons, actions, affections, etc., through the right use of means such as the Word and Prayer. As we mentioned earlier, just as God, by reserving and consecrating the tenth of our goods, thereby sanctifies all the other nine parts for our use, similarly, by setting apart and hallowing the seventh part of our time for His service, He extends sanctification to every day of our life, that we may be holy. Moreover, affirmative precepts do not cease to be moral simply because they do not bind for all time, but it suffices that they bind always, in their due time and place.

Fifthly, they deny that the Lord's day, which is the Christian Sabbath, has any connection to the fourth Commandment regarding the Sabbath day, arguing that it does not succeed it. They claim that the Lord's day is not of divine institution, but only human, and therefore lacks the same authority as the fourth Commandment. This assertion and reasoning are no less unreasonable and absolute than their previous claims. Why? Because the Lord's day, not of divine institution, but only human? They concede it as ecclesiastical but refuse to call it apostolic and vehemently deny it as divine. Therefore, we will first demonstrate that the Lord's day is of divine institution, and secondly, that it takes the place of the Sabbath, and therefore, being of divine institution, possesses the authority of a Commandment.

First, regarding divine institution, while we may lack an explicit word from Christ, we have His actions and works in support of it, which are as authoritative as His words. As we explained earlier, God's act of resting, blessing, and sanctifying the Sabbath or seventh day was an institution. Why else would He bless and sanctify it? For His own sake? He had no need for it. No, it was for humanity, for whom the Sabbath day was created, for rest, just as the sixth day was created for labor. "The Sabbath was made for man," declares the Lord of the Sabbath.

This institution was in Paradise. It appears in Genesis 2:2, even before Adam's fall. However, if Adam indeed fell on the same day as his creation, which is the belief of many reputable Divines, then it is presented as a form of anticipation, or *Hysteron Proteron*. Consequently, this seventh day began immediately after the Fall when the Son of God incarnate was clearly promised. In this regard, Jesus Christ, the Son of Man, was the Lord of the Sabbath, as the One who instituted it. Under Christ's authority, Adam commenced

his spiritual life by observing and sanctifying the Sabbath. During this time, it is not unlikely that Adam began to offer sacrifices, as he later taught his sons to do, as recorded in Genesis 4. It is plausible that the skins God used to clothe Adam's shameful nakedness were obtained from these sacrifices, which God, through Christ, instructed Adam to offer as a type of Christ's righteousness imputed to us. We must not reject the divine institution of this practice just because it is not expressly commanded in the text. If we did so, it would be regarded as will-worship, which is abominable. God's acceptance of Abel and his offering in contrast to Cain's rejection was due to Abel's faith (Hebrews 11:4). Therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that Adam observed a Sabbath for solemn rest and devotion even before the Fall, as a counterpart to his task of tending the garden, which, although not toilsome, was his responsibility. After the Fall, as he was cast out of the Garden, he faced the toil of tilling the ground for his sustenance, which would have made a Sabbath of rest even more essential to alleviate his otherwise ceaseless toil and labour. When did Cain and Abel bring their sacrifices? Most likely on the Sabbath, as the text in Genesis 4:3 refers to "the end of the days," which some interpret as the end of the year, similar to Exodus 22:16. There is no reason why it could not also refer to the end of the week. However, we need not dwell on this point. Adam undoubtedly observed the Sabbath both before the Fall, having it written in his heart, and after the Fall, with a special day, the seventh, assigned to him under Christ, the Redeemer and Lord of the Sabbath. God's act of resting from the work of Creation, blessing, and sanctifying the Sabbath day for the comfort and use of humankind was sufficient to establish it as a divine institution, without the need for any other explicit commandment. The same principle applies to the Lord's day. What gave it divine authority was the Lord's own act of blessing and sanctifying it with His blessed and glorious Resurrection. This event marked His cessation from the work of Redemption, a greater and

more glorious work than Creation. Additionally, it marked the beginning and consecration of the eternal Sabbath. Therefore, Christ's act alone was enough to consecrate this day as the Sabbath of our Redemption, making it rightly called the Lord's day because it was consecrated not only for Him but also by Him as its author. Thus, it was His sole prerogative to abolish the old Sabbath and consecrate a new one for Christians, in commemoration of a superior Creation and as the introduction to the eternal Sabbath. Moreover, observe how Christ honours this day. On the very day of His Resurrection, He personally appeared to His assembled disciples, offering them tangible proof of His Resurrection, comforting and strengthening them, and imparting the gifts of the Holy Spirit.

And, for them to take special notice further of this day, just eight days after, when this day came about again, he appeared to them a second time where they were assembled. He stood in their midst as the Lord of his Church, greeting them with his peace and displaying many signs to further confirm his Resurrection. Yet, for even greater assurance of the consecration of this day, after his Ascension, he sent the Holy Ghost on this very day, fifty days after his Resurrection. The presence of the Holy Spirit, with his manifold gifts and graces bestowed upon the Church, was a clear sanctification of this day and an enduring blessing to the Church until the end of the world.

It is crucial to note that on the days when Christ appeared to his Disciples and when the Holy Ghost descended upon them, they were all solemnly gathered together in holy communion, engaged in prayer and other sacred duties. Thus, Christ's double appearance and the visible descent of the Holy Ghost upon his Disciples while they were assembled on this day provided ample warrant for the Apostles and, consequently, for the succeeding Churches to continue sanctifying the first day of the week through their holy assemblies

and exercises, including prayer, preaching, administering the sacraments, and acts of charity. They recognized that this was the specific day chosen and consecrated by Christ and the Holy Ghost for public sacred gatherings, where they could anticipate Christ's presence through the influence of His Spirit, sanctifying His people in their worship on that day. Consequently, it became a lasting ordinance, not primarily established by Apostolic authority but supported and continued by their practice, as seen in Acts 20:7 and 1 Corinthians 16:2.

In this context, Master Perkins astutely observes that Paul did not command anything as an ordinance to be observed by the Church unless he received it from Christ. However, the practice of collecting for the poor every Lord's day, or the first day of the week, as a consequence or companion of other Sabbath duties such as preaching, prayer, and the administration of the sacraments, was instituted by the Apostles and, therefore, of divine authority rather than a mere human tradition. Thus, it is a fundamental mistake in theology to acknowledge an institution as Apostolic yet deny its divine authority. The sanctification of the first day of the week, the Lord's day, emerged from that initial day when Christ rose from the dead and appeared to His Disciples, as previously mentioned.

This practice was subsequently upheld and passed down by the early Church Fathers, establishing the sanctification of this day through continuous succession. Saint Augustine remarks that the Lord's day was not intended for the Jews but was declared holy to Christians through Christ's Resurrection. He adds that it began to be kept holy from that day onward. Furthermore, Ambrose mentions that the Lord's day is considered honourable and sacred because it is the day when the Savior, like the rising sun dispelling infernal darkness, shone forth in the light of his Resurrection. For this reason, the day

of the worldly people is called Sunday, signifying the rising of Christ, the Sun of righteousness, which illuminated it.

However, there is no need to rely solely on human witnesses when we have divine stars in the Scriptures that can provide sufficient guidance regarding this day. It is clear that the seventh day, which was commanded to be observed as the Sabbath in the Old Testament by the Israelites, was given to them as a memorial of their deliverance from Egyptian bondage, as previously noted from Deuteronomy 5:15. Therefore, it was ceremonial in nature and subject to change into another day, namely the Lord's day, which was to succeed as a memorial of our Redemption and deliverance from our spiritual bondage, of which the physical deliverance was a type. This Redemption and deliverance were accomplished in Christ's Resurrection. Therefore, it was only fitting for Christ, the Lord of the Sabbath, to have the authority to change the Sabbath into the Lord's day.

Another remarkable reference can be found in Leviticus 23:10 and onwards, where the sheaf of the first fruits was to be waved by the Priest before the Lord on the day after the Sabbath. This sheaf of first fruits symbolized Christ's resurrection as the first fruits from the dead. It was to be waved on the day after the Sabbath and no other. This was precisely fulfilled in Christ's resurrection, which took place on the day after the Sabbath, following the high Sabbath of Passover, making it a double Sabbath, during which Christ rested in the grave. The very next morning, Christ, the first fruits, was waved before the Lord as He rose from the dead, becoming the first fruits of those who sleep. This sheaf of the first fruits was accepted on our behalf, for Christ rose again for our justification. As the first fruits are holy, so is the entire harvest. Notably, the meat offering on this day was twice as much as on any other day, consisting of two tenth deals, while the

rest had only one. This significant increase in the offering signifies something extraordinary about this day's oblation. The offering was made by fire unto the Lord as a pleasing aroma, signifying the rest of this day of the sheaf of first fruits, symbolizing Christ's resurrection. This rest did not only relate to Christ, who had completed the work of redemption, but also to all the Redeemed. From this very day of the sheaf of first fruits, they were to count seven Sabbaths or complete weeks, totaling 50 days, and then on the seventh first day of the week following the Sabbath, they were to offer a new meat offering to the Lord. This marked the Feast of Pentecost, and when it fully came (Acts 2), the Holy Ghost descended visibly upon the Church, fulfilling this typological prophecy or prophetic type. The meat offering of loaves and the like, also referred to as first fruits unto the Lord, signified and prefigured the first fruits of the New Testament Church offered, consecrated, and sanctified to God on the same day the Holy Ghost descended. These two wave loaves, composed of grains, one representing the Jews and the other the Gentiles, were offered together as one offering, symbolizing the gathering of all nations under heaven, the Catholic Church in representation. These loaves were the first fruits unto God and the Lamb, sanctified in Christ, who was the first fruits. These wave loaves were considered holy to the Lord, for Christ, our High Priest. This offering also became a pleasing aroma, as previously explained, emphasizing the rest of this day. Consequently, this very day was solemnly declared to be a holy convocation during which no servile work was to be done, and this regulation was to stand as an unchangeable statute. Isychius affirmed that the Lawgiver explicitly expressed His intention by commanding them to count 50 days from the day after the Sabbath, undoubtedly referring to the Lord's day, the very day after the Sabbath. He explained that this is why the Holy Ghost did not descend on any other day of the week but on the day of the Resurrection, when the sheaf of first fruits was waved before the

Lord. Therefore, we can see how the day of Christ's Resurrection was made solemn and sacred not only by Christ Himself but also by the Holy Ghost sent from heaven, sanctifying this day for holy convocations or public gatherings of God's people for His public service. This regulation was to endure as a perpetual statute to the end of the world, supported by evident and ample testimony from the Mosaic Law and Evangelical types. Consequently, we can conclude, as M. Perkins argued in his "Cases of Conscience" (page 113), that which is prefigured is prescribed, and since the Lord's day was prefigured (Leviticus 23:10), it is therefore prescribed and instituted by God.

Another significant reference can be found in Psalm 118:24, where the Prophet, speaking of Christ's Resurrection (verse 22-23), adds, "This is the day which the Lord hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it." This serves as a clear prophetic institution of this day to be celebrated under the New Testament. Firstly, the Lord has made it, meaning He has appointed and set it apart by marking it with a glorious work. Secondly, the Church of God embraces it with joy and gladness, demonstrating the festivity and grateful solemnity of the Lord's day. Although some interpret this day as referring to the entire time under the Gospel (as in 2 Corinthians 6:2), none exclude or deny its specific application to the Lord's day. Saint Ambrose understood this to be the Lord's day, the day of the Lord's Resurrection, a day that derives its holiness from the Lord's Resurrection.

Circumcision is also worth mentioning, as it was performed on the eighth day, which pointed to Christ's Resurrection, also taking place on the eighth day. Circumcision symbolized the holiness that Christ brought to us on the day of His Resurrection, when He rose again for our justification. But let this suffice to illustrate the point. In this

way, the Lord's day possesses not only a genuine institution by Christ Himself but also receives testimony from the Law and the Prophets. As Hugo states, "The fathers of the Old Testament observed the septenary number, or the seventh of Days, Weeks, Months; We of the New observe the octonary number, or the eighth day, namely the Lord's day, in reverence of the Lord's Resurrection and the sending of the Holy Ghost" (Hugo in Psalm 119).

An objection may arise: the Lord's day has no divine institution but is merely of human and ecclesiastical origin. After all, how did it come to be instituted by Constantine the Great, who enacted laws and prescribed rules for its observance? Other emperors, princes, states, councils, and synods also played a role in shaping its observance in different eras.

The response is that this argument doesn't hold, as the fact that pious rulers enact laws for the observance of the Lord's day doesn't negate its divine institution. Pious rulers also enact laws against sins like adultery, but this doesn't mean that God's commandment against adultery is merely a human institution. When King Darius issued a decree for his subjects to tremble before the God of Daniel, it didn't render the commandment "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve" any less of a divine institution. Similarly, when Tiberius Caesar suggested that Christ be deified or included among Roman gods, it didn't alter Christ's divinity. Tertullian aptly remarked, "Ergo nisi homini placuerit, Deus non erit Deus" (Therefore, if it does not please man, God shall not be God).

Christian rulers, upon recognizing how susceptible the Lord's day was to profanation and how inclined people were to disregard the boundaries set by God, enacted human and penal regulations to

reinforce the divine ordinance. This can be seen in the example of our noble Kings of England, notably our pious King Charles, whose reign witnessed the enactment of religious laws to better observe the Lord's day. These laws aimed to mend the breaches and strengthen the divine ordinance, recognizing that the enforcement of laws often falls short of their wise, pious, and just enactment by our forebears.

Despite all the divine and human laws in place, the Lord's holy day is often disregarded by the majority of people today. It is not deemed as requiring the same sanctification as the Sabbath did for the Jews. Let us now explore the deep reverence that ancient holy men from previous ages had for this day and the rules they advocated for its devout observance. We have already mentioned some of their excellent sayings, and we will provide a few more.

First and foremost, it is noteworthy that they often referred to the Lord's day as the Sabbath. They said, "We observe the Sabbath, which is the Lord's day, as a sign of the eternal Sabbath" (*Obseruamus sabbatum, hoc est Dominicam, in signum nempe aeterni sabbati*). The same Augustine, in his 95th sermon *de Tempore*, remarked that those who did not engage in good works and prayer during the observation of the Sabbath, which is the way to sanctify the Sabbath, were like small flies bred from mud that troubled the Egyptians. He also stated that the Sabbath was a day when Christians should avoid gluttony and drunkenness, unlike the wicked customs of the Jews who indulged in such luxuries on that day.

Augustine further emphasised that Christians should refrain from dancing, revelry, attending plays, masquerading, and other activities more suitable for heathens than for Christians. He highlighted that such behaviours were unbecoming for those celebrating the Lord's

Festival. How, then, should the Lord's day be kept? Not like the Ebionites, Arians, and Arians, who fasted throughout the Lord's day but indulged in revelry on other festivals, as these are extremes that should be avoided.

The ancient Christians, as observed by Justin Martyr, held assemblies of citizens and countrymen on the Lord's day. During these assemblies, they would first read the writings of the Apostles and Prophets. After the reading, the chief minister of the assembly would provide words of exhortation, inviting the congregation to imitate virtuous actions. Those who were more affluent would contribute to the support of the poor, and these collections would be placed with the chief minister, who would use them to assist orphans and the needy.

This day is the day when God created the world, and Christ rose from the dead. Justin Martyr pointed out that it was the day when unutterable blessings were bestowed, the very root and source of our spiritual life. Augustine urged people to avoid frivolous activities like quarrels and idle chatter on the Lord's day and, instead, to listen to the word of God, pray for the peace of the Church, and seek forgiveness for their sins. Bernard similarly emphasised that the Sabbath was not only a delight but also holy and glorious to the Lord. He urged Christians to engage in acts of mercy and good works, which are more fitting for the Lord's day.

These examples demonstrate the importance of the Lord's day to early Christians. They viewed it as a day for spiritual nourishment, acts of charity, and devotion to God, and they refrained from worldly pursuits and sinful behaviours. Various councils and synods also issued regulations to uphold the sanctity of the Lord's day. It is clear

that the observance of the Lord's day was highly regarded and deemed essential by early Christian leaders.

One question remains to be answered: Does the fourth Commandment apply to servants as well as to masters of families? Some argue that the Commandment only applies to masters, excluding servants. They suggest that if a master commands their servant to perform servile work on the Sabbath or Lord's day, the servant is not accountable to God as a transgressor of God's Commandment. Instead, it is the master who is in transgression for issuing such a command. This argument is perplexing: a master transgresses God's Commandment by commanding the servant, yet the servant, obeying the master, is considered blameless. Does this reasoning hold true in other relationships, such as between a Prince and their subjects or spiritual pastors and their congregations? Some say yes. But how? They argue that just as God has commanded all to honour their parents, disobeying the Canons of the Church or the edicts of a Prince is a transgression of both God's commandments. However, they maintain that servants are not transgressors of either command when they work on the Lord's day under their master's orders, as neither the Canons of the Church nor the edicts of Princes grant servants the liberty to be rebellious in their service on that day any more than others.

To make their case, they argue that the observance of the Lord's day does not depend on the morality of the fourth Commandment. These are weighty arguments that deserve careful consideration. Let us examine these arguments more closely. Firstly, we must remember that these individuals not only believe that servants obeying their masters and performing servile work on the Lord's day are guiltless (since they deny the divine institution of the Lord's day and the moral duty of rest on that day), but they also deny that the fourth

Commandment bound any Jews other than masters of families, excluding those under their authority. They argue that the Commandment was given solely to masters and did not extend to servants when they stood in relation to their masters and were subjected to servile labour. While it is true that the Commandment was primarily and immediately given to masters to ensure that their entire households observed it, what happens when a master neglects this duty and instead orders servile work? Does the Commandment not then apply to the servant? Is the servant a mindless beast or a fool who blindly obeys their master's commands even when they conflict with God's? Does the servant not have a soul and a duty to answer to God as well? Doesn't the Apostle say, "He that is called in the Lord, being a servant, is the Lord's freeman"? Similarly, "he that is called, being free, is Christ's servant." Indeed, the master's sin is twofold: permitting and commanding servile work when God commands rest. Nevertheless, when the servant obeys the unjust command of the master, they commit at least one sin against God, if not two, as they prioritise their earthly master's command over their heavenly Master's. But some argue that this is a circular argument, presupposing that God's Commandment applies to servants. However, we contend that it does if servants are not unreasonable beasts or blind asses. The master's command should not hold any weight, and it is entirely null if it contradicts God's explicit Commandment. In such cases, for a servant to obey their master is to elevate their master above God, setting up an idol that is utterly worthless. Servants who slavishly observe the "Sabbatum Asinorum" or the "Sabbath of Asses" rightly deserve the whip on their backs or the punishment mentioned in the second synod of Matiscon: "If a servant or rustic breaks the Sabbath, let him be soundly chastised with clubs." But some argue that the Son of God has commanded all Christians to obey the Church, not to despise its Canons or the edicts of Princes.

True, but is Christ's command absolute and without limitation? Are we to obey superiors actively, regardless of whether their commands are right or wrong, for or against God? What if the Canons of the Church, by human traditions, nullify God's Commandment, as the Jewish Synagogue did in the past and the Roman Catholic Church did more recently? Are such Canons to be obeyed against God's explicit Commandment? If the Pharisees and chief Priests create a Canon to punish those who confess Christ, or openly profess and preach His truth and faith faithfully and freely, is it not disobedience to God to obey them? Should one renounce Christ out of slavish fear rather than refuse to submit to such wicked Canons?

Just as the Jews' Corban freed children from honouring their parents, do those who bind servants to obey their masters when they command against God's Commandment not also void God's Commandment? As for Princes' Edicts, we revere and willingly obey them, but without limitation? What if they command against God? What if they forbid, through a public Edict, the free preaching of the word of God, prohibiting the discussion of certain points of faith and salvation or certain heresies? In such cases, should we not respond as the Apostle did, "Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye; for we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard"? Peter also boldly and plainly tells the Rulers, "We ought to obey God rather than men." Must we, then, obey an Edict like Nebuchadnezzar's, which erected his Image and commanded all to worship it, forbidding prayer to any God but the King for thirty days? Certainly not, because it goes against God's Commandment, and should have no force to demand obedience from anyone. But you might ask, "Must we rebel by disobeying our superiors?" No, there is a distinction between not obeying and being rebellious. Superiors should not be obeyed if they command against God. However, this is not rebellion when people are ready to yield

passive obedience to unjust cruelty by not resisting it, even though they reject and deny active obedience to unjust commands. This is how Daniel and the three Children acted. They would rather be cast into the Lion's den or the fiery furnace than dishonour God by bowing to the King's Image. Similarly, all of God's true children have done and will do; they do not dare to obey unjust commands contrary to God's word and a good conscience, nor do they rebelliously resist unjust punishments. In both cases, they obey God.

But let us move on from this point, at least in this place. We have encountered it incidentally, not with the intention of thoroughly addressing it. Instead, we focused on it as a branch of the morality of God's Law, which Antinomians aim to cut down to its very roots.

Let us add a few reasons and motives to strengthen and encourage us towards the diligent observance of the great holy day of the Lord. One reason can be drawn from comparing Christians under the New Testament to the Jews under the Old.

How exactly were the Jews bound to keep the Sabbath, as a memorial of their deliverance from Egypt, in token of their perpetual thankfulness? How much more, then, are we bound to sanctify the Lord's day in perpetual thankful remembrance of our spiritual deliverance from the bondage of sin, Satan, and hell, over which Christ triumphed manifestly on the day of his Resurrection?

Secondly, just as the Sabbath day was given to the Jews as a sign and means of their sanctification, the Lord's day, when properly sanctified through the use of the means, is a significant occasion for our sanctification. This is not only because it shares similar ordinances with the Sabbath but also because it serves as a perpetual memorial of Christ's Resurrection. In the faith and fact of His

Resurrection, our sanctification is initiated, along with our glorification and eternal Sabbath.

Objection: If the Eternal Sabbath began in Christ's Resurrection, then what is the further use of keeping a seventh day weekly as a Sabbath? Now, every day, indeed our entire lifetime, is a Sabbath for us. Therefore, continuing to observe a seventh day is contrary to the nature of the eternal Sabbath that began with Christ's Resurrection. Keeping a seventh day still means reverting to Jewish ceremonies, which have been abolished in Christ's Resurrection.

Answer: Although the Eternal Sabbath commenced with Christ's Resurrection and is perpetually kept by Christ and the triumphant Church, during our earthly lives, which are governed by time and days and necessitated by various physical needs, we must continue to labour in our respective callings. In this regard, the external circumstances of Christians are not unlike those of God's people in the Old Testament. Our solemn observance of the Sabbath remains limited to specific temporal conditions, such as one day out of seven, just as it was in their time. This is not a return to Jewish ceremonies. While their Sabbath was partly typical, ours is the true eternal Sabbath, observed by Christians according to Christ's own ordinance, adjusted to our current needs. We must work for the well-being of our bodies as well as rest solemnly for the good of our souls. Therefore, Christ's wisdom, which aligns with His Father's, has not altered the commandment that states, "Six days shalt thou labour." The change lies in the day itself because the typical Sabbath has given way to the true and eternal Sabbath, which we now solemnly observe on the first day of the week, like the first fruits of our eternal Sabbath in heaven with Christ. Nevertheless, our entire earthly life is a continuation of the true Sabbatism that has begun.

Moreover, it is the marketplace of our souls, where we come to God's house—the marketplace—to acquire the Wine and Milk of the Word without payment or any material exchange.

How is that achieved? By listening attentively to God's word, which sanctifies us through truth (John 17:17), and by praying to Him. Thus, through the Word and Prayer, we are sanctified. "Hearken diligently to me, and eat that which is good, and let your soul delight itself in fatness; Incline your ears, and come unto me, and hear, and your soul shall live, and I will make an everlasting covenant with you, even the sure mercies of David." Behold, the sanctification of the Sabbath, or Lord's day, through diligent use of God's ordinances, is the means by which the mercies of David are made sure to us. It is noteworthy how the Holy Ghost points out Christ's Resurrection by citing and applying this passage from the Prophet (Acts 13:34), not obscurely implying the sanctification of the day of the Lord's Resurrection through diligent listening to the word of God and reverently using other divine ordinances and duties on that day.

If the Lord's day did not succeed the Sabbath, which was abolished as the Jewish Sabbath, what time and means for our sanctification and salvation would be left to us? Without the Lord's day, we would be in a worse situation than the Jews of old, lacking opportunities and means of sanctification. The Lord's day provides us with a market day for our spiritual provision and the trade of our souls, where we can buy the pearl of the kingdom and meet all our spiritual needs. Neglecting or misusing our providence and diligence on this market day exposes us to the censure: "Why stand ye idle in the market place all the day long?" This applies to those who either idly or frivolously waste the Lord's day, or profane it with carnal pleasures, such as feasting and banqueting (a common abuse, especially among our wealthier citizens), revelry and excess, plays

and interludes, idle chatter and communication, gambling, card-playing, and many other un-Christian-like profane pastimes. Christians should be cautious and avoid these on all days of the week, even throughout their lives, and especially on the Lord's day. On this day, we should turn our attention away from pursuing our own pleasures, calling the Sabbath a delight and the holy day of the Lord honourable. Honouring Him means not following our own ways, pursuing our own pleasures, or speaking our own words. By delighting in the Lord in this way, He will exalt us and provide for us abundantly, as the mouth of the Lord has spoken.

If the due sanctification of this day is neglected, then farewell to true Christianity. If the spiritual provisions of this day are not diligently sought, collected, stored, properly distributed for the entire week, we will, like the Prodigal, bring our souls to feed on empty husks. For people to hear the Word on this day and, when done, go home without reflecting on it or discussing it, spending the rest of the day in idleness or godless activities, is like buying provisions at the market to sustain oneself and one's family for the entire week, only to squander everything on idle companions at once and return home empty-handed. What shall we say, then, about the Papists, who permit their profane markets on this day? For spiritual commodities, they offer only painted images and empty sounds, such as their long Latin Matins and Masses, which push aside the preaching of God's word. They use long prayers as a pretext to exclude preaching, to the extent that sermons barely find a place in the morning, let alone in the afternoon. This is done to ensure that there is enough time to make the Lord's day into a Sabbath for Satan, consecrating it to him in all sorts of excesses and indulgence. This way, they can engage in theatres and dancing, as Augustine mentions, or in card games, table games, revelry, and other un-Christian-like pastimes, which Christians should avoid throughout the week, not to mention on the

Lord's day. This is akin to celebrating the Sabbath of the Golden Ass, as Augustine called it, or even Satan's Sabbath. If it is unlawful to engage in one's regular work, which is lawful on the other six days, why should we engage in sinful activities that are not lawful on any day, as they do not come under any legitimate occupation? If we engage in actions for which we have no legitimate calling, we are outside of God's protection, as mentioned in Psalms 91:11, where God commands His angels to protect His saints in all their lawful ways. However, if individuals stray into the bypaths of carnal and un-Christian-like pursuits, God's angel stands ready with a drawn sword to cut them off, as seen in Exodus 4:24 and Numbers 22:23.

A third reason and motive to encourage us to a more careful and diligent sanctification of the Lord's day can be drawn from the evil consequences that result from its neglect. It is easy to observe, and it is an infallible observation, that where the greatest profanation of the Lord's day prevails, all kinds of iniquity and impiety abound among the people. Now, where is this profanation greater than when prayer, along with the powerful ministry and preaching of the word, and the administration of the sacraments, is most neglected and lacking? It is no wonder if in such places, where the banks of public ordinances and the fruits of private family duties are absent, there is an overflowing deluge of licentiousness. Conversely, where the Lord's day is duly and dutifully observed and sanctified through conscientious attendance at holy assemblies for public prayer, faithful preaching of the word, and proper administration of the sacraments, there is not only a beautiful appearance but also a sound foundation of religion. This is especially evident when a good ministry and a righteous government support the community. From the proper sanctification of the Lord's day, all holiness and religious power spring forth. Through this, God is honored, and the commonwealth itself becomes glorious, firmly established and

united by the pure bonds of religion, which is the crown and security of kings and kingdoms.

I could add many more motives to this, but I refrain for now, as they may not be suitable for these licentious times (if the remedies were as tolerated as the maladies are not). I fear I may have already been too lengthy in this discourse, though it was prompted, if not rather compelled, by the persistent Antinomians, the adversaries of true piety.

To sum it up briefly, let me provide the reader with a concise overview of their absurd and impious doctrines.

Positions held by the Antinomians and similar Libertines and sectaries, along with their usual evasions and distinctions.

These Antinomians teach that God sees no sin in His justified Children, and though He knows sin is in them, He does not see it. They portray God as if He were blind, knowing but not seeing. When we object, stating that God sees sin in His justified Children because He reproveth and corrects them for it, they respond that particular congregations consist of a mixed multitude, some believers and some not, and it is only the unbelievers who receive corrections and reproofs, not the others. When it is objected that God saw sin, reproveth it, and corrected David, who was a believer in Christ (as he said in Psalm 69:5, "Thou knowest my foolishness, and my sins are not hid from thee"), they argue that there is a difference in the justification of the Saints before Christ's death and after, due to the difference in the manifestation of justification. God saw sin through

the righteousness of Christ imputed to David, but not through what was imputed to Paul. That's their argument.

Objection: But Paul himself proves that the justification of all the Saints, both before and since Christ's death, is the same. They refuse to accept this and continue with their evasions.

Objection: But God sees their sins daily because He daily commands them to pray for pardon. Their response is that this petition is either to be said only for modesty or for the further manifestation of their justification.

Objection: Does justification completely eliminate sin from a believer? No, for then we would be lying (1 John 1:8, 10). Their reply is that God does not see sin because He looks upon us only in the righteousness of Christ. Everything He sees in it appears as green. To support this, they misapply many statements from Luther and others.

Objection: We are indeed perfectly justified but not perfectly sanctified in this life because the righteousness by which we are justified is perfect, inherent in Christ and only imputed to us. Our sanctification is from Christ, inherent in us, and still imperfect in this life. Their response is that the Scripture, when speaking of sanctification, means it in a broad sense, encompassing justification. They do not readily accept the distinction between justification and sanctification but merge them together. Secondly, they claim that a believer is as perfect here as he will be hereafter, except in terms of manifestation. To support this, they quote the text, "Because as he is, so are we in this world" (1 John 4:17).

Objection: The Scripture everywhere urges us to grow in sanctification, and the more we grow, the more assurance we have of

our justification. They deny this, as they do not want our sanctification to prove our justification; it must only be revealed to us by faith.

Objection: Shouldn't a believer lead a holy life? They cannot tolerate the word "ought" and argue that a believer cannot help but lead a holy life.

Objection: What then is the rule of that holy life?

Answer: The matter of the Law, they say, but not the Law as a Law, for they are not under the Law but under grace. The Law is not given to a righteous man (1 Timothy 1:9). Only the Law of love sets them to walk in a holy life because they are now free, not only from the curse of the Law but also from it as a command or rule of life. Therefore, they claim they must avoid any thought of displeasing God through their failings. They must refrain from being cast down by any shortcomings, which is in direct contradiction to the Apostle's precept and the practice of the Corinthians (1 Corinthians 5:1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 2 Corinthians 7:9, 10, 11).

Again, they claim that we must not think of ourselves as pleasing God at all, in whole or in part, through anything we do. They say that we should not set up a "calf" of our own works to dance around, as if it were a performance. This is their rhetoric, by which they deceive their simple disciples, who are like reeds easily swayed by every novel doctrine that leads to carnal liberty and fills the soul with spiritual pride. However, the Scriptures do not teach us this about Christ.

Read 1 Thessalonians 4:1, Colossians 1:10, 1 Corinthians 7:22, Hebrews 12:5. In those passages where pleasing God is commended through well-doing, the fruit of a lively faith, it does not mean

pleasing God by way of satisfaction (as only Christ pleased God in that sense), but it means being accepted in and through Christ. If we adopt the belief that neither our sins displease God nor our best sanctified actions please Him, what will happen? Our flesh will become either as senseless as stocks and stones or as sensual as beasts. We will lose the sense of discerning between good and evil, as we will perceive no difference, and we will have no conscience of right and wrong. This doctrine is akin to Stoicism, where one is indifferent to everything, repents of nothing, and has no distinction between the feelings of a cock and those of a man—a doctrine that nature itself rejects and condemns.

This concludes the second doctrine that they hold. And those who adhere to the same beliefs, they call "dead faith."

FINIS.

MONERGISM BOOKS

The Law and the Gospel Reconciled, by Henry Burton Copyright ©
2023

All rights reserved under International and Pan-American Copyright Conventions. By payment of the required fees, you have been granted the non-exclusive, non-transferable right to access and read the text of this e-book on-screen. No part of this text may be reproduced, transmitted, downloaded, decompiled, reverse engineered, or stored in or introduced into any information storage and retrieval system,

in any form or by any means, whether electronic or mechanical, now known or hereinafter invented, without the express written permission of Monergism Books.

ePub, .mobi & .pdf Editions October 2023 Requests for information should be addressed to: Monergism Books, PO Box 491, West Linn, Oregon, 97068