



A CONCISE SUMMARY OF THE LUTHERAN CONFESSIONS

**ALSO KNOWN AS THE EPITOME OF
THE FORMULA OF CONCORD**

**TRANSLATED BY
HENRY EYSTER JACOBS**

LUTHERAN LIBRARY – 117TG

What the Epitome says about itself:

This is a brief and simple explanation of the controverted articles, which for a time have been discussed and taught with conflicting opinions among the theologians of the Augsburg Confession. Hence every simple Christian, according to the guidance of God's Word and his simple Catechism, can distinguish what is right or wrong, where not only the pure doctrine is stated, but also the erroneous contrary doctrine is repudiated and rejected, and thus the controversies, full of causes of offence, that have occurred, are thoroughly settled and decided.

May Almighty God, the Father of our Lord Jesus, grant the grace of his Holy Ghost, that we all may be one in him, and constantly abide in this Christian unity, which is well pleasing to him! Amen.

Says Theodore Schmauk:

As a guide to contemporary religious discussion on the great topics of Christianity, and especially on problems connected with the Person of Christ, the Epitome of the Formula will...prove more interesting, and its use of Scripture and of the pure Gospel will be as edifying, to a student and layman, as is the Augsburg Confession. The clearness, calmness, simplicity, and weight of the matter, without repetition of platitudes, fit it for convincing modern use; and we trust that the day will come when it will be published as a tract or pamphlet to be placed in every Lutheran household. - The Confessional Principle, chapter 33.

THE LUTHERAN LIBRARY

Wisdom from the past speaking to the future

The Lutheran Library editor finds and restores encouraging Christian books from earlier eras. All are formatted to work with Kindles®, smartphones, tablets, and most other devices. To download a book or review the latest catalog:

Website: www.alecsatin.com/lutheran-library/

Email: lutheranlibrary@runbox.com

AVAILABLE NOW

***A Concise Summary of the Lutheran Confessions: Also Known As The Epitome* by Henry Eyster Jacobs. 85 pgs. [117tg]**

Every Christian, according to the guidance of God's Word and his simple Catechism, can distinguish what is right or wrong, where not only the pure doctrine is stated, but also the erroneous contrary doctrine is repudiated and rejected, and thus the controversies, full of causes of offence, that have occurred, are thoroughly settled and decided.

May Almighty God, the Father of our Lord Jesus, grant the grace of his Holy Ghost, that we all may be one in him, and constantly abide in this Christian unity, which is well pleasing to him! Amen.

***The Lutheran Country Church* by George H. Gerberding. 145 pgs. [108t]**

...Someone has said; "If it were not for the stream of fresh, pure, uncontaminated blood flowing into them from the country the cities would rot in their own iniquity." We are sorry to be compelled to believe that this is true. But the good, pure and purifying blood does not all come into the

city from the country districts of our own land. Many of the much maligned “foreigners” from the country districts of the old world are a saving salt of no small insignificance. This book wants to help the reader to understand country people and to appreciate the worth of country character. – From The Lutheran Country Church.

***What’s Wrong With the World?* by George H. Gerberding. 117 pgs. [111h]**

In this small volume, Dr. Gerberding presents one of the clearest explanations available of the underlying philosophies which led directly to the wars of the Twentieth Century and beyond.

Since in Adam’s fall we sinned all, sin has been in humanity, working through humanity and bringing disaster upon humanity. But sin has been more dominant at some times than at others. Its outbreaks and ravagings have been more widespread and terrific in certain periods and in some places. Sin manifests itself in selfishness. Human selfishness is sin personified. Sometimes and in some places selfishness seems to sway humanity as the trees are swayed by a storm-wind. At such times humanity seems to become inhuman. The milk of human kindness seems to be dried out, reason and clear thinking seem to be ruled out. Calm, deliberate, righteous decision is absent. The basest and the wildest passions are let loose. Mercy weeps in solitude. Truth is trampled under foot. Right is abolished. Might takes its place. Angels weep and hide their faces.

***Under Two Captains: The Autobiography of Colonel John Jacob Lehmanowsky.* 155 pgs. [101b]**

Jewish believer in Jesus Christ and faithful Lutheran. Colonel in the army of Napoleon. Friend of Lafayette and the American statesman Henry Clay. Immigrant to America. Participant in the Westward migration.

***Theodore Emanuel Schmauk A Biographical Sketch* by George W. Sandt. 290 pgs. 28 illus. [102b]**

There is no man in our Church whose Christian consecration has been more evident, whose deep loyalty to the Church has been stronger, whose full participation in her thought and activity has been wider, whose counsel has been more constantly sought and given, whose influence has been more powerful and helpful than that of Dr. Schmauk. –Dr. Knubel, *The Lutheran*

***New Testament Conversions* by George Henry Gerberding. 163 pgs.
[103d]**

Why, a book of sermons on conversion? Because not all that has been written and preached on the subject is truth. Much of it is the saddest and most dangerous caricature of truth. Few subjects have been more abused, misrepresented and misunderstood. A veritable flood of ruinous error has emanated from pen and pulpit on this subject. A sad wreckage of doubt, gloom, skepticism, despair, insanity and self-destruction is the result. Much of the current twaddle is the shallowest sentimentalism or the wildest fanaticism, with all the various baseless gradations between. It tends to confuse the mind, to harden the heart, to quench the spirit, to ruin the soul. - G H Gerberding, from the Introduction

***Infant Baptism and Infant Salvation in Calvinism* by Charles P.
Krauth. 135 pgs. [110t]**

There are but two developed systems in the world that claim with any show of probability to be purely Biblical. These systems are the Lutheran and the Calvinistic. They possess a common basis in their recognition of the same rule of faith; their profession of the Old Catholic faith as set forth in the three General Creeds; in their acknowledgment of the doctrine of justification by faith and of its great associated doctrines; and they have vast interests, great stakes, mighty bonds of sympathy in common. No two bodies of Christians have more reason for thoroughly understanding each other than Calvinists and Lutherans have, and no two parts of Christendom are closer together in some vital respects than consistent Calvinism and consistent Lutheranism. It is well worth their while to compare views. – Charles Krauth from *Infant Baptism and Infant Salvation in Calvinism*

SCHEDULED FOR LATE 2017 – EARLY 2018 RELEASE

***The Confessional Principle* by Theodore E. Schmauk [104t]**

...the Elector of Saxony received many letters of protest from Calvinistic princes and from Crypto-Calvinistic sources; and even Queen Elizabeth of England sent over a deputation in the interests of Calvinism not to allow this book [The Lutheran Formula of Concord] to be promulgated. Many Reformed proposed that a common Reformed Confession should be set up over against the Formula of Concord, and that the Reformed should withdraw from their acceptance of the Augsburg Confession; but Ursinus, the author of the Heidelberg Catechism, wrote to Beza to the effect that it would be better to continue to accept the Augsburg Confession (and to agitate against the Formula). - From Chapter 25.

***Life and Letters of W A Passavant* by George Henry Gerberding [105b]**

The Life of Dr. Passavant should have been given to the Church at least a decade ago. All good biography is history in the concrete. In the lives of God's eminent children we have most useful and delightful information for the mind, inspiration for the spirit, braces for our faith, stimuli for our hope and most effective incentives for our love. Such lives are lived for others. They are not over when those who lived them are gone, but being dead they yet speak. The stories of these saints are written for our inspiration, for our warning and for our comfort. If posterity is to have the benefit of such lives, their story must be written. It ought to be written while the memory of the heroes is still fresh and the heart still warm towards them. Few lives have been so eminently beautiful and attractive, so useful to others, so many-sided, so helpful to the Church and so signally owned of God as the life of Dr. Passavant.

***Gotthold's Emblems* by Christian Scriber [106d]**

His works had entirely disappeared out of the booksellers' shops, when some stray copies of them, almost entirely decayed, and secretly valued by their owners as the legacy of pious ancestors, but generally despised,

ridiculed, and rejected, fell into the hands of some Christian and judicious men, who were not deterred from reading and examining them, either by the dust which time had accumulated on their boards, or yet by the partially antiquated language of the contents. They instantly felt that the Spirit of God and of genuine Christianity, breathed out of the sallow pages, – and began to vie with each other, and with his admirers of a bygone age, in praising and applauding the author.

“If any clergyman needs a spiritual guide, let him choose Scriver. He is the preacher for preachers, full of consolation and encouragement to the well-meaning, but a storm of hail to the faithless and slothful pastor.”

***The Conservative Reformation and Its Theology* by Charles P. Krauth
[107t]**

This monumental work, first published in 1871, is regarded as one of the great theological classics to come out of American Lutheranism... Dr Krauth’s treatment of the basic doctrines of the Lutheran church is exegetical, dogmatical, and confessional, and reveals a profound understanding of the teachings of Luther and the Reformation. –From the reprint edition.

***Summary of the Christian Faith* by Henry Eyster Jacobs [109t]**

An attempt is here made to restate the doctrines of the Christian Faith upon the basis of the Lutheran Confessions.

To the Candidates for the Ministry of the Gospel, among whom my life has been passed, this volume is affectionately dedicated by their fellow-student,
H. E. J

***Discourses on Romanism and the Reformation* by Emanuel Greenwald
[112h]**

The occasion which led to the preparation and delivery of these Discourses, was the advent of a Jesuit Missionary, and the holding of a Jesuit “Mission”

in Lancaster in the month of September 1879, at which the doctrines and character of Luther and the Reformation were severely criticized. The “Mission” was conducted with unusual eloquence and skill. It awakened a considerable spirit of inquiry in the community. Large audiences, even of Protestants, thronged to hear, and a few were misled by the ingenious arguments employed, to adopt the sentiments advocated. It seemed that the attack upon the Lutheran Reformation, Protestant doctrines, and the Protestant Churches, should not be permitted to pass unnoticed. A course of Sunday Evening Sermons was, therefore, inaugurated, and for seven Sundays, beginning October 5th, the large Church of the Holy Trinity was crowded each evening with a most attentive and deeply interested audience. The Vestry of the Church, as well as many others, have earnestly advised the publication of the Sermons. They are, therefore, submitted to the public in the hope that they may serve to promote in some degree, the cause of Evangelical truth, and with the fervent prayer that the blessing of our dear Lord Jesus Christ may accompany them.

***A Colony of Mercy* by Julie Sutter [113h]**

And every one in distress, and every one in debt, and every one discontented, gathered themselves unto him, and he became a captain over them.

***Martin Luther: Hero of the Reformation* by Henry Eyster Jacobs
[114bhr]**

***Balthasar Hübmaier The Leader of the Anabaptists* by Henry Clay
Vedder [115bhr]**

***The Priesthood of Believers* by George Henry Gerberding [116d]**

A CONCISE SUMMARY OF THE LUTHERAN CONFESSIONS

*Also known as the Epitome of the Formula of Concord of the
Book of Concord*

EDITED BY HENRY EYSTER JACOBS, D.D., LL.D. S.T.D.

**Norton Professor of Systematic Theology in the Lutheran Theological
Seminary at Philadelphia.**

**Originally published 1911 by The Board of Publication of the General
Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in North America,
Philadelphia, as part of the Book of Concord or Symbolical Books of
the Evangelical Lutheran Church**

Lutheran Library Edition, 117Tg, © 2017. All Rights Reserved.

Version 1.0

**Cover image excerpt from George Cole *Pastoral Landscape* 1873. This
is a faithful photographic reproduction of a two-dimensional, public
domain work of art. The work of art itself is in the public domain for
the following reason: This work is in the public domain in its country
of origin and other countries and areas where the copyright term is
the author's life plus 70 years or less.**

INTRODUCTION

Of the Articles in Controversy among the Theologians of the Augsburg Confession, Set forth and Reconciled in a Christian Way, according to God's Word, in the following Recapitulation.

OF THE COMPREHENSIVE SUMMARY, RULE AND STANDARD ACCORDING TO WHICH ALL DOGMAS SHOULD BE JUDGED, AND THE CONTROVERSIES THAT HAVE OCCURRED SHOULD, IN A CHRISTIAN WAY BE DECIDED AND SET FORTH

I We believe, teach and confess that the only rule and standard according to which at once all dogmas and teachers should be esteemed and judged are nothing else than the prophetic and apostolic Scriptures of the Old and of the New Testament, as it is written: (Ps. 119:105): *Thy Word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path.* And St. Paul (Gal. 1:8): *Though an angel from heaven preach any other Gospel unto you, let him be accursed.* [1]

Other writings, of ancient or modern teachers, whatever reputation they may have, should not be regarded as of equal authority with the Holy Scriptures, but should altogether be subordinated to them, and should not be received other or further than as witnesses, in what manner and at what places, since the time of the apostles, the [purer] doctrine of the prophets and apostles was preserved. [2]

II And because directly after the times of the apostles, and even in their lives, false teachers and heretics arose, and against them, in the early Church, symbols, i. e. brief, plain confessions, were composed, which were regarded as the unanimous, universal Christian faith, and confession of the orthodox and true Church, namely, the Apostles' Creed, the Nicene Creed, and the Athanasian Creed; we confess them as binding upon us, and hereby reject all heresies and

dogmas which, contrary to them, have been introduced into the Church of God. [3]

III Moreover as to the schism in matters of faith which has occurred in our time, we regard the unanimous consensus and declaration of our Christian faith and confession, especially against the Papacy and its false ⁻¹⁻ worship, idolatry, superstition, and against other sects, as the symbol of our time, viz. The First Unaltered Augsburg Confession, delivered to the Emperor Charles V. at Augsburg in the year 1530, in the great Diet, together with its Apology, and the Articles composed at Smalcald in the year 1537, and subscribed by the chief theologians of that time. [4]

And because such matters pertain also to the laity and the salvation of their souls, we confessionally acknowledge the Small and Large Catechisms of Dr. Luther, as they are included in Luther's works, as the Bible of the laity, wherein everything is comprised which is treated at greater length in Holy Scripture, and is necessary that a Christian man know for his salvation. [5]

In accordance with this direction, as above announced, all doctrines should be adjusted, and that which is contrary thereto should be rejected and condemned, as opposed to the unanimous declaration of our faith. [6]

In this way the distinction between the Holy Scriptures of the Old and of the New Testament and all other writings is preserved, and the Holy Scriptures alone remain the only judge, rule, and standard, according to which, as the only test-stone, all dogmas should and must be discerned and judged, as to whether they be good or evil, right or wrong. [7]

But the other symbols and writings cited are not judges, as are the Holy Scriptures, but only a witness ⁻²⁻ and declaration of the faith, as to how at any time the Holy Scriptures have been understood and explained in the articles in controversy in the Church of God by those who then lived, and how the opposite dogma was rejected and condemned [by what arguments the dogmas conflicting with the Holy Scripture were rejected and condemned]. [8]

Parallel Passages.– Sol. Dec, 568; Smalcald Articles, Part II., Art ii:15

1. Cf. Preface to Book of Concord, § 3.↩
2. Cf. § 2.↩

CHAPTER 1 – OF ORIGINAL SIN

STATEMENT OF THE CONTROVERSY

Whether Original Sin be properly and without any distinction man's corrupt nature, substance and essence, or indeed the principal and best part of his essence [substance], namely, the rational soul itself in its highest state and powers? Or whether, even since the fall, there be a distinction between man's substance, nature, essence, body, soul, and Original Sin, so that the nature is one thing, and Original Sin, which inheres in the corrupt nature and corrupts the nature, is another? [1]

AFFIRMATIVE

The pure doctrine, faith and confession according to the above standard and comprehensive declaration:

1 We believe, teach and confess that there is a distinction between man's nature, not only as he was originally created by God, pure and holy, and without sin, but also as we have it [that nature] now, since the fall, namely, between the nature itself, which ever since the fall is and remains a creature of God, and Original Sin, and that this distinction is as great as the distinction between a work of God and a work of the devil. [2]

2 We believe, teach and confess also that this distinction should be maintained with the greatest care, because the dogma that no distinction is to be made between our corrupt human nature and original sin conflicts with the chief articles of our Christian faith, concerning Creation, Redemption, Sanctification and the resurrection of our body, and cannot coexist therewith. [3]

For God created not only the body and soul of Adam and Eve before the fall, but also our bodies and souls since the fall, notwithstanding that they are corrupt,

which God also still acknowledges as his work, as it is written (Job 10:8): *Thine hands have made me and fashioned me together round about*. Deut. 32:18; Isa. 45:9 sqq.; 54:5; 64:8; Acts 17:28; Job 10:8; Ps. 100:3; 139:14; Eccl. 12:1. [4]

This human nature, nevertheless without sin, and, therefore, not of other's but our own flesh, the Son of God has assumed into the unity of his person, and according to it become our true brother. Heb. 2:14: *Forasmuch then as the children were partakers of flesh and blood, He also himself likewise took part of the same*. Again, v. 16; 4:15: *He took not on him the nature of angels, but he took on him the seed of Abraham. Wherefore in all things it behooved him to be made like unto his brethren, yet without sin*. [5]

Therefore Christ has redeemed it, as his work, sanctifies it as his work, raises it from the dead and gloriously adorns it as his work. But Original Sin he has not created, assumed, redeemed, sanctified; he also will not raise it, or with the elect adorn or save it, but in the [blessed] resurrection it will be entirely destroyed. [6]

Hence the distinction between the corrupt nature and the corruption which infects the nature, and by which the nature became corrupt, can easily be discerned. [7]

3 But, on the other hand, we believe, teach and confess that Original Sin is not a slight, but so deep a corruption of human nature, that nothing healthy or uncorrupt in man's body or soul, in inner or outward powers, remains, but, as the Church sings:

"Through Adam's fall is all corrupt,
Nature and essence human."

This unspeakable injury cannot be discerned by the reason, but only from God's Word. ⁻¹⁻ And [we affirm] that the nature and this corruption of nature no one but God alone can ever separate from one another; and yet this fully comes to pass, through death, in the resurrection, where our nature which we now bear will rise and live eternally, without original sin, and separated and sundered from it, as it is written (Job 19:26): *I shall be compassed again with this my skin, and in my*

flesh shall I see God, whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold.
[8,9,10]

NEGATIVE

Rejection of the false opposite dogmas

1 Therefore we reject and condemn the dogma that Original Sin is only a *reatus* or debt, on account of what has been committed by another [diverted to us] without any corruption of our nature. ⁻²⁻ [11]

2 Also that evil lusts are not sin, but concreated, essential properties of the nature, as though the above-mentioned defeat and evil were not true sin, because of which man without Christ [not ingrafted into Christ] is to be a child of wrath. ⁻³⁻ [12]

3 We likewise reject the error of the Pelagians, by which it is alleged that man's nature, even since the fall, is incorrupt, and, especially with respect to spiritual things, *in naturalibus*, i. e. in its natural powers, it has remained entirely good and pure. ⁻⁴⁻ [13]

4 Also that Original Sin is only external, a slight, insignificant spot, sprinkle, or stain dashed upon the nature, beneath which [nevertheless] the nature has retained its powers unimpaired even in spiritual things. ⁻⁵⁻ [14]

5 Also that Original Sin is only an external impediment to unimpaired spiritual powers, and not a despoliation or want of the same, as when a magnet is smeared with garlic-juice its natural power is not thereby removed, but only impeded; or that this stain can be easily washed away, as a spot from the face or pigment from the wall. ⁻⁶⁻ [15]

6 Also, that in man the human nature and essence are not entirely corrupt, but that man still has something good in him, even in spiritual things, namely, piety, skill, aptness or ability in spiritual things to begin to work, or to co-work for something [good]. ⁻⁷⁻ [16]

7 On the other hand, we also reject the false dogma of the Manichaeans, when it is taught that Original Sin, as something essential and self-subsisting, has been infused by Satan into the nature, and intermingled with it, as poison and wine are mixed. [17]

8 Also that not the natural man, but something else and extraneous to man, sins, and, on this account, not the nature, but only Original Sin in the nature, is accused. ⁻⁸⁻ [18]

9 We reject and condemn also as a Manichean error the doctrine that Original Sin is properly, and without any distinction, the substance, nature and essence itself of the corrupt man, so that no distinction between the corrupt nature, considered by itself, since the fall, and Original Sin, can be conceived of, nor can they be distinguished from one another even in thought. ⁻⁹⁻ [19]

10 Moreover this Original Sin is called by Dr. Luther natural sin, personal sin, essential sin (Natura'sünde, Persona'sünde, Wesentliche Sünde); not that the nature, person or essence of the man is, without any distinction, itself Original Sin, but that, by such words, the distinction might be indicated between Original Sin which inheres in human nature, and other sins which are called actual sins. [20]

11 For Original Sin is not a sin which is committed, but it inheres in the nature, substance and essence of man, so that though no wicked thought ever should arise in the heart of corrupt man, nor idle word be spoken, nor wicked deed be done, yet the nature is nevertheless corrupt through Original Sin, which is born in us by reason of the sinful seed, and is a fountain-head of all other actual sins, as wicked thoughts, words and works, as it is written (Matt. 15:19): *Out of the heart proceed evil thoughts.* Also (Gen. 6:5; 8:21): *The imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth.* [21]

12 Thus it is also well to note the diverse signification of the word "nature," whereby the Manichaeans cover their error and lead astray many simple men. For sometimes it means the essence [the very substance] of man, as when it is said: God created human nature. But at other times it means the disposition and the vicious quality [disposition, condition, defect or vice] of a thing, which

inheres in the nature or essence, as when it is said: The nature of the serpent is to bite, and the nature and disposition of man is to sin, and is sin; here the word nature does not mean the substance of man, but something that inheres in the nature or substance. [22]

13 But as to the Latin terms “substance” and “accident,” because they are not words of Holy Scripture, and besides unknown to the ordinary man, they should not be used in sermons before ordinary, uninstructed people, but simple people should be excused from this [in this matter regard should rightly be had to the simple and uneducated]. But in the schools, among the learned, these words are rightly retained in disputations concerning Original Sin, because they are well known and used without any misunderstanding, to distinguish exactly between the essence of a thing and what is attached to it in an accidental way. [23-24]

For the distinction between God’s work and that of the devil is thereby designated in the clearest way, because the devil can create no substance, but can only, in an accidental way, from God’s decree [God permitting] corrupt a substance created by God. [25]

**Parallel Passages. – Augsburg Confession, Art. ii.; Apology, Art. ii.
Smalcald Articles, Part. III., Art. i.; Sol, Dec. 573 sqq.**

1. Cf. Smalcald Articles, Part III., Art. i., § 3.↵
2. This error is ascribed especially to Albertus Pighius. Köllner’s *Symbolik of Catholic Church*, 285, 290.↵
3. Taught by Pelagians, both ancient and modern; cf. Council of Trent, Bess. v. (p. 6 Tauchnitz edition).↵
4. Almost the general opinion of the Scholastics; for they contended that since the fall men were destitute only of the *donum supernaturale* [supernatural gift]. Cf Köllner, p. 284.↵

5. Ascribed to D'Andrada, a Romish opponent of Chemnitz, who thus wrote in his *Defensio Trid. fidei Cathol*, lib. v., p. 451 sqq.↵
6. Almost the very words of Vict. Strigel in the disputation with Flacius at Weimar in 1560. Cf. Carpzov, 1179.↵
7. Also taught by Strigel in his declaration, written 1562.↵
8. Ascribed by Augustine to the Manichaeans. Cf. Sol. Dec↵
9. The doctrine of Flacius and his adherents.↵

CHAPTER 2 – OF THE FREE WILL

STATEMENT OF THE CONTROVERSY

Since the will of man is found in four dissimilar states, namely: 1. Before the fall; 2. Since the fall; 3. After regeneration; 4. After resurrection of the body, the chief question is only concerning the will and ability of man in the second state, namely, what powers, in spiritual things, he has, from himself, since the fall of our first parents, and before regeneration, and whether, from his own powers, before he has been born again by God's Spirit, he be able to dispose and prepare himself for God's grace, and to accept [and apprehend] or not, the grace offered through the Holy Ghost in the Word and holy [divinely-instituted] sacraments. [1]

AFFIRMATIVE

The pure doctrine concerning this article, according to God's Word

1 Concerning this subject, our doctrine, faith and confession is, that, in spiritual things, the understanding and reason of man are [altogether] blind, and, from their own powers, understand nothing, as it is written (1 Cor. 2:14): *The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness to him; neither can he know them, because he is examined concerning spiritual things.* [2]

2 Likewise we believe, teach and confess that the will of unregenerate man is not only turned away from God, but also has become an enemy of God, so that it has inclination and desire for that which is evil and contrary to God, as it is written (Gen. 8:21): *The imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth.* Also (Rom. 8:7): *The carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the Law of God, neither indeed can be.* Yea, as unable as a dead body is to quicken and restore itself to bodily, earthly life, just so unable is man, who by sin is

spiritually dead, to raise himself to spiritual life, as it is written (Eph. 2:5): *Even when we were dead in sins, he hath quickened us together with Christ*; (2 Cor. 3:5): *Not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think anything good, as of ourselves, but that we are sufficient is of God*. [3]

3 Yet God the Holy Ghost effects conversion, not without means; but uses for this purpose the preaching and hearing of God's Word ⁻¹⁻, as it is written (Rom. 1:16): *The Gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth*. Also (Rom. 10:17): *Faith cometh by hearing of the Word of God*. And it is God's will that his Word should be heard, and that man's ears should not be closed. ⁻²⁻ With this Word the Holy Ghost is present, and opens hearts, so that they, as Lydia, in Acts 16, are attentive to it, and are thus converted through the grace and power of the Holy Ghost, whose work alone the conversion of man is. For, without his grace, and if he do not grant the increase, our willing and running, our planting, sowing and watering, all are nothing, as Christ says (John 15:5): *Without me, ye can do nothing*. In these short words he denies to the free will all power, and ascribes everything to God's grace, in order that no one may boast before God: 1 Cor. 1:29 [2 Cor. 12:5; Jer. 9:23]. [4-6]

NEGATIVE

Contrary false doctrine

We therefore reject and condemn all the following errors, all contrary to the standard of God's Word: [7]

1 The host [insane dogma] of philosophers who are called Stoics, as also of the Manichaeans, who taught that everything that happens must have happened so, and could not have happened otherwise, and that everything that man does, even in outward things, he does by necessity, and that he is coerced to evil works and deeds, as in chastity, robbery, murder, theft and the like. ⁻³⁻ [8]

2 We reject also the gross error of the Pelagians, who taught that man by his own powers, without the grace of the Holy Ghost, can turn himself to God, believe

the Gospel, be obedient in heart to God's Law, and thus merit the forgiveness of sins and eternal life. [9]

3 We reject also the error of the Semi-Pelagians ⁻⁴⁻, who teach that man, by his own powers, can make a beginning of his conversion, but without the grace of the Holy Ghost cannot complete it. [10]

4 Also when it is taught ⁻⁵⁻ that, although man by his free will before regeneration, is too weak to make a beginning, and, by his own powers, to turn himself to God, and in heart to be obedient to God; yet, if the Holy Ghost, by the preaching of the Word, have made a beginning, and offered therein his grace, then the will of man, from its own natural powers, to a certain extent, although feebly, can add, help and co-operate therewith ⁻⁶⁻ can qualify and prepare itself for grace, ⁻⁷⁻ and embrace and accept it, and believe the Gospel. [11]

5 Also that man, after he has been born again, can perfectly observe and completely fulfill God's Law, and that this fulfilling is our righteousness before God, by which we merit eternal life. ⁻⁸⁻ [12]

6 Also that we condemn the error of the Enthusiasts, who imagine that God, without means, without the hearing of God's Word, also without the use of the holy sacraments, draws men to himself, and enlightens, justifies and saves them. ⁻⁹⁻ [13]

[Enthusiasts are those who expect the illumination of the Spirit [celestial revelation] apart from the preaching of God's Word.]

7 Also that in conversion and regeneration God entirely exterminates the substance and essence of the old Adam, and especially the rational soul, and, in this conversion and regeneration, creates a new soul out of nothing. ⁻¹⁰⁻ [14]

8 Also, when the following expressions are employed with out explanation, viz. that the will of man, before, in, and after conversion, resists the Holy Ghost, and that the Holy Ghost is given to those who resist him intentionally and

persistently; “for,” as Augustine says, “in conversion God changes the unwilling into willing, and dwells in the willing.” [15]

As to the expressions of ancient and modern church teachers, when it is said: *Deus trahit, sed volentem trahit*, i. e. " God draws, but he draws the willing," and *Hominis voluntas in conversione non est otiosa sed agit aliquid*, i. e. “In conversion the will of man is not idle, but effects something” ⁻¹¹⁻ we maintain that, inasmuch as these expressions have been introduced for confirming the false opinion concerning the powers of the natural free will in man’s conversion, against the doctrine concerning God’s grace, they are not in harmony with the form of sound doctrine, and therefore, when we speak of conversion to God, should be avoided. [16]

But, on the other hand, it is correctly said that, in conversion God, through the drawing of the Holy Ghost, changes stubborn and unwilling into willing men, and that after such conversion, in the daily exercise of repentance, the regenerate will of man is not idle, but also co-operates in all the deeds of the Holy Ghost, which he works through us. [17]

9 Also what Dr. Luther has written, viz. that man’s will is in his conversion purely passive, ⁻¹²⁻ i. e. it does nothing whatever, is to be understood in respect of divine grace in kindling new motions, i. e. when God’s Spirit, through the heard Word or the use of the holy sacrament, lays hold upon man’s will, and works [in man] the new birth and conversion. For if [after] the Holy Ghost has wrought and accomplished this, and man’s will has been changed and renewed alone by his divine power and working, then the new will of man is an instrument and organ of God the Holy Ghost, so that he not only accepts grace, but also, in the works which follow, co-operates with the Holy Ghost. [18]

Therefore, before the conversion of man, there are only two efficient causes, [^vo] namely, the Holy Ghost and the Word of God, as the instrument of the Holy Ghost, whereby he works conversion. To this Word man ought to listen, nevertheless it is not from his own powers, but only through the grace and working of the Holy Ghost, that he can believe and accept it. [19]

**Parallel Passages. – Augsburg Confession, xviii.; Apology, xviii.;
Smalcald Articles, Part III., Art. i.; Sol. Dec, ii.**

1. Cf. Augsburg Confession, v.:4.↵
2. Ps. 95:7, 8; Heb; 3:7. Apology, xiii., 13; xxiv., 70; Smalcald Articles, Part III., Art. viii., 13 sqq.; Sol. Dec., 597.↵
3. Of the Stoics, Chrysippus especially taught this doctrine of necessity. Cf. Cicero de fato, c. 17 sq. The Manichaeans are erroneously said to have denied all moral liberty. See Epistle of Secundus the Manichaean to Augustine, § 2.↵
4. Massilians.↵
5. By Synergists. Cf. Sol. Dec.↵
6. Asserted by Strigel in Weimar Disputation.↵
7. Formula of Erasmus, employed by Melanchthon in Loci Theol. Ed 1548.↵
8. Doctrine of Papists and monks (cf. Sol. Dec. ii.:79); also of Schwenkfeldians, Sol. Dec, xii.:33.↵
9. The error of the Anabaptists and Schwenkfeldians. Cf. Augsburg Confession, Art. v.:4; Formula of Concord, Ep. xii.:22 sqq.; Sol. Dec, xii.:80 sqq.↵
10. Error of the Flacians.↵
11. Expressions of Chrysostom, the Scholastics and Melanchthon.↵
12. Cf. Sol. Dec, ii.:89.↵

CHAPTER 3 – OF THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF FAITH BEFORE GOD

STATEMENT OF THE CONTROVERSY

Since it is unanimously confessed in our churches, upon the authority of God's Word and according to the sense of the Augsburg Confession, that we poor sinners are justified before God, and saved alone by faith in Christ, and thus Christ alone is our righteousness, who is true God and man, because in him the divine and human natures are personally united with one another (Jer. 23:6; 1 Cor. 1:30; 2 Cor. 5:21), the question has arisen: "According to which nature is Christ our righteousness?" and thus two contrary errors have arisen in some churches. [1]

For the one side ⁻¹⁻ has held that Christ alone, according to his divinity, is our righteousness, if he dwell in us by faith; contrasted with which divinity, dwelling in men by faith, all the sins of men should be regarded as a drop of water to the great ocean. On the contrary, others ⁻²⁻ have held that Christ is our righteousness before God, alone according to the human nature. [2]

AFFIRMATIVE

Pure Doctrine of the Christian Churches against both errors just mentioned.

1 Against both the errors just recounted, we unanimously believe, teach and confess that Christ is our righteousness, neither according to the divine nature alone, nor according to the human nature alone, but the entire Christ according to both natures, alone in his obedience, which as God and man he rendered the Father even to death, and thereby merited for us the forgiveness of sins and

eternal life, as it is written: *As by one man's disobedience, many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one, shall many be made righteous* (Rom. 5:19). [3]

2 Therefore we believe, teach and confess that our righteousness before God is, that God forgives us our sins out of pure grace, without any work, merit or worthiness of ours preceding, attending or following, for he presents and imputes to us the righteousness of Christ's obedience, on account of which righteousness we are received into grace by God, and regarded righteous. [4]

3 We believe, teach and confess that faith alone is the means and instrument whereby we lay hold of Christ, and thus in Christ of that righteousness which avails before God, for the sake of which this faith is imputed to us for righteousness (Rom. 4:5). [5]

4 We believe, teach and confess that this faith is not a bare knowledge of the history of Christ, but such a great gift of God that thereby we come to the right knowledge of Christ as our Redeemer in the Word of the Gospel, and trust in him that alone for the sake of his obedience, out of grace, we have the forgiveness of sins, and are regarded holy and righteous before God the Father, and eternally saved. [6]

5 We believe, teach and confess that, according to the usage of Holy Scripture, the word justify means in this article, "to absolve," that is, to declare free from sins. Prov. 17:15: *He that justifieth the wicked, and he that condemneth the righteous, even they both are abomination to the Lord.* Also (Rom. 8:33): *Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth.* [7]

And when in place of this, the words regeneration and vivification are employed, as in the Apology, ⁻³⁻ this is done in the same sense; for by these terms, in other places, the renewal of man is understood, and [which] is distinguished from justification by faith. [8]

6 We believe, teach and confess also that although many weaknesses and defects cling to the rightly believing and truly regenerate, even to the grave, yet they

have reason to doubt neither of the righteousness which is imputed to them by faith, nor of the salvation of their souls, but should regard it certain that for Christ's sake, according to the promise and [immovable] Word of the holy Gospel, they have a gracious God. [9]

7 We believe, teach and confess that, for the maintenance of the pure doctrine concerning the righteousness of faith before God, it is necessary that the exclusive particles, i. e., the following words of the holy apostle Paul, whereby the merit of Christ is entirely separated from our works, and the honor given to Christ alone, be retained with especial care, as when the holy apostle Paul writes: *Of grace, without merit, without law without works, not of works*. All these words, taken together, mean that *we are justified and saved alone by faith in Christ* (Eph. 2:8; Rom. 1:17; 3:24; 4:3 sqq.; Gal. 3:11; Heb. 11). [10]

8 We believe, teach and confess that although the contrition that precedes, and the good works that follow, do not belong to the article of justification before God, yet such a faith should not be imagined as can coexist with a wicked intention to sin and to act against conscience. But after man is justified by faith, then a true living faith worketh by love (Gal. 5:6). Thus good works always follow justifying faith, and are surely found with it, if it be true and living; for it never is alone, but always has with it love and hope. [11]

ANTITHESIS OR NEGATIVE

Contrary Doctrine Rejected

Therefore we reject and condemn all the following errors: [12]

1 That Christ is our righteousness alone according to his divine nature. ⁻⁴⁻ [13]

2 That Christ is our righteousness alone according to his human nature. ⁻⁵⁻ [14]

3 That in the expressions of the prophets and apostles, when the righteousness of faith is spoken of, the words *justify* and *be justified* do not signify to declare or be declared free from sins, and obtain the forgiveness of sins, but actually to be

made righteous before God, because of love infused by the Holy Ghost, virtues and the works following them. ⁻⁶⁻ [15]

4 That faith looks not only to the obedience of Christ, but to his divine nature, as it dwells and works in us, and that by this indwelling our sins are covered. ⁻⁷⁻ [16]

5 That faith is such a trust in the obedience of Christ as can exist and remain in a man who has no genuine repentance, in whom also no love follows, but he persists in sins against conscience. ⁻⁸⁻ [17]

6 That not God himself, but only the gifts of God, dwell in the believer. ⁻⁹⁻ [18]

7 That faith saves, on this account, viz. because by faith the renewal, which consists in love to God and one's neighbor, is begun in us. ⁻¹⁰⁻ [19]

8 That faith has the first place in justification, although also renewal and love belong to our righteousness before God, in such a manner that they [renewal and love] are not the chief cause of our righteousness, but, nevertheless, our righteousness before God is, without this love and renewal, not entire or complete. [20]

9 That believers are justified before God, and saved partly by the imputed righteousness of Christ, and by the beginning of new obedience, or in part by the imputation of Christ's righteousness, but in part also by the beginning of new obedience. [21]

10 That the promise of grace is imputed to us by faith in the heart, and by the confession which is made with the mouth, and by other virtues. [22]

11 That faith without good works does not justify, and therefore that good works are necessarily required for righteousness, and without their presence man cannot be justified. [23]

Parallel Passages. – Augsburg Confession, iv., vi., xii., xx.; Apology Chap. ii.; Smalcald Articles, Part II., Art. i.; Part III., Art. xiii.; Formula

of Concord, Sol. Dec, iii.

1. Andrew Osiander (1554) and his followers.↵
2. Francis Stancar (1574) and his followers.↵
3. Art. iv.:65 sq.; xii.:46.↵
4. Error of Osiander.↵
5. Error of Stancar, following Peter Lombard.↵
6. Error of Osiander; also of the Papists. Cf. Council of Trent, Sess vi., Cap. 10.↵
7. Error of Osiander.↵
8. Osiander charged the Lutherans with this error. It is that of the Antinomians. Cf. Smalcald Articles. Part III., Art. iii., § 42 sqq.↵
9. Perhaps taught by Stancar, who, according to Planck, iv.:467 sq.; taught that the Holy Ghost is sent not according to his essence, but according to his effect, operation and manifestation.↵
10. Errors 6-11 were taught by George Major (1574).↵

CHAPTER 4 – OF GOOD WORKS

STATEMENT OF THE CONTROVERSY

Concerning the doctrine of good works two divisions have arisen in some churches: [1]

1 First, some theologians have differed with reference to the following expressions, where the one side wrote: ⁻¹⁻ “Good works are necessary for salvation.” “It is impossible to be saved without good works.” Also: “No one has ever been saved without good works.” But the other side, ⁻²⁻ on the contrary, wrote: “Good works are injurious to salvation.” [2]

2 Afterwards a schism arose also between some theologians ⁻³⁻ with respect to the two words, “necessary” and “free,” since the one side ⁻⁴⁻ contended that the word “necessary” should not be employed concerning the new obedience, which does not proceed from necessity and coercion, but from the free will. The other side has retained the word “necessary,” because this obedience is not at our option, but regenerate men are bound to render this obedience. [3]

From this disputation concerning the terms a controversy concerning the subject itself afterwards occurred. For the one side contended that among Christians the law should not at all be urged, ⁻⁵⁻ but men should be exhorted to good works alone from the Holy Gospel. The other side contradicted this. [4]

AFFIRMATIVE

*Pure Doctrine of the Christian Churches concerning this
Controversy*

For the thorough statement and decision of this controversy, our doctrine, faith and confession is: [5]

1 That good works certainly and without doubt follow true faith, if it be not a dead, but a living faith, as the fruit of a good tree. [6]

2 We believe, teach and confess also that good works should be entirely excluded, as well when the question at issue is concerning salvation, as in the article of justification before God ⁻⁶⁻ as the apostle testifies with clear words, where it is written: *Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works, saying, ... Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin*, etc. (Rom. 4:6 sqq.). And elsewhere: *By grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God; not of Works, lest any man should boast* (Eph. 2:8,9). [7]

3 We believe, teach and confess also that all men, but those especially who are born again and renewed by the Holy Ghost, are bound to do good works. [8]

4 In this sense the words “necessary,” “should” and “must” are employed correctly and in a Christian manner, also with respect to the regenerate, and in no way are contrary to the form and language of sound words. [9]

5 Nevertheless by the words mentioned, “necessity” and “necessary,” if they be employed concerning the regenerate, not coercion, but only due obedience is understood, which the truly believing, so far as they are regenerate, render not from coercion or the impulse of the Law, but from the free will; because they are no more under the Law, but under grace (Rom. 6:14; 7:6; 8:14). [10]

6 Therefore we also believe, teach and confess that when it is said: The regenerate do good works from the free will; this should not be understood as though it were at the option of the regenerate man to do or to forbear doing good when he wished, and nevertheless could retain faith when he intentionally persevered in sins. [11]

7 Yet this should not be understood otherwise than as the Lord Christ and his apostles themselves declare, namely, that the liberated spirit does not do this from fear of punishment, as a slave, but from love of righteousness, as children (Rom. 8:15). [12]

8 Although this free will in the elect children of God is not complete, but is burdened with great weakness, as St. Paul complains concerning himself (Rom. 7:14-25; Gal. 5:17). [13]

9 Nevertheless, for the sake of the Lord Christ, the Lord does not impute this weakness to his elect, as it is written: *There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus* (Rom. 8:1). [14]

10 We believe, teach and confess also, that not works, ⁻⁷⁻ but alone the Spirit of God, through faith, maintains faith and salvation in us, of whose presence and indwelling good works are evidences. ⁻⁸⁻ [15]

NEGATIVE

False Contrary Doctrine

1 We reject and condemn the following modes of speaking, viz. when it is taught and written that good works are necessary to salvation. Also, that no one ever has been saved without good works. Also, that it is impossible without good works to be saved. [16]

2 We reject and condemn the unqualified expression: Good works are injurious to salvation, ⁻⁹⁻ as offensive and detrimental to Christian discipline. [17]

For, especially in these last times, it is no less needful to admonish men to Christian discipline [to the way of living aright and godly] and good works, and instruct them how necessary it is that they exercise themselves in good works as a declaration of their faith and gratitude to God, than that the works be not mingled in the article of justification; because men may be damned by an

epicurean delusion concerning faith, ⁻¹⁰⁻ as well as by Papistic and Pharisaic confidence in their own works and merits. [18]

3 We also reject and condemn the dogma that faith and the indwelling of the Holy Ghost are not lost by willful sin, but that the saints and elect retain the Holy Ghost, even though they fall into adultery and other sins, and persist therein. ⁻¹¹⁻ [19]

**Parallel Passages. – Augsburg Confession, vi., xx.; Apology (III.); xx.:
Smalcald Articles, Part III., Art. xiii.; Cf. Art. ii.; Formula of Concord,
Sol Dec, iv.**

1. George Major, Justus Menius and others, based on expressions of Melanchthon. See Frank's Theology of the Formula of Concord, ii.:149 sqq.↩
2. Nicolaus Amsdorf (1565).↩
3. Antinomians.↩
4. Cf. Epitome, vi.↩
5. Opinion of John Agricola (1566).↩
6. Major had made a distinction between eternal salvation and justification.↩
7. Major and Menius to the contrary.↩
8. Cf. Apology (III.):63.↩
9. Amsdorf.↩
10. Cf. Sol. Dec, iv.:87.↩
11. Antinomians (see above, iii.:17).↩

CHAPTER 5 – OF THE LAW AND THE GOSPEL

STATEMENT OF THE CONTROVERSY

Whether the preaching of the Holy Gospel be properly not only a preaching of grace, which announces the forgiveness of sins, but also a preaching of repentance ⁻¹⁻ and censure, rebuking unbelief, which is rebuked not in the Law, but alone through the Gospel. [1]

AFFIRMATIVE

Pure Doctrine of God's Word

1 We believe, teach and confess that the distinction between the Law and the Gospel is to be maintained in the Church as an especially brilliant light, whereby, according to the admonition of St. Paul, the Word of God may be rightly divided. [2]

2 We believe, teach and confess that the Law is properly a divine doctrine, which teaches what is right and pleasing to God, and reproves everything that is sin and contrary to God's will. [3]

3 Therefore everything that reproves sin is and belongs to the preaching of the Law. [4]

4 But the Gospel is properly such a doctrine as teaches what man who has not observed the Law, and therefore is condemned by it, should believe, viz. that Christ has expiated and made satisfaction for all sins, and, without any merit of theirs [no merit of the sinner intervening], has obtained and acquired forgiveness of sins, righteousness that avails before God, and eternal life. [5]

5 But since the term Gospel is not used in one and the same sense in the Holy Scriptures, on account of which this dissension originally arose, we believe, teach and confess that if by the term Gospel the entire doctrine of Christ be understood, which he proposed in his ministry, as also did his apostles (in which sense it is employed, Mark 1:15; Acts 20:21), it is correctly said and written that the Gospel is a preaching of repentance and of the forgiveness of sins. [6]

6 But if the Law and the Gospel be contrasted with one another, as Moses himself is called a teacher of the Law, and Christ a preacher of the Gospel, we believe, teach and confess that the Gospel is not a preaching of repentance or reproof, but properly nothing else than a preaching of consolation, and a joyful message which does not reprove or terrify, but against the terrors of the Law consoles consciences, points alone to the merit of Christ, and again comforts them by the precious preaching of the grace and favor of God, obtained through Christ's merit. [7]

7 As to the revelation of sin, because the veil of Moses hangs before the eyes of all men as long as they hear the bare preaching of the Law, and nothing concerning Christ, and therefore do not learn from the Law to perceive their sins aright, but either become presumptuous hypocrites [who swell with the opinion of their own righteousness] as the Pharisees, or despair as did Judas; Christ takes the Law into his hands, and explains it spiritually (Matt. 5:21 sqq.; Rom. 7:14). And thus the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all sinners (Rom. 1:18), how great it is; by this means they are instructed in the Law, and then from it first learn to know aright their sins – a knowledge to which Moses never could coerce them. [8]

Therefore, although the preaching of the suffering and death of Christ, the Son of God, ⁻²⁻ is an earnest and terrible proclamation and declaration of God's wrath, whereby men are for the first time led aright to the Law, after the veil of Moses has been removed from them, so that they first know aright how great things God in his Law requires of us, nothing of which we can observe, and therefore should seek all our righteousness in Christ – [9]

8 Yet as long as all this (namely, Christ's suffering and death) proclaims God's wrath and terrifies man, it is still not properly the preaching of the Gospel, but the preaching of Moses and the Law, and therefore a "strange work" ⁻³⁻ of Christ, whereby he attains his proper office, i. e. to preach grace, console and quicken, which is properly the preaching of the Gospel. [10]

NEGATIVE

Contrary Doctrine which is Rejected

Therefore we reject and regard incorrect and injurious then dogma that the Gospel is properly a preaching of repentance or reproof, and not alone a preaching of grace. ⁻⁴⁻ For thereby the Gospel is again converted into a law, the merit of Christ and the Holy Scriptures obscured, Christians robbed of true consolation, and the door opened again to [the errors and superstitions of] the Papacy. [11]

Parallel Passages. – Apology, iv., 5 sqq.; 62 sqq.; (III.), 65 sqq.; Smalcald Articles, Part III., Art. ii., iv.; Sol. Dec, v.

-
1. Insisted on by Agricola. Cf. Apology (III.):66; xii.:29.↩
 2. Agricola maintained that this was sufficient for exciting repentance.↩
 3. Cf. Sol. Dec, in loco.↩
 4. Ascribed not only to Agricola, but to Anton, Otto, Paul Crell and Christopher Pezel.↩

CHAPTER 6 – OF THE THIRD USE OF THE LAW

STATEMENT OF THE CONTROVERSY

Since the Law was given to men for three reasons: *first*, that thereby outward discipline might be maintained against wild, disobedient men [and that wild and intractable men might be restrained, as though by certain bars]; *secondly*, that men thereby may be led to the knowledge of their sins; *thirdly*, that after they are regenerate and [much of] the flesh notwithstanding cleaves to them, they may have, on this account, a fixed rule, according to which they should regulate and direct their whole life; a dissension has occurred between some few theologians, concerning the third use of the Law, viz. whether it is to be urged or not upon regenerate Christians. The one side has said, Yes; ⁻¹⁻ the other, No. ⁻²⁻ [1]

AFFIRMATIVE

The true Christian Doctrine Concerning this Controversy

1 We believe, teach and confess that although men rightly believing [in Christ] and truly converted to God have been freed and exempted from the curse and coercion of the Law, they nevertheless are not on this account without Law, but have been redeemed by the Son of God, in order that they should exercise themselves in it day and night [that they should meditate upon God's Law day and night, and constantly exercise themselves in its observance (Ps. 1:2)], (Ps. 119). For even our first parents before the fall did not live without Law, which Law of God was also written upon their hearts, because they were created in the image of God (Gen. 1:26 sq.; 2:16 sqq.; 3:3). [2]

2 We believe, teach and confess that the preaching of the Law is to be urged with diligence, not only upon the unbelieving and impenitent, but also upon the

rightly believing, truly converted, regenerate, and justified by faith. [3]

3 For although they are regenerate and renewed in the spirit of their mind, yet, in the present life, this regeneration and renewal are not complete, but are only begun, and believers are, in the spirit of their mind, in a constant struggle against the flesh, i. e. against the corrupt nature and disposition which cleaves to us unto death. On account of this old Adam, which still inheres in the understanding, will and all the powers of man, it is needful that the Law of the Lord always shine upon the way before him, in order that he may do nothing from self-imposed human devotion [that he may frame nothing in a matter of religion from the desire of private devotion, and may not choose divine services not instituted by God's Word]; likewise, that the old Adam also may not employ his own will, but may be subdued against his will, not only by the admonition and threatening of the Law, but also by punishments and blows, so that he may follow and surrender himself captive to the Spirit (1 Cor. 9:27; Rom. 6:12; Gal. 6:14; Ps. 119:1 sqq.; Heb. 13:21 [Heb. 12:1]). [4]

4 Then as to the distinction between the works of the Law and the fruits of the Spirit, we believe, teach and confess that the works which are done according to the Law, as long as they are and are called works of the Law, are only extorted from man by the force of punishment and the threatening of God's wrath. [5]

5 But the fruits of the Spirit are the works which the Spirit of God who dwells in believers works through the regenerate, and are done by believers so far as they are regenerate [spontaneously and freely], as though they knew of no command, threat or reward; for in this manner the children of God live in the Law and walk according to the Law of God, a manner which St. Paul, in his Epistles, calls the Law of Christ and the Law of the mind [Rom. 7:25; 8:7 [Rom. 8:2; Gal. 6:2]]. [6]

6 Thus the Law is and remains both to the penitent and impenitent, both to regenerate and unregenerate men, one and the same Law, namely, the immutable will of God; and the distinction, so far as it concerns obedience, is alone in the men, inasmuch as one who is not yet regenerate does what is required him by the Law out of constraint and unwillingly (as also the regenerate do according to the flesh); but the believer, so far as he is regenerate, without constraint and with a

willing spirit, does that which no threatening [however severe] of the Law could ever extort from him. [7]

NEGATIVE

False Contrary Doctrine

Therefore we reject as a dogma and error injurious and conflicting with Christian discipline and true piety that the Law in the above-mentioned way and degree should not be urged upon Christians and those truly believing, but only upon unbelievers and those not Christian, and upon the impenitent. [8]

Parallel Passages. – Sol. Dec, vi.; Smalcald Articles, Part III., Art. iii.: 40; Formula of Concord, Sol. Dec, ii:65 sqq.

1. Luther against Agricola, 1538 and 1539; Erlangen, Ed. 32: 1, 64; De Wette's Luther's Letters, v.:147.↩
2. Called Modern Antinomians. See "New Confession of the Antinomians," Schlüsselberg;, Catalog Haeretic. iv.:45↩

CHAPTER 7 – OF THE LORD’S SUPPER

Although the Zwinglian teachers are not to be reckoned among the theologians who acknowledge and profess the Augsburg Confession, as they separated from them when this Confession was presented, ⁻¹⁻ nevertheless since they are intruding themselves [with their assembly], and are attempting, under the name of this Christian Confession, to introduce their error, ⁻²⁻ we have wished also to make such a report as is needful [we have judged that the Church of Christ should be instructed also] concerning this controversy. [1]

STATEMENT OF THE CONTROVERSY

Chief Controversy between our Doctrine and that of the Sacramentarians upon this article

Whether in the Holy Supper the true body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ are truly and essentially present, are distributed with the bread and wine, and received with the mouth by all those who use this sacrament, whether they be worthy or unworthy, godly or ungodly, believing or unbelieving; by the believing, for consolation and life; by the unbelieving, for judgment [so that the believing receive from the Lord’s Supper consolation and life, but the unbelieving take it for their judgment]? The Sacramentarians say, No; we say, Yes. [2]

For the explanation of this controversy it is to be noted in the beginning that there are two kinds of Sacramentarians. Some are gross Sacramentarians, who declare in clear words what they believe in their hearts, viz. that in the Holy Supper nothing but bread and wine is present, and distributed and received with the mouth. ⁻³⁻ Others, however, are subtle Sacramentarians, and the most injurious of all, who partly speak very speciously [deceptively] in our own words, and assert that they also believe in a true presence of the true, essential, living body and blood of Christ in the Holy Supper, yet that this occurs

spiritually through faith. ⁻⁴⁻ Nevertheless beneath these specious words, precisely the former gross opinion is contained, viz. that in the Holy Supper nothing is present and received with the mouth except bread and wine. For with them the word spiritually means nothing else than the Spirit of Christ, or the power of the absent body of Christ, and his merit, which are present; but the body of Christ is in no mode or way present, except only above in the highest heaven, to which in heaven we should elevate ourselves by the thoughts of our faith, and there, and not at all in the bread and wine of the Holy Supper, should seek this body and blood [of Christ]. [3-5]

AFFIRMATIVE

Confession of the Pure Doctrine concerning the Holy Supper against the Sacramentarians

1 We believe, teach and confess that, in the Holy Supper the body and blood of Christ are truly and essentially present, and are truly distributed and received with the bread and wine. [6]

2 We believe, teach and confess that the words of the testament of Christ are not to be understood otherwise than as they sound, according to the letters; so that the bread does not signify the absent body, and the wine the absent blood of Christ, but that, on account of the sacramental union, they [the bread and wine] are truly the body and blood of Christ. ⁻⁵⁻ [7]

3 As to the consecration, we believe, teach and confess that no work of man or declaration of the minister [of the church] produces this presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Holy Supper, but that this should be ascribed only and alone to the almighty power of our Lord Jesus Christ. [8]

4 But at the same time we also unanimously believe, teach and confess that in the use of the Holy Supper the words of the institution of Christ should in no way be omitted, but should be publicly recited, as it is written (1 Cor. 10:16):

The cup of blessing, which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? etc. This blessing occurs through the recitation of the Word of Christ. [9]

5 Moreover the foundations upon which we stand against the Sacramentarians in this matter are those which Dr. Luther has laid down in his Large Confession concerning the Lord's Supper. ⁻⁶⁻ [10]

The first is this article of our Christian faith: Jesus Christ is true, essential, natural, perfect God and man in one person, undivided and inseparable. [11]

The second: That God's right hand is everywhere; at which Christ is in deed and in truth placed according to his human nature, [and therefore] being present rules, and has in his hands and beneath his feet everything that is in heaven and on earth [as Scripture says (Eph. 1:22)]: There [at this right hand of God] no man else, or angel, but only the Son of Mary, is placed; whence he can effect this [those things which we have said]. [12]

The third: That God's Word is not false, and does not deceive. [13]

The fourth: That God has and knows of many modes of being in a place, and not only the one [is not bound to the one] which philosophers call local [or circumscribed]. ⁻⁷⁻ [14]

6 We believe, teach and confess that the body and blood of Christ are received with the bread and wine, not only spiritually by faith, but also orally; yet not in a Capernaitic, ⁻⁸⁻ but in a supernatural, heavenly mode, because of the sacramental union; as the words of Christ clearly show, where Christ directs to take, eat and drink, as was then done by the apostles, for it is written (Mark 14:23): *And they all drank of it.* [15]

St. Paul likewise says (1 Cor. 10:16): *The bread which we break is it not the communion of the body of Christ?* i. e. he who eats this bread, eats the body of Christ, which also the chief ancient teachers of the Church, Chrysostom, Cyprian, Leo I., Gregory, Ambrose, Augustine, unanimously testify.

7 We believe, teach and confess that not only the truly believing [in Christ] and worthy, but also the unworthy and unbelieving, receive the true body and blood of Christ; yet not for life and consolation, but for judgment and condemnation, if they are not converted and do not repent (1 Cor. 11:27,29). [16]

For although they repel Christ from themselves as a Savior, yet they must admit him even against their will as a strict Judge, who is present also to exercise and render judgment upon impenitent guests, as well as to work life and consolation in the hearts of the truly believing and worthy. [17]

8 We believe, teach and confess also that there is only one kind of unworthy guests, viz. those who do not believe; concerning whom it is written (John 3:18): *He that believeth not is condemned already*. By the unworthy use of the Holy Supper this judgment is augmented, increased, and aggravated (1 Cor. 11:29). [18]

9 We believe, teach and confess that no true believer, as long as he retain living faith, however weak he may be, receives the Holy Supper to his judgment, which was instituted especially for Christians weak in faith, and yet penitent, for the consolation and strengthening of their weak faith (Matt. 9:12; 11:5, 28). [19]

10 We believe, teach and confess that all the worthiness of the guests of this heavenly feast is and consists alone in the most holy obedience and absolute merit of Christ, which we appropriate to ourselves by true faith, and of it [this merit] we are assured by the sacrament. This worthiness does not at all depend upon our virtues or inner and outward preparations. ⁻⁹⁻ [20]

NEGATIVE

Contrary condemned Doctrines of the Sacramentarians

On the other hand, we unanimously reject and condemn all the following erroneous articles, which are opposed and contrary to the above-presented

doctrine, simple [simplicity of] faith, and the [pure] confession concerning the Lord's Supper: [21]

1 The Papistic transubstantiation, where it is taught in the Papacy that in the Holy Supper the bread and wine lose their substance and natural essence, and are thus annihilated; that they are changed into the body of Christ, and the outward form alone remains. [22]

2 The Papistic sacrifice of the mass for the sins of the living and the dead. [23]

3 That [the sacrilege whereby] to laymen only one form of the sacrament is given, and the cup is withheld from them, against the plain words of the testament of Christ, and they are [thus] deprived of his blood. [24]

4 When it is taught that the words of the testament of Christ should not be understood or believed simply as they sound, but that they are obscure expressions, whose meaning must be sought first in other passages of Scripture. ⁻¹⁰⁻ [25]

5 That in the Holy Supper the body of Christ is not received orally with the bread; but that with the mouth only bread and wine are received, and the body of Christ only spiritually by faith. ⁻¹¹⁻ [26]

6 That the bread and wine in the Holy Supper are nothing more than [symbols or] tokens, whereby Christians recognize one another. ⁻¹²⁻ [27]

7 That the bread and wine are only figures, similitudes and representations of the far, absent body of Christ. ⁻¹³⁻ [28]

8 That the bread and wine are no more than a memorial, ⁻¹⁴⁻ seal and pledge, through which we are assured, when faith elevates itself to heaven, that it there becomes participant of the body and blood of Christ as truly as, in the Supper, we eat bread and drink wine. ⁻¹⁵⁻ [29]

9 That the assurance and confirmation of our faith [concerning salvation] occur in the Holy Supper alone through the external signs of bread and wine, and not

through the truly present true body and blood of Christ. [30]

10 That in the Holy Supper only the power, efficacy and merit of the far absent body and blood of Christ are distributed. ⁻¹⁶⁻ [31]

11 That the body of Christ is so enclosed in heaven that it can in no way be at one and the same time in many or all places upon earth where his Holy Supper is celebrated. ⁻¹⁷⁻ [32]

12 That Christ has not promised, neither can afford, the essential presence of his body and blood in the Holy Supper, because the nature and property of his assumed human nature cannot suffer or permit it. [33]

13 That God, according to [even by] his omnipotence (which is dreadful to hear), is not able to render his body essentially present in more than one place at one time. ⁻¹⁸⁻ [34]

14 That not the omnipotent Word of Christ's testament, but faith, produces and makes [is the cause of] the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Holy Supper. [35]

15 That believers should not seek the body [and blood] of Christ in the bread and wine of the Holy Supper, but from the bread should raise their eyes to heaven, and there seek the body of Christ. ⁻¹⁹⁻ [36]

16 That unbelieving, impenitent Christians in the Holy Supper do not receive the true body and blood of Christ, but only bread and wine. ⁻²⁰⁻ [37]

17 That the worthiness of the guests in this heavenly meal consists not alone in true faith in Christ, but also in the external preparation of men. ⁻²¹⁻ [38]

18 That even the truly believing, who have and retain a true, living, pure faith in Christ, can receive this sacrament to their judgment, because they are still imperfect in their outward life. ⁻²²⁻ [39]

19 That the external visible elements in the Holy Sacrament should be adored.
-23- [40]

20 Likewise, we consign also to the just judgment of God all presumptuous, sarcastic, blasphemous questions (which out of regard to decency are not to be mentioned), and other expressions, which very blasphemously and with great offence [to the Church] are proposed by the Sacramentarians in a gross, carnal, Capernaitic way concerning the supernatural, heavenly mysteries of this sacrament. [41]

21 As, then, we hereby utterly [reject and] condemn the Capernaitic eating [manducation] of the body of Christ, which the Sacramentarians, against the testimony of their conscience, after all our frequent protests, willfully force upon us, and in this way make our doctrine odious to their hearers, as though [we taught that] his flesh were rent with the teeth, and digested as other food; on the contrary, we maintain and believe, according to the simple words of the testament of Christ, in the true, yet supernatural eating of the body of Christ, as also in the drinking of his blood, a doctrine which man's sense and reason does not comprehend, but, as in all other articles of faith, our reason is brought into captivity to the obedience of Christ, and this mystery is not embraced otherwise than by faith alone, and is not revealed elsewhere than in the Word alone. [42]

Parallel Passages. – Augsburg Confession, x.; Apology, x.; Smalcald Articles Part III., Art. vi.; Small Catechism, 365; Large Catechism, 499; Formula of Concord, Sol. Dec, vii.

-
1. For they offered the “Tetrapolitan Confession,” and Zwingli his own “Fidei Rationis.”↩
 2. Preface to Book of Concord, p. 12, 15.↩
 3. Carlstadt, Zwingli, Oecolampadius.↩

4. Bucer, Peter Martyr, Calvin and the Crypto-Calvinistic theologians of Leipsic and Wittenberg.↵
5. Smalcald Articles, Part III., Art. vi; Large Catechism, 501:14. The meaning of this expression is explained by Sol. Dec., vii.:14: “With the bread and wine the body and blood of Christ are truly and essentially present, offered and received.”↵
6. Wittenberg, 1528, Erlangen Ed., 30:151.↵
7. Cf. Sol. Dec., vii.:98 sqq.↵
8. The word is derived from John 6:26, 52: “As though his flesh were rent with the teeth and digested like other food,” § 42.↵
9. Cf. § 38.↵
10. Zwingli Oecolampadius, Calvin. John vi. especially was appealed to.↵
11. See Consensus Tigurinus, Art. ix.↵
12. Zwingli, De vera et falsa religione (Opp. iii., p. 145 sq.).↵
13. Opinion of Zwingli, Calvin, Beza, Bullinger. See Planck, iv.:21, 63.↵
14. Cf. Sol. Dec, vii.:115 sqq.↵
15. Calvin, e. g. Comment on 1 Cor. 11:23.↵
16. See Calvin’s Institutes, iv., chap, xxii., § 18.↵
17. See Consensus Tigurinus, xxi.; Niemeyer, xxiv., p. 196. Cf. Sol. Dec vii:119.↵
18. Beza used almost these words: Creophagia, p. 152 sq.↵
19. Consensus Tigurinus, xxi.↵

20. All the Sacramentarians.↩
21. Doctrine of the papists; Council of Trent, Sess. xiii., chaps. 7 and 11.↩
22. Ib.↩
23. With worship, latria; see Council of Trent, Sess. xiii., chaps. 5 and 6,↩

CHAPTER 8 – OF THE PERSON OF CHRIST

From the controversy concerning the Holy Supper a disagreement has arisen between the pure theologians of the Augsburg Confession and the Calvinists, who also have confused some other theologians, concerning the person of Christ and the two natures in Christ and their properties. [1]

STATEMENT OF THE CONTROVERSY

Chief Controversy in this Dissension

The chief question, however, has been whether, because of the personal union, the divine and human natures, as also their properties, have really, that is, in deed and truth, a communion with one another in the person of Christ, and how far this communion extends? [2]

The Sacramentarians have asserted that the divine and human natures in Christ are united personally in such a way that neither has really, that is, in deed and truth, in common with the other that which is peculiar to either nature, but that they have in common nothing more than the names alone. For “union,” they plainly say, ⁻¹⁻ “makes common names,” i. e. the personal union makes nothing more than the names common, namely, that God is called man, and man God, yet in such a way that God has nothing really, that is, in deed and truth, in common with humanity, and humanity nothing in common with divinity, as to its majesty and properties. Dr. Luther, and those who hold with him, have, against the Sacramentarians, contended for the contrary. [3]

AFFIRMATIVE

Pure Doctrine of the Christian Church concerning the Person of Christ

To explain this controversy, and settle it according to the guidance [analogy] of our Christian faith, our doctrine, faith and confession is as follows: [4]

1 That the divine and human natures in Christ are personally united, so that there are not two Christs, one the Son of God, the other the Son of man, but that one and the same is the Son of God and Son of man (Luke 1:35; Rom. 9:5). [5]

2 We believe, teach and confess that the divine and human natures are not mingled into one substance, nor the one changed into the other, but each retains its own essential properties, which can never become the properties of the other nature. [6]

3 The properties of the divine nature are: to be almighty, eternal, infinite, and, according to the property of its nature and its natural essence, to be, of itself, everywhere present, to know everything, etc.; which never become properties of the human nature. [7]

4 The properties of the human nature are: to be a corporeal creature, to be flesh and blood, to be finite and circumscribed, to suffer, to die, to ascend and descend, to move from one place to another, to suffer hunger, thirst, cold, heat, and the like; which never become properties of the divine nature. [8]

5 As the two natures are united personally, i. e. in one person, we believe, teach and confess that this union is not such a combination and connection that neither nature should have anything in common with the other, personally, i. e. because of the personal union, as when two boards are glued together, where neither gives anything to the other, or takes anything from the other. ⁻²⁻ But here is the highest communion, which God has truly with [assumed] man, from which personal union and the highest and ineffable communion that follows therefrom, all results that is said and believed of the human concerning God, and of the divine concerning the man Christ; as the ancient teachers of the Church explained this union and communion of the natures by the illustration of iron glowing with fire, and also by the union of body and soul in man. ⁻³⁻ [9]

6 Hence we believe, teach and confess that God is man and man is God, which could not be if the divine and human natures had, in deed and truth, absolutely no communion with one another. [10]

For how could a man, the son of Mary, in truth be called or be God, the Son of the Highest, if his humanity were not personally united with the Son of God, and he thus had really, i. e. in deed and truth, nothing in common with him, except only the name of God? [11]

7 Hence we believe, teach and confess that Mary conceived and bore not a mere man, and no more, but the true Son of God; therefore she is also rightly called and is the mother of God. [12]

8 Hence we also believe, teach and confess that it was not a mere man who, for us, suffered, died, was buried, descended to hell, arose from the dead, ascended into heaven, and was raised to the majesty and almighty power of God, but a man whose human nature has such a profound, ineffable union and communion with the Son of God that it is [was made] one person with him. [13]

9 Therefore the Son of God truly suffered for us, nevertheless according to the property of the human nature, which he assumed into the unity of his divine person, and made it his own, so that he might suffer and be our high priest for our reconciliation with God, as it is written (1 Cor. 2:8): *They have crucified the Lord of glory*. And (Acts 20:28): *We are purchased with God's blood*. [14]

10 Hence we believe, teach and confess that the Son of man is really, that is, in deed and truth, exalted, according to his human nature, to the right hand of the almighty majesty and power of God, because he [that man] was assumed into God when he was conceived of the Holy Ghost in his mother's womb, and his human nature was personally united with the Son of the Highest. [15]

11 This majesty, according to the personal union, he [Christ] always had, and yet, in the state of his humiliation, he abstained from it, and, on this account, truly grew in all wisdom and favor with God and men; ⁻⁴⁻ therefore he exercised this majesty, not always, but when [as often as] it pleased him, until, after his

resurrection, he entirely laid aside the form of a servant, and not the nature, and was established in the full use, manifestation and declaration of the divine majesty, and thus entered into his glory (Phil. 2:6 sqq.), so that now not only as God, but also as man, he knows all things, can do all things, is present with all creatures, and has, under his feet and in his hands, everything that is in heaven, and on earth, and under the earth, as he himself testifies (Matt. 28:18; John 13:3): *All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth*. And St. Paul says (Eph. 4:10): *He ascended up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things*. Everywhere present, he can exercise this his power, and to him everything is possible and everything known. [16]

12 Hence, being present, he also is able, and to him is very easy, to impart his true body and blood in the Holy Supper, not according to the mode or property of the human nature, but according to the mode and property of the right hand of God, as Dr. Luther says in our Christian Faith for Children [according to the analogy of our Christian faith comprised in his Catechism]; which presence [of Christ in the Holy Supper] is not [physical or] earthly, or Capernaitic; nevertheless it is true and substantial, as the words of his testament sound: *This is, is, is my body*, etc. [17]

By this our doctrine, faith and confession the person of Christ is not divided, as it was by Nestorius, who denied the *communicatio idiomatum*, i. e. the true communion of the properties of both natures in Christ, and thus separated the person, as Luther has explained in his book concerning the Councils. Neither are the natures, together with their properties, confounded with one another [or mingled] into one essence, as Eutyches erred; neither is the human nature in the person of Christ denied, or extinguished, nor is either creature changed into the other; ⁻⁵⁻ but Christ is and remains, for all eternity, God and man in one undivided person, which, next to the Holy Trinity, is the highest mystery, as the Apostle testifies (1 Tim. 3:16), upon which our only consolation, life and salvation depend. [18]

NEGATIVE

Contrary False Doctrines concerning the Person of Christ

Therefore we reject and condemn, as contrary to God's Word and our simple [pure] Christian faith, all the following erroneous articles, when it is taught: [19]

1 That God and man in Christ are not one person, but that the one is the Son of God, and the other the Son of man, as Nestorius raved. [20]

2 That the divine and human natures have been mingled with one another into one essence, and the human nature has been changed into Deity, as Eutyches fanatically asserted. [21]

3 That Christ is not true, natural and eternal God, as Arius held [blasphemed]. [22]

4 That Christ did not have a true human nature [consisting] of body and soul, as Marcion imagined. [23]

5 That the personal union renders only the names and titles common. ⁻⁶⁻ [24]

6 That it is only a phrase and mode of speaking ⁻⁷⁻ when it is said: God is man, man is God; for that the divinity has nothing in common with the humanity, as also the humanity has nothing really, that is, in deed and truth, common with the divinity [Deity]. [25]

7 That the communication is only verbal when it is said: "The Son of God died for the sins of the world;" "The Son of man has become almighty." [26]

8 That ⁻⁸⁻ the human nature in Christ has become an infinite essence in the same manner as the divinity, and from this, essential power and property, imparted and effused upon the human nature, and separated from God, is everywhere present in the same manner as the divine nature. [27]

9 That the human nature has become equal to, and like the divine nature, in its substance and essence, or in its essential properties. [28]

10 That the human nature of Christ is locally extended in all places of heaven and earth, which should not be ascribed even to the divine nature. [29]

11 That, because of the property of his human nature, it is impossible for Christ to be able to be at the same time in more than one place, much less to be everywhere with his body. ⁻⁹⁻ [30]

12 That only the mere humanity has suffered for us and redeemed us, and that the Son of God in suffering had actually no participation with the humanity, as though it did not pertain to him. ⁻¹⁰⁻ [31]

13 That Christ is present with us on earth in the Word, the sacraments and all our troubles, only according to his divinity, and this presence does not at all pertain to his human nature, according to which he has also nothing more whatever to do with us even upon earth, since he redeemed us by his suffering and death. ⁻¹¹⁻ [32]

14 That the Son of God, who assumed human nature, since he has laid aside the form of a servant does not perform all the works of his omnipotence in, through and with his human nature, but only some, and those too only in the place ⁻¹²⁻ where his human nature is locally. [33]

15 That, according to his human nature, he is not at all capable ⁻¹³⁻ of omnipotence and other attributes of the divine nature against the express declaration of Christ (Matt. 28:18): *All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth*. And [they contradict] St. Paul [who says] (Col. 2:9): *In him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily*. [34]

“The body of Christ, since its resurrection, is limited, and received into heaven till the last day.”— lb. 26.

16 That to him [to Christ according to his humanity] great power is given in heaven and upon earth, namely, greater and more than to all angels and other creatures, but that he has no participation in the omnipotence of God, and that this also has not been given him. Hence they devise an intermediate power, that

is, such power between the almighty power of God and the power of other creatures, given to Christ, according to his humanity, by the exaltation, as is less than God's almighty power, and greater than that of other creatures. ⁻¹⁴⁻ [35]

17 That Christ, according to his human spirit, has a certain limit as to how much he should know, and that he knows no more than is becoming and needful for him to know for [the execution of] his office as judge. [36]

18 That not even yet does Christ have a perfect knowledge of God and all his works; of whom, nevertheless, it is written (Col. 2:3): *In whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge.* [37]

19 That it is impossible for Christ, according to his human mind, to know what has been from eternity, what at the present time is everywhere occurring, and will be yet to [all] eternity. [38]

20 When it is taught, and the passage (Matt. 28:18): *All power is given unto me*, etc., is thus interpreted and blasphemously perverted, viz. that to Christ according to the divine nature, at the resurrection and his ascension to heaven, was restored, i. e. delivered again all power in heaven and on earth; as though, in his state of humiliation, he had also, according to his divinity, ⁻¹⁵⁻ divested himself of this and abandoned it. By this doctrine, not only are the words of the testament of Christ perverted, but also the way is prepared for the accursed Arian heresy, so that finally the eternal divinity of Christ is denied, and thus Christ, and with him our salvation, are entirely lost where this false doctrine is not [constantly] contradicted from the firm foundation of God's Word and our simple Christian [Catholic] faith. [39]

Parallel Passages. – Ecumenical Creeds: Augsburg Confession, III.; Apology, III.; Smalcald Articles, Part I.; Small Catechism, Creed, Art. ii.; Large Catechism, ib.; Formula of Concord, Sol. Dec, viii. Cf. Martin Chemnitz, De duabus naturis.

1. See below, § 24-28. Borrowed by Sacramentarians from Theodore¹

2. Cf. Sol. Dec. viii.:14, 15.↩
3. So Gregory of Nyssa, Basil, John Damascenus. See Catalog of Testimonies.↩
4. See Luke 2:52.↩
5. Error of Monophysites, Schwenkfeldians. See below, xii.:29.↩
6. See above, § 3. Cf. § 26.↩
7. Zwingli termed it *allaeosis*. Cf. Sol. Dec., viii., § 39 *sqa*.↩
8. Charged by Bullinger, Beza, Peter Martyr against the Wittenberg theologians. Cf. Sol. Dec., viii., § 63.↩
9. “Let them no longer ascribe to the glorified body of Christ the property of being in many places at once.” – Calvin’s Institutes, iv.:17, 29.↩
10. Cf. Sol. Dec, viii.:40 *sqq*.↩
11. Calvin. Cf. Sol. Dec, viii.:78 *sqq*.; 87 *sqq*.↩
12. I. e. in heaven. Cf. above, vii.:32. Also note to vii.:14.↩
13. Beza in Mompelgard Colloquy: “The finite is not capable or participant of the infinite.”↩
14. Cf. Sol. Dec, viii.:54, 55. Errors 16-19 were held by some of the Calvinists.↩
15. The Crypto-Calvinists taught that Christ was exalted according to both natures.↩

CHAPTER 9 – OF THE DESCENT OF CHRIST TO HELL

STATEMENT OF THE CONTROVERSY

Chief Controversy concerning this Article

There has also been a controversy among some theologians, who have subscribed to the Augsburg Confession concerning the following article: When, and in what manner, the Lord Christ, according to our simple Christian faith, descended to hell, whether this was done before or after his death? Also, whether it occurred according to the soul alone, or according to the divinity alone, or in body and soul, spiritually or bodily? Also, whether this article belongs to the passion or to the glorious victory and triumph of Christ? [1]

But since this article, as also the preceding, cannot be comprehended by the senses or by the reason, but must be grasped alone by faith, it is our unanimous advice that there should be no disputation concerning it, but that it should be believed and taught only in the simplest manner; according as Dr. Luther of blessed memory, in his sermon at Torgau in the year 1533, ⁻¹⁻ has, in a very Christian manner, explained this article, separated from it all useless, unnecessary questions, and admonished all godly Christians to Christian simplicity of faith. [2]

For it is sufficient that we know that Christ descended to hell, destroyed hell for all believers, and delivered them from the power of death and of the devil, from eternal condemnation [and even] from the jaws of hell. But how this occurred, we should [not curiously investigate, but] reserve until the other world, where not only this point [mystery], but also still others, will be revealed which we here simply believe, and cannot comprehend with our blind reason. [3]

**Parallel Passages. – Ecumenical Creeds; Augsburg Confession, iii.;
Small Catechism, 357; Large Catechism, 452 sqq.; Formula of Concord,
Sol, Dec, ix.**

1. Erlangen Edition, 20:165 sqq. [↩](#)

CHAPTER 10 – OF CHURCH RITES WHICH ARE [COMMONLY] CALLED ADIAPHORA OR MATTERS OF INDIFFERENCE

Concerning ceremonies or church rites which are neither commanded nor forbidden in God's Word, but have been introduced into the Church for the sake of good order and propriety, a dissension has also occurred among the theologians of the Augsburg Confession. [1]

STATEMENT OF THE CONTROVERSY

The chief question has been, whether, in time of persecution and in case of confession, even if the enemies of the Gospel do not agree with us in doctrine, yet some abrogated ceremonies, which in themselves are matters of indifference and are neither commanded nor forbidden by God, may without violence to conscience be re-established in compliance with the pressure and demand of the adversaries, and thus in such ceremonies and adiaphora we may [rightly] have conformity with them? The one side ⁻¹⁻ says, Yes; the other ⁻²⁻ says, No, thereto. [2]

AFFIRMATIVE

The Pure and True Doctrine and Confession concerning this Article

1 For settling also this controversy we unanimously believe, teach and confess that the ceremonies or church rites which are neither commanded nor forbidden in God's Word, but have been instituted alone for the sake of propriety and good order, are in and of themselves no service, nor are even a part of the service of

God. Matt. 15:9: *In vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.* [3]

2 We believe, teach and confess that the Church of God of every place and every time has the power, according to its circumstances, to change such ceremonies, in such manner as may be most useful and edifying to the Church of God. [4]

3 Nevertheless, that herein all inconsiderateness and offence should be avoided, and especial care should be taken to exercise forbearance to the weak in faith (1 Cor. 8:9; Rom. 14:13). [5]

4 We believe, teach and confess that in time of persecution, when a bold [and steadfast] confession is required of us, we should not yield to the enemies in regard to such adiaphora, as the apostle has written (Gal. 5:1): *Stand fast, therefore, in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again in the yoke of bondage.* Also (2 Cor. 6:14): *Be not unequally yoked together with unbelievers, etc. For what concord hath light with darkness?* Also (Gal. 2:5): *To whom we gave place, no, not for an hour, that the truth of the Gospel might remain with you.* For in such a case it is no longer a question concerning adiaphora, but concerning the truth of the Gospel, concerning [preserving] Christian liberty, and concerning sanctioning open idolatry, as also concerning the prevention of offence to the weak in the faith [how care should be taken lest idolatry be openly sanctioned and the weak in faith be offended]; in which we have nothing to concede, but should boldly confess and suffer what God sends, and what he allows the enemies of his Word to inflict upon us. [6]

5 We believe, teach and confess also that no Church should condemn another because one has less or more external ceremonies not commanded by God than the other, if otherwise there is agreement among them in doctrine and all its articles, as also in the right use of the holy sacraments, according to the well-known saying: “Disagreement in fasting does not destroy agreement in faith.” ⁻³⁻
[7]

NEGATIVE

False Doctrines concerning this Article

Therefore we reject and condemn as wrong, and contrary to God's Word, when it is taught: [8]

1 That human ordinances and institutions should be regarded in the churches as in themselves a service or part of the service of God. ⁻⁴⁻ [9]

2 When such ceremonies, ordinances and institutions are violently forced upon the Church of God, contrary to the Christian liberty which it has in external things. ⁻⁵⁻ [10]

3 Also, that in the time of persecution ⁻⁶⁻ and public confession [when a clear confession is required] we may comply with the enemies of the Gospel in the observance of such adiaphora and ceremonies, or may come to an agreement with them, – which causes injury to the truth. ⁻⁷⁻ [11]

4 Also, when these external ceremonies and adiaphora are abrogated in such a manner as though it were not free to the Church of God to employ one or more ⁻⁸⁻ [this or that] in Christian liberty, according to its circumstances, as may be most useful at any time to the Church [for edification]. [12]

Parallel Passages. – Augsburg Confession, xv., xxvi.; Apology, vii.:3(sqq.; xv.; Smalcald Articles, Part III., Art. xv.; Formula of Concord, Sol Dec, x.

-
1. The authors of the Leipsic Formula: Melanchthon, Paul Eber (1569), Bugenhagen (1558), George Major (1574), John Pfeffinger (1573).↩
 2. Especially Flacius, Nicol. Gallus (1570), John Wigand (1587), Amsdorf, Joach. Westphal (1574).↩
 3. Irenseus In Ep. to Victor, Bishop of Rome, in Eusebius's Church History, v.:24. Cf. Augsburg Confession, xxvi.:44.↩

4. Opinion of the Papists. See Confutation, I., Art. xv; II., Art. v. Cf. Apology, xv.:40.↵
5. Cf. Apology, xv.:37.↵
6. As when the Augsburg Interim was introduced by force.↵
7. See extracts from Leipsic Interim, Walch's Introduction, p. 865; 01 text of Interim, Gieseler's Church History, iv.:201-203.↵
8. Sol. Dec, x.:30. An error of the Papists, who affirmed that in ecclesiastical rites nothing ought to be changed without the consent of the Pope, Cf. Council of Trent, Sess. xxv., p. 85 (Tauchn. Ed.)↵

CHAPTER 11 – OF GOD’S ETERNAL FOREKNOWLEDGE [PREDESTINATION] AND ELECTION

Concerning this article no public dissension has occurred among the theologians of the Augsburg Confession. ⁻¹⁻ But since it is a consolatory article, if treated properly, and by this means the introduction in the future of a controversy likely to cause offence may be avoided, it is also explained in this writing. [1]

AFFIRMATIVE

The Pure and True Doctrine concerning this Article

1 First of all, the distinction between foreknowledge and predestination, that is, between God’s foreknowledge and his eternal election, ought to be accurately observed. [2]

2 For the foreknowledge of God is nothing else than that God knows all things before they happen, as it is written (Dan. 2:28): *There is a God in heaven that revealeth secrets and maketh known to the king Nebuchadnezzar what shall be in the latter days.* [3]

3 This foreknowledge is occupied alike with the godly and the wicked; but it is not the cause of evil or of sin, so that men do what is wrong (which originally arises from the devil and the wicked, perverse will of man); nor the cause of their ruin [that men perish], for which they themselves are responsible [which they ought to ascribe to themselves]; but only regulates it, and fixes to it a limit [how far it should progress and] how long it should last, and that everything, notwithstanding that in itself it is evil, should serve his elect for their salvation.

[4]

4 The predestination or eternal election of God, however, is occupied only with the godly, beloved children of God, and this is a cause of their salvation, which he also provides as well as disposes what belongs thereto. Upon this [predestination of God] our salvation is founded so firmly that the gates of hell cannot overcome it (John 10:28; Matt. 16:18). [5]

5 This is not to be investigated in the secret counsel of God, but to be sought in the Word of God, where it is also revealed. [6]

6 But the Word of God leads us to Christ, who is the Book of Life, ⁻²⁻ in whom all are written and elected that are to be saved, as it is written (Eph. 1:4): *He hath chosen us in him [Christ] before the foundation of the world.* [7]

7 Thus Christ calls to himself all sinners, and promises them rest, and he is anxious that all men should come to him and permit him to help them. To them he offers himself in his Word, and wishes them to hear it, and not to stop their ears or [neglect and] despise the Word. He promises besides the power and efficiency of the Holy Ghost, and divine assistance for perseverance and eternal salvation [that we may remain steadfast in the faith and attain eternal salvation]. [8]

8 Therefore we should judge concerning this our election to eternal life neither from reason nor from the Law of God, which would lead either into a dissipated, dissolute epicurean life, or into despair, and would excite in the heart of men pernicious thoughts (and such thoughts cannot be effectually guarded against as long as they follow their own reason), so that they think to themselves: “If God has elected me to salvation, I cannot be condemned, although I do whatever I will.” And again: “If I am not elected to eternal life, it matters not what good I do; for my efforts are nevertheless all in vain.” [9]

9 But the true judgment concerning predestination must be learned alone from the Holy Gospel concerning Christ, in which it is clearly testified that *God hath concluded them all in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all*, and that *he is not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance* (Rom. 11:32; Ez. 18:23; 33:11; 2 Pet. 3:9; 1 John 2:2). [10]

10 To him, therefore, who is really concerned about the revealed will of God, and proceeds according to the order which St. Paul has observed in the Epistle to the Romans, who first directs men to repentance, knowledge of sins, to faith in Christ, to divine obedience, before he speaks of the mystery of the eternal election of God, this doctrine [concerning God's predestination] is useful and consolatory. [11]

11 That, however, *many are called, few are chosen*, does not mean that God is unwilling that all should be saved, but the reason is that they either do not at all hear God's Word, but willfully despise it, close their ears and harden their hearts, and in this manner foreclose the ordinary way to the Holy Ghost, so that he cannot effect his work in them, or, when it is heard, they consider it of no account, and do not heed it. For this [that they perish] not God or his election, but their wickedness, is responsible (2 Pet. 2:1 sqq.; Luke 11:49, 52; Heb. 12:25 sq.). [12]

12 Moreover, a Christian should apply himself [in meditation] to the article concerning the eternal election of God, so far as it has been revealed in God's Word, which presents Christ to us as the Book of Life, which, by the preaching of the holy Gospel, he opens and spreads out to us, as it is written (Rom. 8:30): *Whom he did predestinate, them he also called*. In him, therefore, we should seek the eternal election of the Father, who, in his eternal divine counsel, determined that he would save no one except those who acknowledge his Son, Christ, and truly believe on him. Other thoughts are to be entirely banished [from the minds of the godly], as they proceed not from God, but from the suggestion of Satan, whereby he attempts to weaken or to entirely remove from us the glorious consolation which we have in this salutary doctrine, viz. that we know [assuredly] that out of pure grace, without any merit of our own, we have been elected in Christ to eternal life, and that no one can pluck us out of his hand; as he has promised this gracious election not only with mere words, but has also certified it with an oath, and sealed it with the holy sacraments, which we can [ought to] call to mind in our most severe temptations, and from them comfort ourselves, and thereby quench the fiery darts of the devil. [13]

13 Besides, we should endeavor with the greatest pains to live according to the will of God, and, as St. Peter admonishes (2 Ep. 1:10), *make our calling sure*, and especially adhere to [not recede a finger's breadth from] the revealed Word, that can and will not fail us. [14]

14 By this brief explanation of the eternal election of God, his glory is entirely and fully given to God, that alone, out of pure mercy, without all merit of ours, he saves us, according to the purpose of his will; besides, also, no cause is given any one for despondency or an abandoned, dissolute life [no opportunity is afforded either for those more severe agitations of mind and faint-heartedness or for epicureanism]. [15]

ANTITHESIS OR NEGATIVE

False Doctrine concerning this Article

Therefore we believe and hold: When the doctrine concerning the gracious election of God to eternal life is so presented that troubled Christians cannot comfort themselves therewith, but thereby despondency or despair is occasioned, or the impenitent are strengthened in their wantonness, that such doctrine is treated [wickedly and erroneously] not according to the Word and will of God, but according to reason and the instigation of Satan. *For*, as the apostle testifies (Rom. 15:4), *whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we, through patience and comfort of the Scriptures, might have hope*. Therefore we reject the following errors: [16]

1 As when it is taught that God is unwilling that all men repent and believe the Gospel. ⁻³⁻ [17]

2 Also, that when God calls us to himself he is not in earnest that all men should come to him. ⁻⁴⁻ [18]

3 Also, that God does not wish every one to be saved, but, without regard to their sins, alone from the counsel, purpose and will of God, some are appointed

to condemnation, so that they cannot be saved. ⁻⁵⁻ [19]

4 Also, that not only the mercy of God and the most holy merit of Christ, but also in us is a cause of God's election, on account of which God has elected us to everlasting life. ⁻⁶⁻ [20]

All these erroneous doctrines are blasphemous and dreadful, whereby there is removed from Christians all the comfort which they have in the holy Gospel and the use of the holy sacraments, and therefore should not be tolerated in the Church of God. [21]

This is a brief and simple explanation of the controverted articles, which for a time have been discussed and taught with conflicting opinions among the theologians of the Augsburg Confession. Hence every simple Christian, according to the guidance of God's Word and his simple Catechism, can distinguish what is right or wrong, where not only the pure doctrine is stated, but also the erroneous contrary doctrine is repudiated and rejected, and thus the controversies, full of causes of offence, that have occurred, are thoroughly settled and decided. [22]

May Almighty God, the Father of our Lord Jesus, grant the grace of his Holy Ghost, that we all may be one in him, and constantly abide in this Christian unity, which is well pleasing to him! Amen. [23]

Parallel Passages. – Formula of Concord, xi.

1. But between them and the Reformed. A controversy on this subject arose at Strasburg in 1561 between Jerome Zanchi and John Marbach.↵
2. Phil. 4:3; Rev. 17:8↵
3. For defense of this error see Calvin's Institutes, iii.: xxi. sqq.↵
4. Cf. Calvin's Institutes, iii.: xxiv.↵

5. “They are abandoned to this depravity, because they have been raised up by a just but inscrutable judgment of God to display his glory in their condemnation.” – Calvin’s Institutes, xxiv.:14.↩
6. Charged by the Calvinists against the Lutherans; more justly attributed to Arminians. Cf. above, § 13. Faith can never be a cause “on account of which” God elects, since it is never a cause “on account of which,” we are justified. See the *propter Christum per fidem* of Art. IV. of the Augsburg Confession. Cf. above, § 13.↩

CHAPTER 12 – OF OTHER FACTIONS [HERESIES] AND SECTS, WHICH NEVER EMBRACED THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION

In order that such [heresies and sects] may not silently be ascribed to us, because, in the preceding explanation, no mention of them has been made, we wish at the end [of this writing] simply to enumerate the mere articles wherein they [the heretics of our time] err and teach what is contrary to our Christian faith and confession above presented. [1]

ERRONEOUS ARTICLES OF THE ANABAPTISTS

The Anabaptists are divided into many sects, ⁻¹⁻ as one contends for more, another for less error; nevertheless, they all in common propound [profess] such doctrine as is neither to be tolerated nor allowed in the Church, the commonwealth and worldly government or domestic life. [2]

Articles that cannot be tolerated in the Church.

1 That Christ did not assume his body and blood of the Virgin Mary, but brought them with him from heaven. ⁻²⁻ [3]

2 That Christ is not true God, but only [is superior to other saints, because he] has more gifts of the Holy Ghost than any other holy man. ⁻³⁻ [4]

3 That our righteousness before God consists not only in the sole merit of Christ, but in renewal, and thus in our own godliness [uprightness] in which we walk. ⁻⁴⁻ This is based in great part upon one's own special, self-chosen [and humanly devised] spirituality [holiness], and in fact is nothing else than a new sort of monkery. [5]

4 That ⁻⁵⁻ children who are not baptized are not sinners before God, but righteous and innocent, who, in their innocency, because they have not yet attained their reason [the use of reason], will be saved without baptism (which, according to their assertion, they do not need). Therefore they reject the entire doctrine concerning original sin, and what belongs to it. [6]

5 That children should not be baptized until they have attained their reason [the use of reason], and can themselves confess their faith. [7]

6 That the children of Christians, because they have been born of Christian and believing parents, are holy and the children of God, even without and before baptism. For this reason also they neither attach much importance to the baptism of children, nor encourage it, contrary to the express words of God's promise, which pertains only to those who keep God's covenant and do not despise it (Gen. 17:7 sqq.). [8]

7 That ⁻⁶⁻ that is no true Christian congregation [church] wherein sinners are still found. [9]

8 That no sermon should be heard or attended in those churches in which the Papal masses have previously been observed and said. [10]

9 That no one [godly man] should have anything to do with those ministers of the Church who preach the Gospel according to the Augsburg Confession, and censure the sermons and errors of the Anabaptists; also, that no one should serve or in any way labor for them, but should flee from and shun them as perverters of God's Word. [11]

Articles that cannot be tolerated in the Government

1 That, ⁻⁷⁻ under the New Testament, the magistracy is not an estate pleasing to God. [12]

2 That a Christian cannot, with a good, inviolate conscience, hold or exercise the office of magistrate. [13]

3 That a Christian cannot, without injury to conscience, use the office of the magistracy against the wicked in matters as they occur [matters so requiring], nor may subjects invoke for their protection and screening the power which the magistrates possess and have received from God. [14]

4 That a Christian cannot, with a good conscience, take an oath, neither can he by an oath do homage [promise fidelity] to his prince or sovereign. [15]

5 That, under the New Testament, magistrates cannot, without injury to conscience, inflict capital punishment upon transgressors. [16]

Articles that cannot be tolerated in Domestic Life

1 That a Christian cannot [with an inviolate conscience] hold or possess property, but is in duty bound to devote it to the church. [17]

2 That a Christian cannot, with a good conscience, be a landlord, merchant, or cutler [maker of arms]. ⁻⁸⁻ [18]

3 That on account of diverse faith married persons may be divorced and abandon one another, and be married to another person of the same faith. ⁻⁹⁻ [19]

ERRONEOUS ARTICLES OF THE SCHWENCKFELDIANS

1 That all who regard Christ according to the flesh as a creature have no true knowledge of Christ as reigning King of heaven. [20]

2 That, by his exaltation, the flesh of Christ has so assumed all divine properties that Christ as man is in might, power, majesty and glory equal to the Father and to the Word, everywhere as to degree and condition of essence, so that now there is only one essence, property, will and glory of both natures in Christ, and that the flesh of Christ belongs to the essence of the Holy Trinity. [21]

3 That the Church service [ministry of the Word], the Word preached and heard, is not a means whereby God the Holy Ghost teaches men, and works in them

saving knowledge of Christ, conversion, repentance, faith and new obedience. [22]

4 That the water of baptism is not a means whereby God the Lord seals adoption and works regeneration. [23]

5 That bread and wine in the Holy Supper are not means through and by which Christ distributes his body and blood. [24]

6 That a Christian who is truly regenerated by God's Spirit can, in this life, observe and fulfill the Law of God perfectly. [25]

7 That there is no true Christian congregation [church] where no public excommunication [and some formal mode of excommunication] or no regular process of the ban [as it is commonly called] is observed. [26]

8 That the minister of the church who is not on his part truly renewed, regenerate, righteous and godly cannot teach other men with profit or distribute true sacraments. [27]

ERROR OF THE NEW ARIANS

That Christ is not true, essential, natural God, of one eternal, divine essence with God the Father and the Holy Ghost, but is only adorned with divine majesty beneath and beside God the Father [is so adorned with divine majesty, with the Father, that he is inferior to the Father]. [28]

ERROR OF THE ANTI-TRINITARIANS

This is an entirely new sect, not heard of before in Christendom, composed of those who believe, teach and confess that there is not only one, eternal, divine essence of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, but as God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost are three distinct persons, so each person has its essence distinct and separate from the other persons of the Godhead; and nevertheless [some of them

think] that all three, just as in another respect three men distinct and separate from one another are of equal power, wisdom, majesty and glory, or [others think that these three persons and essences] are unequal with one another in essence and properties, so that the Father alone is properly and truly God. [29]

Parallel Passages. – Sol. Dec. xii. Cf. Augsburg Confession, i.:5, 6 v. 4; ix.:3; xii.:7 sqq.; xiv.; xvi.:3; xvii.:2, 3; Apology, ix., xvi.; Smalcald Articles, Part III., Art. viii.:3 sqq.; Large Catechism, 492, § 47 sqq. Formula of Concord, Ep. ii.:13.

These and like errors, one and all, with whatever other errors depend upon and follow from them, we reject and condemn as wrong, false, heretical, contrary to the Word of God, the three Creeds, the Augsburg Confession and Apology, the Smalcald Articles and Luther's Catechisms, against which all godly Christians, of both high and low station, should be on their guard as they love the welfare and salvation of their souls. [30]

That this is the doctrine, faith and confession of us all, for which we will answer, at the last day, before the just Judge, our Lord Jesus Christ, and that against this we will neither secretly nor publicly speak or write, but that we intend, by the grace of God, to persevere therein, we have, after mature deliberation, testified, in the true fear of God and invocation of his name, by signing with our own hands this Epitome. [31]

Bergen May 29th, 1577.

-
1. Among those of the sixteenth century were the Münzerites, Münsterites, Hoffmanites, Mennonites.↵
 2. In order to avoid the taint of Adam. Melchior Hoffman and Simon Menno taught thus.↵
 3. This error is referred to Ludwig Hetzer, David George or Joris, and Trechsel.↵

4. Münzer, Hoffman and others insisted upon good works for justification.↵
5. Errors 4-6 held by Anabaptists generally.↵
6. In errors 7-9 the Anabaptists have followed the Donatists.↵
7. Errors 1-4. See Confession of Mennonites, 37, 38; Gieseler's Church History, iv.:374.↵
8. For they thought that these occupations conflicted with mutual love. Cf. §§ 16, 17.↵
9. Confession of Mennonites, 39. The Münsterites defended polygamy.↵

ORIGINAL PREFACE BY HENRY EYSTER JACOBS

The Church's Confessions of Faith are its authorized declarations on subjects concerning which its teaching has been misunderstood or misrepresented, or is liable to such misunderstanding and misrepresentation. They are not comprehensive systems of doctrine covering the entire sphere of divine revelation, but have arisen entirely from historical circumstances, where the teaching of the Church has become a matter of controversy. An exception to this statement may probably be found in Luther's Catechisms; and yet, while they were written for other than polemical purposes, they were offered as standards for the more popular presentation of the truths of the Christian religion at a crisis when both pastors and people needed especial guidance. In each Confession the topics treated, as well as the order, the extent, and the mode of treatment of each topic, are not ideal or determined by any effort to present an exhaustive and logical summary of the faith, as a whole, from the Holy Scriptures, but only to meet an historical need and to respond to a call for a particular emergency. Each Confession is in reality only a part of the one Confession of the faith, which the Church, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, is continually drawing from the Holy Scriptures and from communion with the Church's Lord.

The Holy Scriptures are the sole source and authority of the Church's teaching, and amply sufficient for all ordinary purposes of instruction; but when that which the Holy Scriptures teach is called into question, it is the Church's duty, in all ages, as a witness to the truth and set for its defense, to give clear and unmistakable testimony as to what is the meaning of God's Word on the subjects under discussion. All the authority of such testimonies depends upon their conformity with Holy Scripture. Confessions are authoritative, not because the Church has adopted them, but because of the Word of God which they are found to contain. "We accept the Unaltered Augsburg Confession, not because it was

composed by our theologians, but because it has been derived from God's Word." (Formula of Concord, p. 536, 5.)

What the Church has once confessed, with respect to questions of more than merely temporary or local significance, becomes a part of her very life. If it be what the Confession declares that it is, the very truth of God's Word, expressed in terms so clear and unambiguous as to guard against all misunderstanding, the Church of the future cannot be indifferent to it, but cherishes it as a sacred trust ("the deposit," 1 Tim. 6:20), which is to be transmitted to posterity that later generations may be profited by the experience of their predecessors. Nevertheless, in so doing, the Church cannot restrict its testimony, as new circumstances arise, simply to that which, under entirely different circumstances, has been given at some particular crisis in the past. She is not so bound to the past as to be unable to define her faith in terms adapted to new conditions, but is "ready always to give answer to every one that asketh a reason" of her faith (1 Pet. 1:15). Accordingly, the Augsburg Confession very appropriately asserts the principle of Confessional development in its closing words:

"If anything further he desired, we are ready, God willing, to present ampler information according to the Scriptures" (p. 67 sq.).

The simplest and briefest of all the Confessions, the Apostles' Creed, historical investigations show as the product of a gradual growth of four hundred years, as successive controversies furnished the occasion for additional articles. It was not primarily a liturgical formula, as it is with us to-day, but a clear and distinct utterance on various controverted points, without mentioning those who taught otherwise. A similar growth can be traced without difficulty in the Nicene Creed, where the Council of Nice marks only a particular stage in its formulation, but neither its beginning nor its completion. The Athanasian Creed is the ultimate fruit of centuries of controversy concerning the Trinity and the Incarnation, as the arena for theological discussion is passing from the East to the West.

Neither the structure nor the contents of the Augsburg Confession can be adequately interpreted without the study of the historical occasion for each article. Even where it is least polemical, an historical motive for each statement

is present. The Apology is the author's own protest against perversions of the meaning and the attempts to answer the positions of the Augsburg Confession; in other words, it is the official interpretation of those who prepared and presented the Augustana.

When, some years later, after the conciliatory spirit that animates the Augsburg Confession had failed to make an impression on its opponents, Luther, in the Smalcald Articles, provided for the General Council that the Emperor had promised to call a statement of the issues involved in the controversies with Rome that was entirely up to date, while Melancthon supplemented it with an appendix on Church Power, that is the foundation of all Lutheran Church Polity.

The last of the Confessions, the Formula of Concord, after more than a generation had passed since the controversy with Rome was most acute, attempts to afford a common basis upon which Lutherans could stand, and thus end a period of confusion, division, and estrangement that had broken the Lutheran Church of Germany into fragments. Never was there a more careful and discriminating Church document written, guarding in each article against exaggerations on each side, and then, in most precise and definite words, setting forth the teaching from the Holy Scriptures on the subjects concerning which there had been misunderstanding and alienation of feeling. In it the Lutheran Church shows her fidelity in judging errors within, just as in the other great Confessions she had judged errors from without, her borders. To judge others without also judging our own selves (1 Cor. 11:31) is to be fair and just neither to ourselves nor to others.

Upon the basis of all these Confessions the foundations of the Lutheran Church in America were laid. They were included not only in the Constitutions of many of the earlier congregations, but also in the first Constitution of the Mother Synod. With the entrance of a period when the importance of this confessional position was not recognized, there came into our history retarding and disorganizing forces that threatened the very existence of our Church as it became anglicized, and that to the present day have greatly divided and confused it.

With a widespread and all but general return towards the confessional position of the Fathers, a period of new life and promise for our Church in America has begun. Upon the hearty acceptance of these Confessions in their historical sense, and their consistent application in the spirit of the Gospel to practice, the General Council, in common with others, offers a basis for the union of the entire Lutheran Church in America. The work in which she has so successfully cooperated in the preparation of a Common Service will not be complete until the agreement possible in such joint work is traced to a more thorough harmony in the faith than had been supposed, and its ultimate expression in agreement as to the terms of confessional statement.

But for the attainment of such end the Confessions must be readily accessible in the common language of the country, and should be found in the studies of all our pastors and in the homes and libraries of all our intelligent people. Even although our Church has never asked its laymen to subscribe to more than the Catechism, yet the importance of their acquaintance with all that, as members of Lutheran synods, they require their pastors to know and teach cannot be questioned.

Heretofore translations into English have been accessible only in expensive editions. The edition of which this is a revision was undertaken in 1882 by a retired clergyman, the Rev. G. W. Frederick, at great pecuniary risk. He spared no expense in providing for the work a most attractive form, and in enabling the editor to introduce any amount of matter, which he deemed of value for illustrating the history and teaching of the Confessions. That edition is not supplanted by this. It will continue to be published by the General Council's Publication Board for the use of scholars. In it will be found the history of each confession, and the various documents upon which they were based. But the popular edition, here offered, fulfills the hope of the editor from the very beginning, to have the Confessions published at such price that they may be scattered broadcast throughout all English-speaking lands, where there are confessors of the Lutheran faith – for Canada and Australia, for South Africa and India, for the West Indies and South America, as well as for the United States of America. Such edition will serve an important office in deepening and strengthening the faith of our people in drawing them together in the bonds of a

common fellowship, and in enabling them to appreciate all the more highly their heritage. But beyond this, as the preceding edition was warmly welcomed by eminent representatives of other denominations because of much that they found in it encouraging them in their conflicts, so this edition will continue to a much wider circle than the Lutheran Church the testimony which our Fathers gave, and, while in many other religious bodies confessional lines have vanished and confessional obligations weakened, a standard is here raised around which millions in this western world will rally. The attentive reader, whatever may be his antecedents, will see that the matters here treated are not antiquated or obsolescent, but enter most deeply into the issues of the hour.

The translations included in this volume are those of the two volume edition, except that, for the translation of the Augsburg Confession, credited in that edition to Dr. Charles Porterfield Krauth, but which is in reality a reprint of a sixteenth century English translation, published in “The Harmony of the Confessions” in 1586, we have substituted the translation officially approved by the General Council after its preparation by a joint committee of the various synodical bodies, mentioned in the note introducing it at the proper place (p. 32). With this exception, the plates are those of the larger edition. A number of minor changes, however, have been made, suggested by twenty-nine years’ use of the translation in the study and the class-room, and by criticisms of which we have been informed.

We send forth this volume with gratitude for the privilege of having been called to edit it and its predecessor, and in the full confidence that it will be a blessing to our Church in America, and, through it, in advancing the kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ, in whose name these confessions were written.

HENRY EYSTER JACOBS.

Lutheran Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, Pa., February 27, 1911.

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION

The translation of the Augsburg Confession adopted in this volume is the well-known one of Dr. Charles P. Krauth, which he has kindly revised as the proof-sheets passed through his hands. In the Small Catechism, the translation prepared by Dr. Charles F. Schaeffer with the co-operation of a committee of the Ministerium of Pennsylvania, and in universal use in the English churches of the General Council, is reprinted, with the addition of the formula for confession contained in the Book of Concord. The Large Catechism was translated for this work by Rev. A. Martin, Professor of the German Language and Literature in Pennsylvania College, to whom the Editor is greatly indebted for assistance and advice also in other directions. Some changes have, however, been made to conform it as nearly as possible to the plan of translation adopted in the rest of the volume.

The Apology of the Augsburg Confession, the Smalcald Articles and the Formula of Concord were translated by the Editor. The rendering of the Apology is from the Latin, the German translation of Justus Jonas of the Concordienbuch being more of a paraphrase than a translation, differing sometimes from the original by the omission, introduction and transposition of entire paragraphs, and therefore inducing the editors of some of the best German editions of the Symbolical Books to prepare fresh translations. We have, accordingly, carefully revised our translation from the Latin, by comparing it with the German translations of Schopf, Kothe, Spieker and Bodemann.

The Smalcald Articles were translated from the German, and Melancthon's Appendix, "Of the Power and Primacy of the Pope," from the Latin, in which it was composed. In the Formula of Concord the German, according to the same principle, has been used as the standard text.

The chief variations of the alternate language, officially received in our churches, from the original language of each Confession, is indicated in brackets, with the exception of the Apology, where they were found so numerous and extensive as to render it necessary to insert them frequently among the foot-notes.

The Latin edition of Dr. Fredericus Franke, published by Tauchnitz, Leipsic, 1848, has not only been largely followed in indicating variations, but has also furnished most of the notes.

The paging of Miiller's Symbolischen Bucher has been printed in the margin, so as to enable this translation to furnish all references to this most widely-received and highly-esteemed edition of the Confessions. As the St. Louis German edition, published in 1880 as a jubilee offering, adopts the same plan, this edition can be readily used also with it by observing the marginal numbers in each. The references in the foot-notes conform to the marginal paging.

The second edition of the New Market translation (1854), for which our English churches owe so much to the energy and devotion of the brothers Revs. Ambrose and Socrates Henkel, as well as the Swedish edition, published under supervision of the SwedishAugustana Synod, Chicago, 1878, have been frequently consulted, and have furnished material aid.

Additional matter, prepared as Introduction and Appendix to this work, but which has swollen to such an extent as to exceed the limits of this volume, will be published in the near future. The second volume will comprise a brief outline of the history of the Confessions; the documents from which Melanchthon elaborated the Augsburg Confession; the non-Lutheran Confessions of Augsburg – the Tetrapolitan of the Reformed cities, Zwingli's Medio Fidei and the Confutation of the Augsburg Confession by the Papists (so indispensable for an intelligent study of the Apology, which is its answer); the Variola in its two chief forms; the Official Appendix to the Book of Concord – viz. the Catalogue of Testimonies; together with a minute index on the basis of the exhaustive index in Muller.

With all the care that has been taken, the Editor fully expects that errors that have escaped his notice will be occasionally detected. Had he waited until satisfied that his work would be all he could wish, it would never have appeared. All that he claims is that, with all the means at his command, he has made a sincere effort to supply a deeply-felt want.

In the hope that it may stimulate a fresh interest in the priceless treasures that are the heritage of the Lutheran Church, and promote their more thorough study, and that it may bear also its part, under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, in bringing to a clear understanding of the faith and uniting upon a firmly-grounded scriptural platform our perplexed and divided people, this new edition of the Confessions is, in God's name and for His glory presented to the American public.

HENRY E. JACOBS

Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg, Pa., February 27, 1882.

THEOLOGY TITLES FROM THE LUTHERAN LIBRARY

110T – *Infant Baptism and Infant Salvation in Calvinism* by Charles P. Krauth

There are but two developed systems in the world that claim with any show of probability to be purely Biblical. These systems are the Lutheran and the Calvinistic. They possess a common basis in their recognition of the same rule of faith; their profession of the Old Catholic faith as set forth in the three General Creeds; in their acknowledgment of the doctrine of justification by faith and of its great associated doctrines; and they have vast interests, great stakes, mighty bonds of sympathy in common. No two bodies of Christians have more reason for thoroughly understanding each other than Calvinists and Lutherans have, and no two parts of Christendom are closer together in some vital respects than consistent Calvinism and consistent Lutheranism. It is well worth their while to compare views. – Charles Krauth from *Infant Baptism and Infant Salvation in Calvinism*

104T – *The Confessional Principle* by Theodore E. Schmauk

...the Elector of Saxony received many letters of protest from Calvinistic princes and from Crypto-Calvinistic sources; and even Queen Elizabeth of England sent over a deputation in the interests of Calvinism not to allow this book [The Lutheran Formula of Concord] to be promulgated. Many Reformed proposed that a common Reformed Confession should be set up over against the Formula of Concord, and that the Reformed should withdraw from their acceptance of the Augsburg Confession; but Ursinus, the author of the Heidelberg Catechism, wrote to Beza to the effect that it would be better to continue to accept the Augsburg Confession (and to agitate against the Formula). - From Chapter 25.

[2018 release] 107T – *The Conservative Reformation and Its Theology* by Charles P. Krauth

This monumental work, first published in 1871, is regarded as one of the great theological classics to come out of American Lutheranism... Dr Krauth's treatment of the basic doctrines of the Lutheran church is exegetical, dogmatical, and confessional, and reveals a profound understanding of the teachings of Luther and the Reformation. –From the reprint edition.

108T – *The Lutheran Country Church* by George H. Gerberding

...Someone has said; “If it were not for the stream of fresh, pure, uncontaminated blood flowing into them from the country the cities would rot in their own iniquity.” We are sorry to be compelled to believe that this is true. But the good, pure and purifying blood does not all come into the city from the country districts of our own land. Many of the much maligned “foreigners” from the country districts of the old world are a saving salt of no small insignificance. This book wants to help the reader to understand country people and to appreciate the worth of country character. – From *The Lutheran Country Church*.

[2018 release] 109T – *Summary of the Christian Faith* by Henry Eyster Jacobs

An attempt is here made to restate the doctrines of the Christian Faith upon the basis of the Lutheran Confessions.

To the Candidates for the Ministry of the Gospel, among whom my life has been passed, this volume is affectionately dedicated by their fellow-student,
H. E. J

To request any of these titles, report typos, or learn more:

Website: www.alecsatin.com/lutheran-library/

Email: lutheranlibrary@runbox.com

BENEDICTION

Now unto him that is able to keep you from falling, and to present you faultless before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy,

To the only wise God our Savior, be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and ever. Amen. –Jude 1:24-25

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The Lutheran Library

A Concise Summary of the Lutheran Confessions

Introduction

Chapter 1 – Of Original Sin

Chapter 2 – Of The Free Will

Chapter 3 – Of the Righteousness of Faith before God

Chapter 4 – Of Good Works

Chapter 5 – Of the Law and the Gospel

Chapter 6 – Of the Third Use of the Law

Chapter 7 – Of the Lord's Supper

Chapter 8 – Of the Person of Christ

Chapter 9 – Of the Descent of Christ to Hell

Chapter 10 – Of Church Rites which are [commonly] called Adiaphora or Matters of Indifference

Chapter 11 – Of God's Eternal Foreknowledge [Predestination] and Election

**Chapter 12 – Of Other Factions [Heresies] and Sects, which never
Embraced the Augsburg Confession**

Original Preface by Henry Eyster Jacobs

Theology titles from the Lutheran Library

Benediction

Table of Contents

The Lutheran Library	3
A Concise Summary of the Lutheran Confessions	9
Introduction	10
Chapter 1 – Of Original Sin	13
Chapter 2 – Of The Free Will	19
Chapter 3 – Of the Righteousness of Faith before God	24
Chapter 4 – Of Good Works	29
Chapter 5 – Of the Law and the Gospel	33
Chapter 6 – Of the Third Use of the Law	36
Chapter 7 – Of the Lord’s Supper	39
Chapter 8 – Of the Person of Christ	48
Chapter 9 – Of the Descent of Christ to Hell	56
Chapter 10 – Of Church Rites which are [commonly] called Adiaphora or Matters of Indifference	58
Chapter 11 – Of God’s Eternal Foreknowledge [Predestination] and Election	62
Chapter 12 – Of Other Factions [Heresies] and Sects, which never Embraced the Augsburg Confession	68
Preface	74
Theology titles from the Lutheran Library	82
Benediction	84