

A

VERY PLAIN AND POINTED REPLY

TO THE

Anti-Christian Doctrine

AND

FALSE ACCOUNT BY MARTIN MICRON CONCERNING THE DISCUSSION BETWEEN HIM AND MYSELF, BEFORE MANY WITNESSES, HELD A. D., 1553, CONCERNING THE INCARNATION OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST, ACCORDING TO THE TRUTH AND POWER OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES, TOGETHER WITH A SINCERE EPIS-
TLE OR ADMONITION TO HIM, TO LEARN TO
KNOW HIMSELF, TO REPENT AND BE SAVED.

BY

MENNO SIMON.

WRITTEN A. D., 1556.

"This is life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent," Jn. 17 : 3.

"For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ,"
1 Cor. 3 : 11.

ELKHART, INDIANA:

PUBLISHED BY JOHN F. FUNK AND BROTHER.

1871.

P R E F A C E.

To the well-disposed Reader:

It is manifest, honorable reader, that as Satan, the envier of the divine honor and of our salvation, in the beginning of creation, used the serpent as an instrument to lead Adam and Eve off the way of life, and thus to lead them into death, as he actually did, Gen. 3: 19, he now uses his false authors and preachers to do so, some of whom he clothes with an angelic appearance of innocence, by using many garbled Scriptures, philosophy, sophistry, words of human wisdom, and by leading a reasonable, private life, whereby he detains and ensnares the poor, bound souls in their great blindness and abominations, and robs them by his many wiles of their only means of salvation, which is Jesus Christ.

For the serpent said unto Eve, "Ye shall not surely die." Thus, now, our opponents say, *Should Christ be the Son of God? No, he is not. The man Christ has no father,* and like expressions. For from the beginning, the devil neither did nor could confess the true faith in Christ Jesus, namely, that we should acknowledge him to be the true Son of God, as may be plainly understood from 1 Jn. 2: 22; 4: 3; 2 Jn. 7. "Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him, and he in God," 1 Jn. 4: 15. In short he has life everlasting. Such destroy the dominion of the devil and the kingdom of falsehood. Yea Christ himself had to suffer death because he confessed himself to be the Son of God, Matt. 26: 64; Mark 14: 62, Jn. 5: 18; 19: 7.

If Satan, then, did not confess such faith, in the beginning, as was heard, how shall he now suffer, as by the righteous judgment of God, he is arisen, through anti-christ and his servants, to full dominion, for the sake of sin, and has bound all earth by his deceitful doctrine, explanations, flatterings, statutes, commandments, idolatry, tyranny and violence?

We see clearly, since Christ Jesus, by his grace, has shown himself through the clouds so that we, with Peter, and with all the Scriptures confess him in power and truth to be the Son of the true and living God, and submissively seal this faith with the sign of the holy baptism, as did the Ethiopian, Acts 8: 36, according to his command, because we would, in our weakness, walk according to his commandments and be saved by his grace; how terribly we are upbraided, slandered, belied, accursed, persecuted and murdered by this wicked, perverse, blind, and carnal generation, on that account. For Satan, never, from the beginning confessed true faith in Christ Jesus, nor submissively sealed it by true baptism. Nor will he ever do so, unto the end.

The apocalyptical Apollyon has so corrupted things by the locusts of the bottomless pit, that but little truth remains with man; for it is manifest that not only the Turks and the Papists are inimical to the clearness of the most holy birth of Jesus Christ in which consists true faith, to the nature, power, fruit, impression and sealing of faith, but also those of whom we should expect better things, as may be seen by the writings of our opponents.

Oh! oh! how very little these poor children have and know of the kingdom of God, and of the power of his holy word, although they may think, perhaps, that they understand a great deal. For it is very clear that an earthly, carnal minded heart, an ambitious, proud mind, a spiteful, envious person, and an untrue and false tongue is not of the good, but of the evil one, 1 Jn. 3: 8; that the writings of our opponents were prompted by an earthly, carnal, hateful and false heart; that they did not seek the glory, name and honor of God, but their own; and that they are partial and untruthful, can be easily deduced from the fact that from beginning to end they do

not speak a kind word about me nor our beloved brethren; that they are quite silent upon the favor, faithfully rendered them in need; nor once mention that they were so often silenced and could not present any excuses, something which I do not mention to our honor, but to the praise of the Lord; also, that they did not at all in their writings touch upon their confession which they made before us all, that woman has no seed, * * * whereby, in fact, his whole cause was already lost. Again, that there were two persons in Christ; and that the crucified one was not the Son of God; something which does not become an impartial writer who does not seek his own honor, but sincerely seeks the honor of God; also, that they call me quite ignorant, yea, as a cuckoo (as he also calls me) which always sings the same song, and passes himself for a spiritual master, versed in Scripture, while, before God and his angels and before all present, it was actually found to be quite different, as, by the grace of God, will be found and clearly seen from my following writings, if judged according to the divine truth. Very little, alas, have they meditated upon the Scripture of Paul, saying, that we should not be desirous of vain glory, Gal. 5: 26. Inasmuch as they give such an untrue account of the discussion, and as they have so lamentably profaned the Father and his Son, and their precious, dear, powerful and true word and all their confessors as also, our beloved brethren who daily, piously suffer and die for the sake of the Lord's word, and who are slandered as if their whole life and death were but madness, and their forsaking possessions and kindred, were but heresy; therefore I am impelled, as in duty bound, and for the love of my Lord and Savior Jesus Christ and his holy church (not urged by wrath; for this I leave to him who in due time shall judge us all without respect of person), faithfully and truthfully to annotate all that which Micron has willfully suppressed, to the dishonor of Christ and his holy word. Besides also, how slanderously he has blasphemed the Father and the Son, the Word and its confessors, and how wrongfully he opposes our faith and doctrine concerning the incarnation of

Christ, which is taught and testified to throughout the Scriptures in incontrovertible power and clearness.

I therefore beseech all readers, for the Lord's sake, to peruse this my explanation, with impartial hearts, to consider well the foundation and to pray the Lord for grace and understanding. I trust to be able to show and explain it, by the aid of God, with such power and clearness of the holy Scriptures, that it will be plainly seen that anti-christian deceit is on the side of our opponents and that the clear ground of truth is on our side. Therefore I would have the judicial term, *Alteram partem audito*, that is, hear also the other party, applied, and to compare my writings with theirs and not be mistaken through prejudice as do the partial.

I also beseech you not to think hard of my having to use such terms as, seed of man, seed of woman, &c.; God knows how unwillingly I do so; but necessity forces me to make use of such terms, that the glory of Christ Jesus may not be obscured with many, and that the heavenly brightness of his most holy birth may not remain obscured by the anti-christian flattering and sophistry of the breath of Micron.

I can not sufficiently wonder at the man's heart and mind that he dares publish such absurd fables to the world, and that he dares show himself so ambitious and proud (something which, before God, I must deduce from his writings), as it will doubtlessly be read by many an intelligent person; for what else does he do all through his writings, but exalt himself, and trample me in the dust as is the nature of all the ambitious, something which I would not have written if it only touched me, and not the honor of God, while so many god-fearing, pious men were present who heard the discussion from beginning to end. Yet besides, it is well known, perhaps, to thousands, as I presume, to whom it is known through my printed writings which are daily read here and there, that I have frequently solicited a public discussion, at the risk of being burned if I could not maintain my faith and doctrine by virtue of the Scriptures; but which, alas, has never been accepted.

If I, now, were so entirely ignorant, as must be understood from his writing, it would be very curious why such a discussion should have been so long denied me, as he might thereby have gained many a soul, might have redeemed many a child, if we were wrong; and as he might have won such a fame and reputation, if he had been successful, among those of high standing and also among the whole world. But Micron has not yet forgotten how they were situated with us, notwithstanding he wrote thus sneeringly. If Micron and Herman had feared God as they pretend by their sheep's clothing, they would not have acted so foolishly as they have done by their writings. But I presume that the one who urged Pharaoh to persecute Israel (notwithstanding he had seen such miracles in Egypt by the hands of Moses and Aaron), and found his punishment in the Red Sea, Ex. 7: 25; 8: 2; 9: 6; 10: 14; 11: 5; 14: 28; who urged Antiochus to turn Jerusalem into a death-pit, and on his way met the punisher; that this same one has urged Micron and Herman to write thus, that their covert hypocrisy, their many gross falsehoods, ambitious partiality (I call it as I judge them before the Lord), ingratitude, slander, adulteration and willful garbling of the holy, divine word, their corrupting flatterings, sophistical philosophy, miserable deceit of the poor, despised souls, abominable, anti-christian doctrine, blasphemy of both the Father and his blessed Son, palpable blindness, and their vain, carnal hearts, may once be made manifest through this our explanation: and that thus the hearts which are bound by their snares through the falsehoods which they publish against us, by the fine appearance they put on, and by the garbled Scriptures which they teach by smooth, flattering words, may be unbound and delivered, to the glory of the Lord.

I do not know what else to say or think

of the matter. For, more than two years ago I warned him by a man of considerable name and one of his fellow-believers, that if he would put it in print (for I was told that he intended to do so), and would not tell the tale just as it truthfully happened, for I observed that he did not spare falsehood, I should reply to him, if I lived and the Lord granted it. But he was aware that if he did not tell it differently from what it was, he would have acquired but little fame and honor with the world; for it would have sounded: *Micron lost it all*; something that conceited, proud flesh does not like to hear.

Yet, I would never, in my life, have thought that he was of such extremely ambitious, partial, untrue, infamous, and shameless mind, if I had not been convinced thereof in our discussion and by this writing of his. I thought that his intellect would have told him, even without the warning of any one, that if he should do as he did, while I am yet living, that it would produce him nothing but shame and dishonor with all reasonable readers and auditors. But Micron had to speak, as his heart was full.

But perhaps, he hoped or thought that I might, in the mean time, die, and that he might thus acquire fame and honor, unrebuked, with the world. He was also aware that he could not offend the world, who gladly accept and hear false consolations and slanders, by abusing me; for whosoever can best belie, defame, upbraid, and depict me and my brethren in evil colors, is, with them, a great prophet, and a pleasing preacher. Let them run their course until hindered by the Lord! John says, "They are of the world, and therefore they speak of the world, and the world hear them," 1 Jn. 4: 5. If possible, the beloved Lord grant them grace. Let the reader take due notice of the following reply, that he may learn to know Christ, do right, and be saved.



A VERY PLAIN AND DISCREET

ANSWER TO MARTIN MICRON'S

ANTI-CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE, AND UNTRUE ACCOUNT OF THE DISCUSSION
OF 1553, ACCORDING TO THE TRUTH AND POWER OF
THE HOLY, DIVINE SCRIPTURES.

How and when the so called English came to us, and what faithful love our brethren showed them.

IN the year 1553, a little before midwinter, it happened that it was told the brethren that a ship-load of people had arrived from Denmark, who, on account of their faith, were driven from England, and that they lay a short distance from the shore, frozen up in the ice.

When the brethren heard of this, they were moved by christian mercy on their account, as was proper. They counseled together and concluded to lend them their assistance to help them out of the ice and properly escort them to the city, without any commotion. as they also did; although they conjectured that it might cause trouble with their governments, as was also the fact.

They met them with wheat bread and wine, so that if there should be any sick among them, they might refresh and stimulate them therewith. And after they had escorted them into the city they made a collection of twenty-four thalers out of their poverty, and presented that sum to the leading ones of them, to be distributed among the needy if such there should be

among them. They refused the money, and said they had enough; but would like that labor might be procured for some of their number; in which our brethren assisted them as much as they could.

One of our number offered to take the children of John A'Lasco into his house, and to do the best he could for them. To which Herman Backereel answered: No, this can not be granted; for John A'Lasco is a man who has dealings with lords, princes and other high personages. It might (oh! reader observe) injure his reputation if his children should sojourn with such people. On hearing this, I observed that we had not met with the true, plain and humble pilgrims of Jesus Christ.

Behold, thus was their arrival and reception by us; and such faithful love have our brethren shown them, which was, not long afterward, taken quite amiss by ungrateful Herman; and as appears, is not touched upon in Micron's account, merely out of hatred of the truth and out of disfavor to the brethren, lest piety should be ascribed to them.

HOW THE ENGLISH CAME INTO DISCUSSION WITH US.

AFTER they had been a few days in the city, Herman and his followers called some of us together and desired a discussion with

them, and after many broad assertions he said unto them, "I am a teacher, and would like to have a teacher put against me; for I

have heard that Menno was to be in the city. Therefore I would have him or some other teacher to discuss with me. For I have had discussions with hundreds of yours, and when they would be vanquished they would invariably appeal to their teachers." Behold, thus he spoke! I might here write a good deal about his false pretensions and ambitious expressions; also about his infamous talk behind my back, and seeking if he could not find a splinter about me to magnify into a beam and to tie this upon my back as a sign of shame. Also, how he inquired of an unconscious child about my secret shelter, &c. But, as it can not be serviceable to the reader, therefore I will commend it to the Lord, and leave the shame of Herman untouched, that the reader may not think that I wish to retaliate evil with evil, from which may the Lord forever save me. Yet it is my heart's desire that he would be more truthful, and more impartial of heart, and that he would fear the Lord, his God, more.

The discussion was agreed upon with Herman and his fellows upon this condition: That they were to tell none where the discussion took place (as I was a poor, weak man, hated of all the world). Upon which they, on their part, gave our brethren their hands that they would never tell it. But how they kept their word their deeds have shown. For it was but a short time until it was known in the streets of Emden where Menno lived, and that Micron and his fellows had a discussion with him. And besides, they have published it in print, to all the world. If honorable, pious persons are not bound to respect their word and pledge (which is considered the same as an oath by all reasonable people) better than this, I will leave to the judgment of all readers, both those for and against me.

But there are many who think that they cannot misuse us.

In the same manner they have been ungrateful to the city which showed more mercy to them than all Eastland and Denmark, when in midwinter they knew not where to find shelter; as they, with their unsalted, partial writings, have made the city suspected by lords, princes and other cities, that the city maintained us; while the city knew no more of my sojourning than they knew of the hour of their death.

Lastly, they registered the names of some good persons who had not merited such treatment, that they might be known in all countries to which they might move. A reward of thousands has been offered for the apprehension of one and his little children, who have rendered them such great services if the Lord, by his grace, do not prevent it. If they had now, in all this considered the unfeigned, pure love (which wishes harm to none, much less does it), common honesty, and their word and honor, since such a course instructs none upon the earth, nor makes them better in God, and appears more like the work of a traitor, than of a pious man; then, according to my opinion, the evangelical, christian character, spirit, discipline and reasonableness would have been more uniform than it now is. The Lord's word is true: The fruit shows what the tree is, Matt. 12: 33. Behold, thus have they acted who pretend to be christians and say that we are heretics; who call upon God as their witness and judge that they have faithfully described the discussion, while they are well aware that the first sentence they wrote was a falsehood. And how quite untrue it is, will, by the grace of the Lord, be shown by self-evident truths from my following explanation of the discussion between Herman and myself.

DISCUSSION BETWEEN HERMAN AND MYSELF.

It happened when we met for the purpose of a discussion, that I briefly admonished them in regard to the suffering, oppression, tribulation, persecution and cross of the

true christians. To which he immediately answered: "That I wished to make his doctrine suspected." Something of which I had not thought of in the least. I then

quit, and said, Well Herman, I presume you would rather discuss the question of the incarnation? He answered in the affirmative. Then, I said, confess your faith. When he had made his confession, I said, Beloved Herman, take heed of your words. For behold, all these inconsistencies follow from your belief. And enumerated eight of them.

And behold, when I had finished my discourse there was one among them (J. M. whose name is frequently referred to in Micron's writings), who asked me if I could prove that to be the fact, according to Scripture? thinking that I had thus spoken in regard to my own faith. I told him that he might ask Herman, as it was his faith and doctrine. On hearing this he dropped his head and was silent. I told him thrice, successively, to get Herman to prove it to him, according to the Scriptures. I have yet to receive his answer.

When I observed such partiality, I was very sorry. I said, Great God, are we thus to treat the word of the Lord. O shame! When you thought that it was my doctrine you wanted Scripture; but since you find that it is the doctrine of Herman, now you have Scripture enough! O, friend, I said, repent and be ashamed before God; for you do not treat his word, as becomes a true christian. And this is one of the principal, impartial witnesses, as Micron wrongfully boasts.

Afterward Herman replied and said, "I will scatter these inconsistencies as the wind scatters the dust." Dear Herman, I said, do not speak so boldly, it does not become a christian. I know you can not do it. And, praise to the Lord for his grace, it is verified to the present time as I can plainly see by Micron's Appendix, notwithstanding they have revolved the matter in their heads for more than two years.

The inconsistencies remained unreplied to, and it was mostly *granting* that could be heard from him. So at last I said, My dear sir, show me, where do you find it written that he took on him our flesh or our human nature, as you claim? He then answered: Paul teaches us that Christ "took on him the form of a servant," Phil. 2: 7.

When he had finished his discourse I asked him whether or not he agreed with John A'Lasco, in doctrine? He answered in the affirmative. I replied: Well, A'Lasco has made an antithesis of this Scripture of Paul "In the form of God," and, "the form of a servant." That as he was in a divine form and thereby truly *was* God, he has thus, also, taken upon himself our sinful form and was thereby, truly, made man, "but" (he says), "the sins, on account of which we are called servants in Scripture, he did not have."

From which antithesis one of two things must be true. Either, if he had the sinful form and not the sin, that he then, by virtue of the antithesis, also, must have had the divine form; but he did not have the divine form. Or if he had, and therewith the divinity also, that he, also, must have had the sinful form, and therewith sin; else the antithesis is false and can not stand, in fact. In this view of the matter one of two things is true, that Christ Jesus was either a sinner, or else he was not God. And how such doctrine agrees with the Scriptures, I will leave to your own judgment.

Then he replied: "The Scriptures testify that he was without sin." It is true, I said. Therefore it is manifest that this antithesis of A'Lasco is false, and that you can not maintain your doctrine by this Scripture. But if the Scripture is to remain unbroken, then this is the true antithesis; as Christ was in the godly form, and was thereby truly God, as he humbled himself and did not take on himself the form of a potentate, emperor, or king, whom we should serve, but the form of a poor servant, because he wanted to serve; for as he has been truly God in God, and with God his Father, from eternity; thus he became our true servant, in due time, Isa. 7: 15; 9: 5; 40: 28; Jer. 23: 5; 33: 15; Jn. 1: 2; Rom. 9: 26; 1 Jn. 5: 5; Matt. 12: 18; 20: 28.

He then abandoned that Scripture, and said, "There is another one much plainer, which has it that," "He has taken on him the seed of Abraham," Heb. 2: 16. Not so Herman, I said. We should not thus adulterate the Scriptures. For it does not read that *he has taken* on him the seed of Abra-

ham, but it reads that *he took* it on himself. Which taking on shall last unto the end.

He then took the words of the same chapter and said, "That Christ had taken upon himself the children's flesh and blood, and is thus, on account of the flesh, called our brother."

On hearing this I replied: That that was again an adulteration of the Scriptures; for it is written that he took upon himself *flesh and blood*; but not the flesh and blood of children. Therefore let us get at the meaning of these words at the start, lest we adulterate the Scriptures. Thus Paul says, "He that sanctifieth, and they who are sanctified, are of one." Now I ask, to whom has it reference? To God or to Adam? He replied: "To Adam." Then it follows, I said, incontrovertibly, that all ungodly children of the devil, such as thieves, murderers, drunkards, haters, idolaters, whores and rogues, are Christ's brethren and sisters. He frankly admitted this to be the case.

It would further follow, if we were Christ's brethren and sisters on account of the flesh, then also we would be his children on account of the flesh; for Paul says, "Behold, I and my children," &c. From which it would surely follow that the one brother had generated the other, and the children their father, according to the flesh. And I will leave you to study out how such a generation could be, according to the Scriptures, and according to the ordinance of God.

After passing some other words concerning *the partaking of*, I asked him if Adam had not partaken of flesh and blood? He answered in the affirmative. Well, said I, of whose flesh and blood did he partake, if we are to understand *participation* as you do? Therefore beloved Herman, take heed. Your learned ones deceive you. Thus Paul says, "He that threshes in hope, should be partaker of his hope," that is, that he may obtain that for which he hopes. Again, in the same chapter: "If others be partakers of this power over you, are not we rather?" 1 Cor. 9: 10, 12, that is, if others have this power. Again, "We are made partakers of Christ, if we hold the beginning of our confidence steadfast unto the end," Heb.

3: 14. Not that we partake partly but wholly.

Therefore, beloved Herman, I warn you, let the Scripture remain Scripture and do not garble it to suit your opinion. For Paul does not say that the unsanctified, such as, liars, haters, proud, adulterers, and the children of the devil are one with Christ, our Savior, but that the sanctified are of one with him, that is, those who, with him are born of one God. On account of which birth of God, and not of Adam, we are his brethren; for the regenerated with him, have one Father, as he is the first begotten Son of God, thus he is also the firstborn among many brethren, Heb. 1: 6; Rom. 8: 29.

As holy Paul, then, teaches us that he is thus the first-begotten among the brethren; therefore it is very plain that he is not our brother of Adam, but of God; for he was not the first-begotten of Adam, therefore Adam's children must, through regeneration by faith, also become the children of God, Jn. 1: 12, and thus be Christ's brethren, Matt. 12: 50; Mark 3: 35; Luke 8: 21; Heb. 2: 11.

Behold, he is not ashamed to call his brethren, such regenerated and sanctified ones who, with him, have one Father (no whores, rogues and children of the devil), saying, Thy name (he means his Father's name and not Adam's) I will promulgate to my brethren. Again, I will trust in him (namely, in the Father, and not in Adam). Again, behold, "I and the children which God (not Adam) hath given me." Inasmuch as it is very plain that his children are not the carnal, but the spiritual children (for he had no carnal children) then his brethren must be spiritual brethren; or else one Scripture must be understood spiritually and the other carnally, then, also sister Mary must have generated her brother Christ, in the flesh. This is incontrovertible.

Although now such regenerated, the sanctified, are his brethren and sisters they yet have, contrary to their own will, communion with flesh and blood, through the inherent sinful nature; they frequently sin, stumble and transgress, and are thus through the beforementioned communion, conscious of

guilt according to the law which requires perfect righteousness. And behold, therefore he is their Savior, first-begotten Brother, and Father Christ, who in like manner, has partaken of flesh and blood, not of the children, for it does not read so, and in that case he must have been one of two sons, one of whom was of heaven, eternal and immortal, the other of earth and mortal, but the Word itself (I add some words for explanation) is become flesh, that is, a truly passive, mortal man, in Mary, as John says, "The word is become flesh," like unto his sanctified brethren in all things, except sin, that he might fulfill the law in his innocent flesh and not by our guilty flesh; that he might take away the deserved death by his innocent death; destroy the devil who had the power of death; bruise the Serpent's head; sanctify us unto God, his Father, by virtue of his precious blood; and assist us in all our temptations and besetting sins which result from our wicked flesh and the inspirations of Satan. Behold, this is the proper explanation of Heb. 2:14. And by such explanation Christ remains the undivided Son of God, the Scripture remains unbroken, Christ remains the Sanctifier and we are the sanctified. Brethren and children, there is not a single Scripture which contradicts this, while Herman's confession and faith are very inconsistent as has been heard.

When I again touched upon the inconsistencies, he asked me to confess my faith, as he had done his; and he was going to show, he said, more inconsistencies (although he had not yet heard it) in my faith than I had shown in his. And when I had made my confession, he said, "This is too long for me; I can not *reply to it*." I then

made a brief statement. Yet I was shown no inconsistency.

Behold, worthy reader, these are the principal points and Scriptures which Herman and I discussed concerning the incarnation of Christ. I say the principal ones; for to repeat all the words which passed between us, is impossible.

After meal time we came to the discussion of pedo-baptism, which he tried to make right by the assertion, that the children, as he said, are accounted as believing, by the Scriptures, and that Zaccheus (he insisted upon Zaccheus, notwithstanding I told him that it was not Zaccheus), and his whole house were baptized.

Kind reader, if I were to give an account of the discussion as it happened it would seem to some readers as if I were partial; again, to others, who know me, that it was very foolish of him to challenge us while he did not know more of Scripture. I told him twice, dear Herman, you are too young; you will have to learn a great deal before you ought to try to defend your cause. What is become of all your bold assertions which you made at the start? Yet, Micron writes that some of their weak brethren were very much strengthened by Herman during the discussion. I will leave the matter here. Thus they hoodwink the reader that he may not observe that Herman acted so childish, to their shame.

I know to a certainty that Micron was written to immediately after the discussion, as his own writing implies. For their brethren who were with us were in great need, inwardly and outwardly. What he means by 'inwardly' I will leave the reader to judge.

HOW PARTIALLY MICRON NARRATED OUR FIRST DISCUSSION; HOW SILENT HE IS ON THE PRINCIPAL POINTS; HOW HE GARBLES MY WORDS AND HOW HE ADORNS HIS OWN.

WHEN we were met for the discussion, I said to Micron, I hear that your name is Martin Micron. You are unknown to me, and I have never heard of you before you came here. But I understand that you have

made quite a reputation at London, England, that you have published writings, as I hear. Therefore my fraternal admonition to you is, that if you hear more powerful truths and firmer foundation in this our

discussion, than you have heard or learned before this, that you seek not your own fame and honor, but the praise and honor of God. To which he replied: "Menno, this is also my admonition to you." I said, I am here for that very purpose; and I have suffered for many years because I would gladly have the truth and follow it.

This brotherly admonition, given him in faithfulness of heart, he has lamentably disregarded in the latter part of the discussion, as he was every time conquered in his false, anti-christian doctrine, and he said it before my face that I had blamed him with seeking his own praise and honor by his writing, in London. Something which I had, then, never thought of; for I was not acquainted with him.

He called upon his own as witnesses, which poor, enchanted children all agreed with him, at which I was very sorry, and said, Is the fear of God, then, not before you? There are now ten of you, all of whom answer to suit him. If there were ten thousand more besides you, you would not tell the truth in this matter. For how could it be possible that I should at the first start run up to a man with whom I was not acquainted, and of whom I had heard nothing but a good report, and say, that he had sought his own honor with his writings.

Also, all of our brethren contradicted him, and said, "Good Micron, you are mistaken; for so and so has Menno admonished you, and thus you have answered him." Yet it was of no avail. These unkind, bitter, lying, and defaming words must, alas, be published in his book. What kind of a spirit this is; how he follows the unadulterated, christian truth, piety and love; and how faithfully he narrates the matter, I will let all impartial, reasonable readers judge by his dishonest adulteration of my words which I spoke to him with such good intentions. We then discussed some articles with which my writings are replete; and to which it is useless to reply. Lastly, we came to the discussion of the incarnation, for the sake of which we are called such abominable heretics and deceivers by them, namely, because we confess with God, the Father, with Christ, with the angel Gabriel, with Peter, and with all

the Scriptures that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, Matt. 3:17; 17:5; Mark 1:11; 9:7; Luke 1:31; 3:22; Jn. 1:45; 5:22; 6:35; 7:21; 8:23; 9:37; 10:36.

His proper confession and foundation was, *That there are two Sons in Christ. The one eternal and impassive; the other temporal and passive; and that the one which was crucified for us, was not the Son of God.* Which confession he did not make thoughtlessly and by mistake, but with premeditation and a sober mind, before us all; and he has repeated it, at least four or five times. Yet he calls on the judgment and name of the Lord, that they frequently confessed, with us, that the Son of God died for us. Syrach truly says, "Many would rather do the worst than to lose their honor; and do it for the sake of the ungodly," Syr. 20:24.*

I proposed the inconsistencies of his belief and after many long and broad assertions I let him read undisturbedly an hour or an hour and a half from the Bible, about the seed of woman, the seed of Abraham, and of David; and about the fruit of the loins of David. When he had finished reading, I asked, what he wanted to assert thereby? "I assert thereby, he said, that the man Christ is of the fathers, and that the word did not become flesh, as you say." This was the amount of his words.

I replied, I cordially acknowledge and confess all these Scriptures to be right and good; for they teach us, and testify that such a Savior should come. But now we will find out from the Scriptures of whom the human fruit comes; whether it comes of the father or of the mother. On hearing this, he said, "Are you going to find that out?" I answered in the affirmative; for I trust, by the grace of God, to be able to prove by virtue of the holy, divine Scriptures, that the origin of the child is of the father, and not of the mother, but through the mother. This, I think, was something new to him; for he said, "Sir, let us hear it." I pointed him to 1 Cor. 11:8, where Paul says, "Man is not of the woman, but the woman of the man." On hearing this he interrupted me and said, "This is spoken of Adam and Eve."

*German Bible.

Hold, said I; but it further reads: "Even so is the, man also by the woman." Was Adam, then, by Eve? He was then silent, as one who is beaten. I showed him many plain Scriptures, as Gen. 15: 4; 17: 6; 19: 32; Rom. 9: 7; Heb. 7: 10; 11: 12. I also referred him to the genealogy, Matt. 1, that Christ, according to his foundation, must also have been a Syrian, Canaanite, Moabite and an Ammonite. I also made some natural illustrations, as of the sewer, his seed and soil; from which he tries to make it appear to the reader that I made use of my intellect and not of the Scripture, against him. But, as the saying is, Micron's little finger knows full well that the seed of the land and the seed of man are called by the same name, in the Scriptures; and that also Abraham cast his seed, that is, sowed it, Heb. 11: 11, although he garbles it in his writings and would apply the casting to Sarah. What we are to judge of such willful adulterers of the holy, divine word, I will leave to the impartial reader. It is the same means of which the serpent made use when he led Adam and Eve into death, Gen. 3: 1. Kind reader, as the Scriptures, together with daily occurrences, openly testify to us by the ordinance of God, that there are sowers, and also that there is seed, which is sown, there must also be a fit soil to be sown; for neither in the unplowed land, nor upon houses, trees and rocks do we sow, as may be seen. And whether or not my comparison of the husbandman, of his seed, and of his field can stand according to the Scriptures, I will not leave to the calumniating Micron and Herman, but to the reasonable reader.

When I had finished my argument I said, Behold, Martin, this natural comparison which I have proposed, you may take into consideration, at your leisure, but let us have a reply to my Scriptures. Then he appeared as one who is in doubt, and said, "Away with this philosophy of the seed of woman." On hearing this, I replied: I have proposed to you the plain Scriptures whereby I have proved that the child is originally of the father, and not of the mother; and you want it to be of the mother, without the Scriptures. Say, kind sir, which of us two makes use of philosophy? You or I? He

made no reply at all. But he now writes as if he had then said, thus, "The words of Paul, 1 Cor. 11: 7, should be understood as having reference to Adam and Eve; for Paul wanted to humble the men that they should not exalt themselves above woman, on account of their glory," which in one sense is right, yet not according to the sense of Paul in this instance. For Micron desires to apply it to Adam and Eve, and Paul spoke it in reference to all who are born of Adam and Eve. For he says, "For as the woman is of the man, even so is the man also by the woman." Mark, he says, *By the woman*. If Onan had done as he did, Gen. 38: 9, a thousand times; and besides, all men with him, who were from the beginning, no human fruit would be born therefrom. For the seed must have a proper soil to produce fruit and to generate according to the word and ordinance of the Lord, and therefore Paul says, "Neither is the man without the woman, neither the woman without the man, in the Lord," 1 Cor. 11: 11. I trust that such plain Scriptures can be understood.

Again, concerning the Scripture, Wis. 7: 2, Micron says, "It does not read of man's seed alone." To which I reply: Micron must be a man who esteems the judgment of the Almighty God too little, that he is not afraid to adulterate such plain words, or to obscure them by the breath of the abyss, as it is so plain that the Holy Spirit in plain words here ascribes to the father that which belongs to the father, according to the ordinance of God, and to the mother what belongs to the mother. * * I repeat it, that such plain words of the Scriptures are easily understood.

Again, to my pointing him how Sarah conceived of Abraham, and Rebecca of Isaac, Heb. 11: 11; Rom. 9: 7, he replies thus, but in the discussion he did not refer to it, the reason why Abraham and Isaac are called the origin of their descendants, he says, is to exclude other men, and also, because woman has lost her privilege through sin. This is such glozing as if both the Scripture and that were lost. Therefore this is my brief reply: God does not require of any one that which he has not given, nor does he envy any one for

that which is given him; for he is a God of the truth and not of a mere name. And if the Lord had done so, for the reason given by Micron, then God would have had pleasure in the name, and not in truth. He would also have given more to those patriarchs than truthfully belonged to them, and taken from woman what belonged to her. Mark what kind of a God the sophistry of Micron teaches.

As for the privilege, of which he writes, I would in all love ask him what kind of a privilege this was, which woman has lost through sin? If she is no more woman, and if she is become unfit to fulfill her maternal calling and office to which she was ordained of God? That she is woman still, and necessary to fill her place in the world, is too clear to need arguing. Therefore I do not know what the privilege might be, as the Scriptures say no more than, "I will greatly multiply thy sorrow, and thy conception; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children: and thy desire shall be to thy husband and he shall rule over thee," Gen. 3: 16. But thus something must be done to deceive the humble reader, when flattery will not give it a scriptural appearance.

Oh! oh!! If we poor children were to treat the Scriptures the twentieth part as they do (something from which may the Lord save us), and would veil the eyes of the ignorant as does Micron by his flatterings, great God! how they would be offended. They would also have full right to do so. Nevertheless, however they teach and do, it is a welcome gospel to the poor, deceived world, as was commonly the case from the beginning with all false prophets and their followers. He is allowed to break the bones of the passover, and to cut off Samson's hair, Ex. 12: 46; Num. 9: 12, until the time comes that it is ended with him and he has to give an account of his deceit before the Lord.

After some passing remarks, we came to the inconsistency that they had an impure Christ; and I asked him if he confessed Mary to be of the impure and sinful seed of Adam? He answered, "Yes." But he said she was pure, because the angel said unto her, "Blessed art thou among women," Luke 1: 28. To this I replied: The Lord

said unto Abraham, "I shall bless thee;" "and I will bless them that bless thee," Gen. 12. Again, he promised to the obedient parents under the law: "Blessed shall be the fruit of thy body," Dent. 28: 4. Were, thereby, Abraham, together with all those that bless him, and all those who are born of such pious parents, pure and without sin?

He said, "Christ was pure and without sin, and that because he was not of human seed." I replied: From such explanation the greatest inconsistencies would follow.

He then replied: "God was the cause that the nature of Adam was corrupted." I noticed that he was unable to reply, and that he knew not what to say. I asked him, Why? Because, said he, "God said," "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." So I hear, I said, that God was the cause of the transgression of Adam? together with some other remarks. "No," he said, "I do not say so." Oh, Micron! I said, Consider what inconsistencies you advance and what a weak, unscriptural foundation it is which you would assert and maintain! He did not reply again, yet he claims in his writing that he asserted and maintained the purity of Christ, against us. If that is not seeking one's own honor and to give an untrue account of the discussion, I will leave the reader to judge. And how the assertions which he now makes in his writings, will stand according to the Scriptures, we will show by the Scripture. Thus he writes: "We can conclude nothing under sin, but that which the Scriptures conclude under it." In this he is right, yet contrary to himself. For the Scriptures conclude Adam and all his seed under sin. Therefore it must be so with Adam and all his seed; this cannot be denied, 1 Cor. 15: 21; Rom. 5: 18; Gal. 3: 22; Eph. 2: 1. He further writes: That which the Scriptures make free, we also should consider free. Again he is right; but contrary to himself, for the Scripture makes Christ free, and therefore we also consider him as free, because he is from above, of God who is pure, and not from below of impure Adam; which Adam, I repeat, according to the Scriptures, is concluded under sin, with all

his seed, and the Scriptures do not contradict themselves.

He further writes that the apostles and prophets had no need of saying so much about the holiness of Christ, if he were from above, and not of Adam. This is so simple, that it looks surprising. For, if Christ were such a pure man of impure Adam, as our opponents say, then the Scriptures would contradict themselves; or else Adam must have had two seeds of which one was corrupt and the other remained pure, which is not thus taught by holy writ. Observe what blind arguments he advances.

Lastly, he writes: "That which God testifies to be holy; man can not make common or unholy," and adduces, Acts 10: 15. Here the most holy holiness of the flesh of Jesus Christ is compared, by him, to the flesh of the animals, which, under the law, were forbidden Israel to eat, Lev. 11; Deut. 14: 7, and which are now, under the gospel, allowed as clean, Matt. 15: 11; Mark 7: 15; Acts 10: 15; Rom. 14: 20; Tit. 1: 15, as if Adam, thus, by one word (as the animals under the law), was made unclean; and now, again, by one word (as also these animals), was made clean, in this his seed (of which, according to him, Christ should be generated); by which he blasphemes the most holy holiness of Christ's flesh. O, abominable flattery!

Behold, dear reader, this is the best foundation upon which Micron can build his assertion of the purity of the flesh of Christ, after a study of two years of which he, at the time of the discussion did not advance a single word. You may consider for yourselves whether he does not make his doctrine suspected by such flattery.

And when he was defeated in his assertion about the seed of woman, by virtue of the Scripture, and could find nothing to solve the inconsistency, and was hedged in on all sides, he proposed the following question, as if he was so confused that he knew not what to say and yet wanted to say something, that it might not be said that he was silenced: "Do you believe that Mary was a human being?" For God's sake, hear what he has proposed!

On hearing this, I became recklessly excited, and answered thoughtlessly: She cer-

tainly was no brute. What is this for a base question? Behold thus the brute came into play; upon the cause of which he is silent; and which he adduces quite strangely, and little to my honor.

I confess before him and before all readers that I did not answer him respectfully; and I am sorry for it; for it would have been proper to have given him a considerate answer; and not to return foolishness with foolishness. But to which of us the greatest blame should be attributed, to Micron with his surprisingly indiscreet question, or to myself with my unseasoned answer, I would gladly leave to his own consideration if he were impartial.

After this had taken place I had but very little desire to discuss with him at that time, as I saw that he so quite partially placed himself against the truth although he had nothing to advance whereby he could defend his foundation, so that I was forced to say, Good Martin, do not take it amiss; it would be well if you would learn to know yourself better, for you are yet too much of a novice in the Scriptures to defend the foundation of your doctrine in regard to this matter.

"Attend," he said then, "I will tell you something else." But as it had no foundation at all, and was nothing but nonsense; and as he went from one thing to another, I recklessly answered: Away with your talk. All you adduce is nothing but anathema.

He then became very angry and cried out thrice: "The pope has taught you this." No, I answered with the same words, thrice, Not the pope, but Paul has taught me this, Gal. 1: 8. For it is a strange gospel, your philosophy about Christ, which is not taught us by the apostles nor by the Scriptures; and I did not say a word about 1 Cor. 16: 22, although he, without any truth, said and wrote so, the like of which alas, he often does to defame me, out of malice.

I again acknowledge that I might have borne with him more patiently than I did. Yet the Son of God has not lost his sonship and rights, by my inconsiderate answer; nor was Micron's anti-christian doctrine thereby rendered the christian doctrine. I became very tired of answering his foolish

questions; for I began to observe by what kind of a spirit he was prompted.

Besides, he has quite reversed the narration of the discussion; has enlarged his ten words into very many, to flatter his cause; has abreviated mine in many instances, to weaken our cause, and has written many things which were never thought of; and such by which he was quite stunned, he has not mentioned at all. Yet this audacious man dares call on God as his witness that he has given a true narration. O Lord!

Well, every one will have to give an account of himself before his God, let him

adorn his falsehoods and seal them as much as he pleases. By the grace of God, I shall affirm my humble truth with yea, and nay, as Scripture teaches. Whosoever will, may therewith believe my writings; and if he will not I can not help it. I will call on nothing higher. I have suffered much pain and trouble for about twenty-one years for the sake of truth, yea and nay, and have borne it submissively; nor shall I by the merciful assistance of the Lord leave it in my old age, on account of Micron and all anti-christians' false doctrine, however Satan may portray me by his authors and servants.

HOW AND WHAT MICRON CONFESSED DURING OUR SECOND DISCUSSION, AND HOW UNFAITHFULLY HE HAS NARRATED IT.

* * * *

In the second place, I asked him if he admitted the confession which he had made, concerning the two Sons in Christ, at the time of our first discussion? He answered, "Yes." Then I desired Andrew whom he calls Cananeus, to write it down, which he did in Micron's presence, and reads thus: "Two sons in Christ. The first, God's eternal Son, born of him before time was, without mother, and impassive. The second, Mary's son, or the son of man, born of her in due time, without father, and passive. In which passive son of Mary, the impassive Son of God, dwelt. So that the man Christ who died for us, was not the Son of God; for he had no father." Behold, this was his confession which we all heard from his own mouth, and which was written down in his presence.

When Andrew had written it down, Micron said, "Read it to me." After it was read I asked him if he had not written it down right. He replied "Yes." And now this untruthful man comes and writes that they frequently confessed that the Son of God died for us; while it did not happen otherwise than it is here narrated; and comes now again in his writing and says that he had no father. For on the thirty-

second page he writes: "As to the real origin of the human substance (which he called before us, the second son), he had, according to the testimony of the Holy Scriptures, no father; and refers to Matt. 1: 2, 3. And thus the pure, Holy Scriptures (because they call Mary a virgin), must be the cover of his abominably false doctrine; notwithstanding it clearly testifies in many places that God is his Father; and that he is the Son of God, Luke 1: 31; 9: 35; Matt. 3: 17; 14: 33; 16: 16; 17: 5; Mark 3: 11; 9: 6; 15: 39; Jn. 1: 45; 3: 16; 6: 69; 7: 28; 8: 23; 9: 37; 10: 36; 11: 27. Behold this is the man who, according to his own writing, has so cleverly discussed and so powerfully asserted the foundation of his doctrine, as he falsely makes his followers believe; and who has, to his own everlasting shame, placed such a bright crown upon his head, as he claims in his book. The proverb, "That honor shames those that seek it," is true.

In the third place, I asked him, since he says that the man Christ had no father, whether he did not call him the Son of God? He answered, "Yes." I asked him again, for what reason he called him so; whether it was on account of his birth, or of regeneration, or of his creation, or of the accep-

tation? For if he should be truly called such it must be because of one of these four reasons; or else one would speak a falsehood as often as he would call him such. I received this answer: "On account of none of these four reasons." This is all the answer he gave me; but he sought another retreat, that he might not be caught in the net of truth. This question (then left unanswered) he now adduces quite garbled, and says, page 173, "That he is called the Son of God, on account of the union of the two sons" (which he artfully calls two natures that it may not sound too strange), of which union we can find not a letter in all the Scriptures, whereby he confesses publicly that the crucified Christ Jesus who has borne the sins of all the world and reconciled it unto God his Father, was merely *called* the Son of God; and that God is therefore but a God in name, and not a God in truth. Surely, this is too much of blasphemy, that the Almighty, great God and his blessed, beloved Son must hear of such a man.

In the fourth place, I asked him if he knew that Gellius Faber had issued a publication against us, and if he had read it? He answered, "Yes." Well, said I, how do you like it? "It is a very fine thing," he said, "I have also let our brethren read it."

Ah, Martin! said I, do you endorse that ungodly homily which is so replete with falsehood, by which the word and ordinances of the Lord are so lamentably broken, and wherein the most holy flesh of Christ is called a *boose-geld** and ransom? If the Lord will help me he will be replied to, for when this happened mine was almost in print. Behold, I tell the truth. Then Micron said, "I have spoken to Gellius about the *boose-geld*; and he claims that it is a mistake of the printer, and that it should be *loose-geld* (a ransom). Then one of ours said, *loose* means, in this sense, false or frivolous." Should Christ's flesh, then, have been a false or frivolous money? &c.

On hearing this, I said: I have often thought to myself how is it possible that a man could thus write? It must be a mistake. Reflecting upon the matter, I said, I

remembered that John A'Lasco and he were unanimous in this doctrine; and that A'Lasco wrote: "If Christ be holy why was he then condemned by the judgment of the Father, on account of sin?" Again, "Christ partook of no other flesh but that of sin, that he might be tempted, and subject to death." Inasmuch as they agreed, I thought, and as these sayings of A'Lasco openly testify, that he (Christ) was not holy, but that he was of a sinful flesh, guilty of death, therefore it might, in the same manner, be called by the learned, a *boose-geld* and ransom. Behold, thus I answered, and not otherwise.

When I told it thus, Micron desired to read the sayings of A'Lasco, and said at last, after having studied about them: "It is very obscure." Yes, certainly, I said, Not obscure but ungodly. And this discreet reply of mine he has not only suppressed, but lamentably garbled, to my disadvantage. Besides, he has left the writings of A'Lasco out of the narrative and thus he blames me of what others are guilty. I will leave it to the all-seeing God and to his own mind whether he has written it with the Spirit of truth, which is quite impartial, and with true, christian love, as if standing before God.

Inasmuch as I have thus found it printed in his book, and as the sayings of A'Lasco imply that Christ's flesh was guilty of death; as has been heard, which may rightfully be called a *boose-geld* and ransom, as he deems it to be sinful, then say, beloved, what have I said about which to make such an ado? and, as he perhaps thinks, on account of which he has so mortally wounded me; besides, according to truth it is their foundation and the unmistakable result of their doctrine. But thus he must render Gellius a favor at my expense, although he once spoke quite differently to some preachers at Emden, about Gellius' book.

We then came to the inconsistency of concluding two persons in Christ. To which Micron answered: "We do not assert that there are two persons in Christ; but we say there is but one. For although the Word, from eternity, was one person, yet when it was conceived in Mary it was no person." Beloved, mark, what indiscreetness he uses.

*Boose in Dutch means wicked.

He further said: "Although every man is a person, and although the man Christ was a man as any other man, yet the man Christ, for himself alone, was no person." Is it not a shame that one has to repeat such ignorant words before intelligent persons? Paul truly asks: "Where is the disputer of this world?" 1 Cor. 1:20. When we had finished our arguments in regard to this matter, I said, I understand that some of you say, "Menno said sometime ago that the whole Christ was God's Son; but he did not prove it by the Scripture." Therefore I desire to do so now; and I will read the Scriptures of the New Testament to you, which testify that the whole Christ Jesus, from head to foot, visible and invisible, is God's own, only and first-begotten, true Son, if you will patiently attend, as I did when you were reading. "Do so," he said.

I read about twenty-four or twenty-five strong, plain Scriptures, to some of which I shall here refer. The first was, "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God," Luke 1:35. Here the angel of the Lord testifies that Christ Jesus should be the Son of God, and you, Micron, say that he was not.

The Father himself says, "This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased," Matt. 3:17; 17:5; Mark 9:7; Luke 3:22; 9:35. And you, Micron, boldly contradict it, and say that he is not. Again, Christ said unto the blind man, "Dost thou believe on the Son of God? He answered and said, Who is he, Lord, that I may believe on him? And Jesus said unto him, Thou hast both seen him, and it is he that speaketh with thee," Jn. 9:35, 36. Here the visible, speaking Christ confesses himself to be the Son of God. And you, Micron, say he is not.

Christ says, "What and if ye shall see the son of man ascend up where he was before?" Jn. 6:62. Here Christ testifies that the Son of man was from above, and that he would again return thither. And you, Micron, say that the son of man is not of heaven, but of earth.

Peter answered Christ to the question:

"Whom say ye that I am?" "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," Matt. 16:16; and Christ blessed him for it. And you, Micron, say that the man Christ is not the Son of God.

The centurion confessed him to be such; at the cross. He said, "Truly this man was the Son of God," Mark 15:39. And you, Micron, controvert it, and say that he was not.

All the apostles confessed Christ to be the Son of God, Matt. 14:33; also, John, the Baptist; Nathaniel and Martha, Jn. 1:45; 11:27. And you, Micron, are not ashamed to say that he is not.

John says, "These are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name," Jn. 20:31. Beloved Micron, take heed. At another place it reads, "He that believeth not God, hath made him a liar; because he believeth not the record that God gave of his Son," 1 Jn. 5:10. "He is anti-christ that denieth the Father and the Son," 1 Jn. 2:22. Behold, Micron, what kind of spirits you are we will let you judge by this Scripture of John. What is your answer to all those plain Scriptures, which I have read?

He was again puzzled as before, during the first discussion when he was overcome on the subject of woman's seed. Both he and Herman became pale (as the brethren told me, for I did not notice it), and Micron said, "Most of these Scriptures I confess to be right and just." Not all? I asked. I have not added a single word; but merely read from the Bible. Tell me which are *not* right.

I received no answer at all. But again he asked a strange question three or four times, which I refused to answer, desiring an answer to the Scriptures which I had read. At last he spoke, but merely deceitfully, that he might lead me off my Scriptures which he could not answer because they were too powerful and plain, and also because he yet wanted to make a show: "They shall be answered," he said. Then ask on, said I. "Do you believe," he said, "that Christ was born of the Father, and seated with the Father, from eternity?" I let him ask the question again.

Martin, said I, you do not act as becomes a true and pious man. Is that an answer to my Scriptures? Immediately he began to boast that I could not answer his question. I was sorry that I had commenced to discuss with such a perverse man; for I saw clearly that he was not prompted by the spirit of truth. I further said, that I have never read of such a birth, in the Scriptures, as the one which he enquired about, which implied a seat with God from eternity. If you read of it, I said, then show me where to find it.

"No," he said, "We want to find it out by you." Martin, said I, be ashamed. When I want to see the Scriptures you are not willing to show them. He again said, "He wanted to find it out by me." Man, man, I said, By this you show what kind of a spirit there is in you. What indiscreet perverseness, to require of me to show that which is not to be found in the Scriptures. Heaven and earth have not yet stood six thousand years, and the Scriptures say that heaven is God's throne, and earth his footstool, and that God is an eternal God who has neither beginning nor end. If I should ask, now, what were God's throne and footstool before heaven and earth were created, would you be obliged to answer me, while the Scriptures say nothing about it? I again received the answer: "We want to find out by you." Mark with what kind of a spirit this man discussed with me.

Observing that the bait which he threw out was to get something peculiar from me, I said to him: Micron, since you can not stand before the truth, I can see what your object is. Therefore understand me, that you may give a true account of me. Whatever the Scripture testifies concerning the eternal, divine form of Christ, I sincerely believe, although I may not thoroughly comprehend it, as that his goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting, Micah 5: 2; that he is the Alpha and Omega, Rev. 1: 8; 2: 8; the eternal Word of the Father, his Wisdom and Son, by whom all things were created, Gen. 1: 1; Ps. 33: 6; Prov. 8: 22; Jn. 1: 3; Eph. 3: 9; Col. 1: 16; Heb. 1: 2; the firstborn of every creature, Col. 1: 15, who is before Abraham was, Jn. 8: 58, and other like Scriptures I do not

comprehend. But that there was a birth from everlasting, as you say, I can not find in the Scriptures.

Inasmuch as I can not find this in the Scriptures, and, as I am prepared to obey them unto death, therefore I ask you to show me (as you ask it of me) where it is written, and, by the grace of God, I will not in the least controvert it; for I was certain that he could not show it. He answered again: "No, we want to find out by you." Now judge of the spirit of the discussion.

I will now leave this to the judgment of all impartial, reasonable readers whether Micron has met us in discussion as a godly, humble, kind and pious christian, to teach me and all of us, or to be taught of us in the matters pertaining to Christ Jesus, by the Spirit and word of the Lord; or, whether he met us as an ungodly, proud, cruel and infamous pharisee.

A more abominable discussion I never heard of. In the first place, because he wanted to find out by us something which is not in the Scriptures. And in the second place, because I desired him to show it to me, and he would not do it for the sake of truth and love. But Micron knew that he could not find it in the Scriptures, yet, by such trickery, after he had lost this foundation, he tried to make a show among his followers who understood so little about the Scriptures. But he was caught in the net he set for us, as you may clearly see from the following account. For, when I observed that he had lost all christian reasonableness; that no Scriptures would avail anything in his case, and that he strove for nothing else but to catch me at some expression or other, which he might, by falsely adding to it, himself, fasten upon us, to our disadvantage, I desired of him to explain his question a little better, namely, whether he believed that Christ, from everlasting, was born of the Father, or that he was from eternity seated with the Father, and separated from him? Three or four times, he said, "Born."

Born? I said, I do not contradict it; for you have heard my confession, clear enough, but explain your question. It was again, "Born."

Then I said to Herman, Do tell, what is

your faith? He spoke in his usual, thoughtless manner and frankly said, "That he was seated, separate from the Father."

Well, Micron, I said, is that your faith also? He again answered, *Born*. For the fox was afraid that he should be caught in his den.

Micron, said I, say yes or no. We have heard enough of your, *Born*. Then he said, "Yes!" Well, I said, give attention!

I presume, I said, that you have read that there was a sect in ancient times which was called *Triticole* or *Tritoites* (Tritheists),* because they worshipped three Gods. If you have the same faith concerning the Holy Ghost, that you have concerning the Father, and the Son, then it is plain that you are Tritheists; for you so divide them, as being seated separate, one from the other, as was seen. He made no reply to this, at all.

In the second place, I said, You are aware that Arius was deemed a heretic, because he said that Christ had a beginning! He answered, "Yes." This is right, I said. But reflect. If Christ was from eternity with the Father, separated from him, as you say, having neither beginning nor end, then he is not the Father's Son; for in such case he is not born of the Father; and if he be born in such a manner, that he was divided from the Father, and separated from him, as you have it, then he must have had a beginning; for that the begetter must be before the begotten, in a natural sense as you assume, is as clear as day. And if you, then, are not Arians, I will leave to your own judgment. I am yet to be answered.

In the third place I said, Some ancient authors have compared the eternal, divine Being to the Sun, that is, they have compared the body to the Father, the Word or Son to the brightness, and the Holy Ghost to the heat. For as these three, the body, the brightness and the heat are one sun, thus the Father, his Word, and his Holy Ghost are one God.

And, as the brightness cannot be separated from the sun and yet remain brightness, thus the Word can not be separated

from God and still remain the Word. Yet the Word is not the Father, nor is the Father the Word. And therefore you daily sing in your temples, *Lumen de lumine*, that is, *a Light of lights*. Also says Paul, "He is the brightness of the glory of God," Heb. 1:3.

Behold, dear Micron, this the beforementioned writers have confessed concerning the eternal, divine Being, and you confess thus. I will leave it to your own judgment whether you did not forsake their faith and whether you did not make them false writers, by your confession. He did not reply at all to this.

In the fourth place I said, You surely confess that Christ Jesus from everlasting, was the Almighty word, wisdom and power of God? He replied, "Yes." Well, I said, if such a birth, then, took place, as you say, that he was seated, divided and separated from the Father, then the Father must have been seated without wisdom, word and power from eternity, inasmuch as they were separated, as you claim. This is too plain to be controverted, Jn. 1:1; Gen. 1:1; Isa. 40:8; Bar. 3:5. Dear Micron, consider how you blaspheme God. Not a word did he reply to this.

But now he comes and says that Christ, from eternity was born of the Father, although yet remaining in the Father. Mark, what a double tongue and unsteady spirit it is. At the time of the discussion, Christ was, from everlasting, seated, divided and separated from the Father; and now, he remained in the Father. In such a short space of time he has changed his mind on five points concerning the incarnation of Christ, as is shown in the "Admonition" written to him, and now he comes to cast upon me the base stains of his own unsteadiness; while the merciful Lord has, by his grace and power, for about twenty-one years, kept me steady in one sense and foundation of the doctrine, notwithstanding the many artifices devised against me by so very many crafty spirits, as all must testify who have impartially read my books and heard my admonitions.

Here I would faithfully admonish all readers, in love, and would humbly pray them, for God's sake, that none will say or

*Tritheist, One who believes that the three persons in the Trinity are three distinct Gods.

think that I, by these four answers to his proposed and explained question, would change or forsake my doctrine concerning the birth of Christ, the eternal Word, before every creature. Not at all. For, with all those who, with holy Paul, in truth, confess Christ Jesus to be the first-born of every creature, and that without the intermixture of any human philosophy, with these I hereby confess to be unanimous, now and forever.

I declare that if Micron had asked, in accordance with the Scriptures, if I confessed Christ, according to his divine form, to be the first-born of every creature, then I would immediately have answered him in the affirmative. It would, then also have prevented his irrelevant questions. But as his questions were the result of reason and not of the Scriptures, and as he would thus make of the word a separate person, from everlasting, of which not a single word is found in the Scriptures, before his ascension, therefore, he was immediately defeated by the four inconsistencies concerning the eternal, divine Being, from which he could not extricate himself at all, as was heard.

Mark also, that he has reflected upon the foolishness of his wisdom which he, without any Scripture, used against me, so that he is now ashamed of his own confession and words; for he says, "If I received the correct news, that he never talked about" "being seated." If this is true, then, alas, it is too gross a falsehood. He also writes now that he is born of the Father, from everlasting, but, that he yet abided in him as is also the doctrine of the Nicene council, Athanasius, Erasmus of Rotterdam, Luther, Pomeranius, Melanchthon, Bullinger and of the most learned persons, as can be easily deduced from their comparison of the sun, as also from the writings of some of them.

He again makes use of philosophy and not of the Scriptures, as he did in his first which he has now eaten up. For the spirit of wisdom has not left us a single word concerning the ineffable, incomprehensible mystery of the eternal birth, at all; whether he became separate from the fatherly Being at his birth, before all creatures, or whether he remained ineffably one there-

with. For God is a Spirit, Jn. 4: 24, and that Spirit is ineffable.

As he again makes use of philosophy and not of the Scriptures, the searching, curious philosopher might again ask him in regard to the word, *born*: How can one be born and yet remain in the begetter? I do not know where Micron can find a direct answer, wherewith he could stand before the disputer. Therefore I would that the ineffable mystery was left with God. For all who want to follow their own intellect in this ineffable mystery, and maintain their opinion thereby, are immediately caught in the snare of the disputer. No matter how he manage.

Inasmuch as we clearly find and know that the Holy Ghost has hidden this mystery in the Scriptures, and that he has not, in any manner, revealed it unto us, neither by prophet, apostle nor by the Son himself; and, inasmuch as it is manifest that it can not be explained by intellect how short or how long; how near or how far he was to the Father; or whether at birth, he became separate from the Father or not; as he is a Spirit; besides, as we learn from history, and find in our own time how many piercing eyes are dazzled by this impenetrable brightness; therefore I warn all pious hearts that would walk with a good conscience before their God, not to speculate about this ineffable and indescribable majesty of the immeasurable, eternal Godhead and not to conclude, assert, teach or maintain any thing more than the Holy Ghost has revealed and taught, lest they, by their fancies, make themselves a god which is not revealed unto them, by the Scriptures. For it is sufficient for all godly souls that they have such faith in God, as his word directs and points out, that Christ Jesus is from everlasting; the ineffable, eternal word, wisdom and power of the Father, and first-born of every creature, an eternal, true, perfect, divine substance or being in, by, and with God, and that this same, by the power of the Almighty, eternal Spirit, according to the promise, became, in due time, a true, passive, mortal man, in Mary, as the Scriptures teach.

For, if we should have needed more knowledge and understanding of this ineffable

fable birth, the Holy Spirit which rightly teaches his unto all godliness, would undoubtedly not have hidden it from us, but would have revealed or explained it to us by some of his holy apostles, or prophets, or by the Son himself.

I hereby pray all pious hearts, for Jesus' sake, to submit their intellect to the word of the Lord, to feel and believe of God as the Scriptures command and teach, not to ascend higher nor descend lower, and to walk before God and his church with a patient, humble, contrite heart, and he shall find peace therein. Whosoever feareth God, let him reflect upon what I write.

When he was again met in his question, and unable to reply, he broke forth with a disturbed mind, as it appeared, and said, "Do you also believe that Christ was nourished by Mary?" Yes, I said, I sincerely believe so. "Fy!" he said then, "what an impure Christ; for if he was nourished by her, then he must also have become impure." He knew not, as I thought, what to say, for surprise.

Dear Micron, I said, control your heart and tongue. We speak of his origin and not of his nourishment. And if nourishment could make him impure, which is contrary to Christ's own word, Matt. 15: 11; Mark 7: 15, how much more the substance taken from such body of which the fruit should have come as you say and teach, and that Mary was born of the impure, sinful seed of Adam, of which you say the flesh or humanity of Christ came; this you admitted yourself; nor could you produce a single Scripture by which you could prove her spotlessness, as I mentioned sufficiently plain in the narration of the first discussion.

Behold, honorable reader, here you have the principal foundation of that which Micron and Herman have suppressed in their narration. It is easy to guess for what purpose and with what intention they have done so.

Inasmuch as it did not happen otherwise than we have here told, and as it is well known to the all-seeing God, to Micron and Herman, as also to their own witnesses and all of us who were present, that he was quite outdone in the argumentation in regard to the question under discussion and

on which their whole foundation rests, whereby the cause was already lost, had he not again admitted it, as also, that there were two sons in Christ, and that the crucified one was not God's Son, whereby he had already forsaken the Son of God; and as he could not prove by the Scriptures the spotlessness of the flesh of Christ, according to his view of the matter; nor that there were two persons in the one Christ, as he professes to believe, nor did he know how he could show the fatherless Christ (as he makes him) to be the Son of God; and as he could not reply a single word to all the plain Scriptures which I produced to prove that the visible, palpable, speaking and crucified Christ Jesus was God's own Son; and, lastly, as he was so inextricably caught in his unscriptural, strange question; and as he is silent on all these, not even touching them, and yet calls upon the name and judgment of the Lord, and upon my own conscience, that he has faithfully narrated the matter in discussion; therefore I will leave it to the judgment of all reasonable, impartial readers whether he has written as a true writer or as a false one; whether he gained the discussion or lost it; whether he has done justice to truth and to us, or whether he has done wrong; whether he sought the honor and glory of God, or his own honor and fame; and also, whether he should be deemed a pious, praiseworthy, honorable, unblamable, true teacher, or an impious, unfaithful, ungodly, blamable and lying deceiver and calumniator; as he wrote through envious partiality and carnality, without truth, and yet, to affirm his falsehood, so highly seals it, alas! as was heard.

When I had answered his last question, they left me, and went to the front part of the building. What was said there I can not say to a certainty; for I was not there myself. But I was told by the brethren that he was still arguing there, notwithstanding the weapons were knocked out of his hands by force of the Scriptures. Also some of their members about the doors next the street were too noisy in their talk. For which reason some of the brethren said they would better go, and asked them to help us all out of the gates. Of which he so unworthily has made, *thrust out*, that he

might thereby make a greater stench and hatred for the pious and true, and make them a bad name.

Justly has the Holy Spirit likened this generation unto the fearful apocalyptic locusts whose shapes were like unto horses prepared unto battle, who have crowns on their heads, like gold; which however are not gold; of which Micron and Herman have placed one on each others head, by their writings; their teeth are as the teeth of lions, and they have tails like unto scorpions, and there are stings in their tails, Rev. 9. Consider what the Holy Spirit means, as also that the serpent should bruise the heel of the seed of woman, Gen. 3: 15. I think they have not stung a little by this writing of theirs. The Lord forgive them and grant that they may yet sometime find his merciful grace, if possible.

Had they now been people of contrite hearts, as they should reasonably be ex-

pected to be, insignificant in their own sight, born of truth, and gifted with the power of the word, they would have thought: What is the use to write. Our cause is lost. And if we now defame them we do so out of partiality, and not with truthfulness; for it is manifest that they do not hate us, because they have shown us such faithfulness and love, in time of need. But, alas, there was not so much prudence, honorableness, reasonableness, reflection and love found with them.

As we have truthfully and plainly shown all that which Micron has artfully suppressed in his narration, to the dishonor of God and of his holy church, as was heard, thus we shall now, by the grace of God, briefly show to the reader how far we differ with them in regard to this matter, that, thereby, truth may be the more clearly distinguished from falsehood, and light from darkness.

THIRTY-ONE ARTICLES AND DIFFERENCES, PRESENTED TO THE READER, TO SHOW THAT MICRON SAYS THIS, WITHOUT THE SCRIPTURES, AND WE THAT, ACCORDING TO SCRIPTURE.

First. Micron and Herman have clearly and publicly confessed before us all, "That Christ Jesus was so born of the Father, from everlasting, that he was separated from the Father, and seated separate from him, from eternity," Mark that this being *seated* separate from the Father, is without the Scriptures.

We confess, and that according to the Scriptures, that Christ Jesus was from eternity the Father's wisdom, Prov. 8: 12. His eternal Word, Jn. 1: 1, by which all things are created, Gen. 1: 1; Ps. 23: 6; Jn. 1: 3; Eph. 3: 9; Col. 1: 16; Heb. 1: 2; that his goings forth were from the beginning and from the days of eternity, Micah 5: 2; that he was before Abraham was born, Jn. 8: 58; that he was before John the Baptist, and came after him, John 1: 3; the first and last, Rev. 1: 8; 2: 8; the firstborn of every creature, Col. 1: 15. But of such a birth

which implies a separate seat, from everlasting, as Micron and Herman confessed before us, we do not read in the Scriptures. Consider whether this our confession is not in accordance with the Scriptures.

Secondly. The doctrine and belief of our opponents is, "That this separate Son of God, in due time, became a real son, body and soul, of the flesh and blood of Mary." Mark, *two* Sons, and a *divided* Christ.

Our doctrine and belief is that this same Word, Wisdom, or Firstborn, as we have confessed, in due time descended from heaven, and that he became a true, passive, mortal man, by the power of the Most High and his Holy Spirit; not of Mary, but in Mary, above all human comprehension, as John says, "The word is made flesh." Observe if this our confession is not in accordance with the Scriptures.

Thirdly. Micron and Herman frequently

confessed before us all, "That there were two Sons in Christ; the one, the eternal Son of God, the other the temporal son of Mary." Mark, again, *two* sons, and a *divided* Christ. We confessed, as said before, that he who was the Word, Wisdom and first-born from everlasting, became the son of man, in due time, an only, undivided Son, whose Father was God, from everlasting, and whose mother was Mary temporarily, Luke 1: 31; Matt. 1; Jn. 1: 49. Observe if this our confession is not according to the Scriptures.

Fourthly. Micron and Herman frequently, have plainly confessed before us all, and do so in their narration many times, that the son of man had no father, sometimes they say, no near father, which is the same as no father. Mark, how they blaspheme both the Father and the Son, Christ.

We confess with the angel Gabriel, Luke 1: 28; with the heavenly Father, Matt. 4: 17; 17: 5; Mark 1: 11; 9: 7; Luke 3: 22; 9: 20; with Christ himself, Jn. 3: 16; 5: 22; 6: 69; 7: 28; 8: 23; with all the apostles, Matt. 14: 33; with Peter, Matt. 16: 16; with John, the baptist, with Nathaniel, Jn. 1: 49; with Martha, Jn. 11: 27; and with all the Scriptures, that God is his Father, Jn. 1: 14; 9: 38. Observe whether this confession is not right according to the Scriptures.

Fifthly. Micron and Herman have frequently confessed before us all, and yet do so in their narration, "That the crucified Jesus, who died for us, was not the Son of God and is one with the other." Observe if this is not forsaking the Lord who has purchased them, as Peter says. We confess according to the Scriptures, that the crucified Christ Jesus is God's first and only begotten, own true Son, whom he has not spared, for our sake, Rom. 8: 32; but sent him to be the propitiation for our sins, by his paternal, divine love, 1 Jn. 4: 10, by whose blood we are cleansed and bought, 1 Cor. 6: 20; 7: 23; who also, in the last extremity confessed God the Father to be his Father, crying, "Father, into thy hands I commend my Spirit," Luke 23: 46. Mark, whether our confession is not right according to the Scriptures.

Sixthly. Micron makes use of a parable that as body and soul are an undivided

man, thus the Son of God and the son of Mary are an undivided person. Mark, in the third place, *two* Sons, and a *divided* Christ.

We call one what the Holy Scriptures, and all the world call one, that which is one; and that which they call two, are two. If there are two sons in Christ which generated at different times, the one from eternity, the other in due time, of different persons, namely, of God and of Mary, in different forms, the one invisible and impassive, and the other visible and passive, as is the doctrine of our opponents, then there must also be two persons in him; or else the Word was no real Son of God, or the son of Mary no real son of man, or else the one must be taken away by the other and absorbed thereby. Of this, we can not, by the grace of God, be convinced by human reasoning, without the Scriptures.

Nor is such a parable of body and soul, in regard to this matter, known to the Scriptures; nor such a Savior and Christ, who was changed from one Son into two sons, from one person into two persons, from earthly into heavenly, from holy into sinful, from good into evil, from pure into impure, from blessed into cursed, and who was changed from man into Jesus Christ.

Seventhly. The foundation and doctrine of our opponents is, "That as the man Christ was born of Mary, he was, therefore, also of her flesh and seed;" and refer to Matt. 1: 16. Mark, fourthly, *two* Sons, and a *divided* Christ.

We say, Obed is also born of Ruth, and Solomon of Bathsheba; nevertheless Boaz and David were their fathers, who begat Obed of Ruth, and Solomon of Bathsheba, thus, also, the man Christ was born of Mary; yet, God the heavenly Father, was his Father, Matt. 1: 20; Gen. 17: 6; 19: 32; 35: 11; Wis. 7: 2; Rom. 9: 5; Heb. 11: 11. Observe whether I do not rightly teach you according to the Scriptures.

* * * *

Ninthly. The foundation and doctrine of our opponents is, "That the man Christ is of the natural seed of David," because the Scriptures say, "Of the fruit of thy body will I set upon thy throne," Ps. 132: 11;

89: 4. Mark, fifthly, *two* sons, and a *divided* Christ.

We say, according to the foundation and doctrine of the Holy Scriptures, that he is David's supernatural, promised and given son; for if he were David's natural son, as our opponents have it, then he must have been of Joseph's natural seed (for the evangelists count to Joseph), and the Word did not become flesh. Observe whether we do not teach according to the Scriptures.

Tenthly. Again, the foundation and doctrine of our opponents is, "That the man Christ was of David's seed, and refer to Rom. 1: 3; 9: 5." Mark, sixthly, *two* sons, and a *divided* Christ.

We say that the foundation and doctrine of the Holy Scriptures are, that the same who was God's Almighty, eternal Word, from eternity, in due time, according to the promise, became man by his Almighty power, in the virgin Mary, who was promised to a man of the generation of David, called Joseph, to which Joseph, the evangelists count, Matt. 1: 16; Luke 3: 23; Matt. 1: 18; Jn. 1: 14, and was thus, in due time, born according to the flesh of the same generation of which he was incarnated, as the Lord had promised unto David. And thus Christ is born of the seed of David, that is, of the generation of David; but did not become flesh of the seed of David, as our opponents claim, by garbling this Scripture. Observe whether we do not teach rightly according to the Scriptures.

Eleventhly. The foundation and doctrine of our opponents is, "That the man Christ is flesh of our flesh, and bone of our bone, and that our flesh is seated at the right hand of the Father." This he advocates in his book on "The Doctrine of the Church of God." Mark, seventhly, *two* sons, and a *divided* Christ.

We say that the foundation and doctrine of the Holy Scriptures are, That the regenerated church of Christ is flesh of his flesh, and bone of his bone, as Adam testifies of his Eve that she was flesh of his flesh and bone of his bone, Gen. 2: 23, but Eve was not thus of Adam. Thus Christ also testifies of his church which he has begotten by virtue of his holy word in the sprinkling of

his most holy blood, by faith, that she is flesh of his flesh, and bone of his bone; but the church can not thus testify of Christ, Eph. 5: 30. See if we do not rightly teach you according to the Scriptures.

Twelfthly. The foundation and doctrine of our opponents is, "That the man Christ, and we, are of one Adam, and are thus brethren by virtue of the flesh." The foundation of this assertion is that Paul says, "He that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one," that is, of "one Adam," they say. Mark, in the eighth place, *two* sons, and a *divided* Christ.

We say that the foundation and doctrine of the Holy Scriptures are, that Christ and his regenerated church are of one God, Jn. 1: 12, that is, those who hear and obey his word, Mark 3: 35; Luke 8: 21, and therefore he calls them his brethren, and says, "I will declare thy name unto my brethren;" for as he is God's firstborn Son, Heb. 1: 6, thus he is also the firstborn, of the brethren, Rom. 8: 9. If he were our brother in Adam, as is the doctrine of our opponents, then he must, also, have been Adam's first-begotten son, as he is the first-begotten of the brethren, as was heard. Then, also, all the ungodly of the whole world, who have the devil as their father, Jn. 8: 44, must be Christ's brethren and sisters, as well as the regenerated who have God as their Father. See if we do not teach you rightly according to the Scriptures.

Thirteenthly. The foundation and doctrine of our opponents is, "That Christ has partaken of the flesh and blood of his children; which can not be explained or understood otherwise than that he has received his flesh and blood of the children." Mark, in the ninth place, *two* sons, and a *divided* Christ.

We say that they thereby deny the word of the Lord and the ordinance of creation. For the Scriptures say, only, that he partook of flesh and blood. If they should say that the children are spiritual children (as is also the case, because Christ had no carnal children), and, if then the brethren should yet be carnal brethren, then they first break the Scripture, in explaining the one word, which is so closely connected to the other, as being understood in a spirit-

ual, and the other in a carnal sense. And, secondly, they assert an inconsistency. Consider whether they teach according to the Scriptures.

Fourteenthly. Micron frequently writes that Christ has taken unto himself the seed of Abraham, and refers to Heb. 2: 16. In the tenth place, mark, *two* sons, and a *divided* Christ.

We say, and that truthfully, that Micron lamentably adulterates the text; for Paul does not say, *has taken*, but he says, *takes* unto himself the seed of Abraham, that is, the children and descendants of Abraham. Mark, how he deals with the Scriptures.

* * * *

Eighteenthly. Micron confessed before us all, "That although Mary was of the impure, sinful flesh of Adam, she was, nevertheless, pure and holy, because the angel said unto her, 'Blessed art thou among women,'" Luke 1: 28. See whether such doctrine can stand the test of the Scriptures.

We confess, and that according to the Scriptures, that as Mary was of the sinful seed of Adam, as we are, she, therefore, was concluded under sin, the same as we; for the Scriptures except none of Adam's seed, Rom. 5: 12; 1 Cor. 15: 21; Gal. 3: 22; Eph. 2: 3. For if she would have been pure on account of such, as Micron says, "Then God might have cleansed the whole world by such a word; and it would have been vain to have sent his beloved Son into this wicked world, in such an humble form." Oh no. It required another who must requite the debt, fulfill the law and be the pleasing sin-offering for Mary, no less than for us, if we were to be saved. Observe and see if we do not rightly teach you in accordance with the Scriptures.

* * * *

Twentieth. Now Micron writes, "That we should free from sin whatever the Scripture frees therefrom; and that man should not declare common or unholy that which God testifies to be holy," and refers to Acts 10: 15.

We confess and say, and that in accordance with the Lord's word, that the Scripture frees none from sin but him that is free indeed, namely, Christ Jesus, Isa. 53: 12; 2 Cor. 2: 15; 1 Pet. 2: 22; 1 Jn. 3: 5; whereby

it is plainly shown that he is not of Mary's flesh, which was also concluded under sin; but that the Father's most glorious word, which knew not sin, became flesh, Jn. 1: 14. For he is holy, and that in truth, and shall ever remain holy. Therefore, in my opinion, it is blasphemy against the most holy flesh of Christ, which is the true food for our souls, the living bread, given in such great love, to the reconciliation of the sins of all the world, thus to compare it to the flesh of irrational animals which were forbidden as food, under the law, and were, therefore, deemed unclean; and which are now again, under the gospel allowed as clean and free, as was once heard. See if we do not teach in accordance with Scripture, Jn. 6: 51; Lev. 11: 4; Deut. 14: 7; Rom. 14: 20; Matt. 15: 11; Mark 7: 15; Acts 10: 15; Tit. 1: 15.

Twenty-first. The doctrine of our opponents is, "That the Son of God has fulfilled the law in our flesh." In the fourteenth place, mark, *two* sons, and a *divided* Christ.

We say, that it is the doctrine of the Holy Scripture that none born of the accursed and sinful flesh of Adam, could fulfill the law which was spiritual; for the seed of Adam was too much corrupted, and was also, by the righteous judgment of God, subject to the curse, Dent. 27: 26. Inasmuch, then, as it is become so quite impotent and weak in Adam, and as the law accused us before God, therefore he, in his great love, took pity upon Adam and all his seed, and did not spare his own Son, but he sent him in the form of sinful flesh, Rom. 8: 3, 32, who fulfilled the law for us, Matt. 5: 17; Eph. 2: 13, who innocently died for us guilty sinners that through him we might live, 1 Pet. 2: 24; and thus he became our holy, innocent and spotless High Priest, Mediator, Advocate and Reconciler, with God, his Father, Heb. 5: 1; 6: 20; 7: 26; 8: 1; 9: 14; 10: 12; 13: 12; 1 Tim. 2: 5; 1 Jn. 1: 2. And thus the glory is to God our Almighty Father, by his blessed Word or Son, alone, as the Scriptures teach; and not by the accursed, sinful flesh of Adam, as our opponents teach, Rom. 7: 14. Observe whether we do not teach you in accordance with the Scriptures.

Twenty-second. The distinct doctrine of our opponents is, "That the man Christ who died for us, was not of heaven, but of earth." In the fifteenth place, mark, *two* sons, and a *divided* Christ.

Our foundation and doctrine is, according to the Scriptures, that he was of heaven and not of earth, as he himself says, "I am the living bread which came down from heaven;" "and the bread that I will give, is my flesh," Jn. 6: 51. Again in verse 62, "What and if ye shall see the son of man (mark he says, *The son of man*, who Micron says, was of earth) ascend up where he was before?" Again, "I am from above; ye are of this world," Jn. 8: 23. Again, "He that cometh from above, is above all," Jn. 3: 31. Christ says, "I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world; again, I leave the world, and go to the Father," Jn. 16: 28. Paul also says, "The first man is of the earth, earthy; the second man is the Lord from heaven," 1 Cor. 15: 47, and many other similar Scriptures. By the grace of God, we will, at the proper time plainly show what kind of spirits those are who deny these plain Scriptures and point the poor, ignorant people to a divided, earthly, impure and sinful creature and Christ, as also what abominations they commit by their false doctrine. Observe whether we do not rightly teach in accordance with the Scriptures.

Twenty-third. Micron writes: "They testify sufficiently that the name without truth and works is vain; and, that none can be saved by the name, unless he have, above all, the reality of the being; for the name cometh of the truth." Mark how he here judges himself.

We say, that he is right, that the name without the reality avails nothing; and yet he confesses in different parts of his writings that the man Christ (as he calls him), had no father, still he calls him the Son of God; he calls him of heaven, yet he says that he is of earth; he calls him pure, yet confesses that he is of the impure seed of Adam, and says other like things. Whether or not Micron proves thereby that he calls vain names and does not speak the truth—for according to his doctrine the Son of God is the son of man, and the man

Christ, the son of God. I will let himself and all intelligent persons judge according to his own word.

Twenty-fourth. Micron writes: "As, then, the same human nature (he means, the whole man of Mary's flesh) in which he suffered, was his own flesh and body, and was none other; therefore it can not be concluded therefrom that God's Son did not suffer for us." Mark how, here, the mere name, and not the reality, must avail with him, contrary to his own doctrine.

We say that Micron manages it so with his flatterings that they may not be too much alarmed; for at different places he says that Christ, according to his human substance and nature, had no Father, and that he suffered in this same human substance and nature, which had no father; and here he says that this was God's Son, and that he suffered for us. What kind of a flatterer and writer Micron is, and what one should think of his foundation and doctrine, I will let each one judge for himself, from his own writings. This is not simply truthful declaiming, as he writes. I know not what greater shame one could think of.

Twenty-fifth. Micron writes that the Scriptures say, "That the Son of God suffered and died for us. This he writes for two particular reasons. First, to prove the inseparable union of both the divine and human natures, in one person, Christ. Secondly, to show that Christ's suffering, in his body and flesh, could not conduce to man's salvation otherwise than by such inseparable union of both the divine and human natures in one person, Jesus Christ." In the seventeenth place, mark, *two* sons, and a *divided* Christ.

We say, Micron generally sings the same tune about the union of both natures all through his appendix, of which not a single word can be found in all the Scriptures. We ask nothing more than that he shall show us where the Scripture says, "This is the divine nature in Christ," or, "that is the human nature in Christ," although I confess both natures to be in Christ; but not as the doctrine and teaching of our opponents have it. Or else, that he show us where the Scriptures say this is the union of the two

natures in one person, as he generally writes; or that he show us where the perfect Son of God is called only of divine nature, or the perfect man, body and soul, only of human nature, as he would make the reader believe, that we may reflect upon it. If it is no Scripture, it is anathema, Gal. 1:8, and if it is Scripture, let it be shown us, and we will yield. O, God! what abominable deceit which they falsely teach the poor, ignorant people under semblance of the Scriptures!

I would further say, that if it were such inseparable union, and that the same made his suffering have the power unto salvation, as he says, then it is manifest that also the divine nature suffered. For that which is inseparable cannot be separated, and in other places he says that the divine nature did not suffer; whereby he makes the natures separable. Thus he contradicts himself, and deceit remains deceit however he garbles the Scriptures by his flatterings. See if we do not rightly teach you according to the Scriptures.

Twenty-sixth. Micron writes, "Those speak very unintelligently of this great and holy mystery of our salvation, who say that Mary's flesh was crucified for us, when the man Christ was born of her, for they do not consider that Christ was not only man, but also God." Mark, *two sons and a divided Christ.*

We say that Micron makes his glozings worse and worse, so that it must be apparent that he advocates the cause of anti-christ. I leave it to the judgment of all the world if the man Christ (mark what he means by saying the man Christ) were of the seed of Mary, born of her, as the wine is of the vine, and the blossom and fruit are of the tree, if he was not, then, Mary's flesh and blood who was crucified for us? Although one could not say when Absalom hung upon the tree, there hangs David, as he writes, yet one could have truthfully said, There hangs David's flesh and blood; neither do we say, that Mary was crucified, but Mary's flesh and blood (mind, I speak this in the manner of Micron) was crucified; that is, if he were born of the flesh and blood of Mary; or else the whole Scriptures must be wrong, which say that we are the

seed, children, flesh and blood of Adam, on account of our carnal birth. Mark whether we do not rightly teach you in accordance with the Scriptures.

Twenty-seventh. Micron says, "That David confessed Christ to be his Lord, according to his divinity, and to be his son, according to his humanity," Ps. 110:1; Matt. 22:42. Mark again, *two sons, and a divided Christ.*

We say that the prophets call him, without any distinction as to his divinity or humanity, our "Immanuel," Isa. 7:14, "The mighty God" and "everlasting Father," Isa. 9:6, "The Lord Our Righteousness," Jer. 23:6; 33:16. Paul calls him our Lord, 1 Cor. 8:6; 12:3. Thomas called him, "my Lord and my God," Jn. 20:28. Christ says, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth," Matt. 28:18. Paul says, "That at the name of Jesus, every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord," Phil. 2:10, 11. As also, that all things are put under his feet; and that the Father gave him to be the head over all things to the church; "and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come," Eph. 1:21; that he is the Lord both of the dead and living; and if he is thus not also David's Immanuel, the Powerful, God, Father, Jehovah, Lord, Head, and Judge, all those may reflect upon in the fear of the Lord, who rightly confess the Lord and his word. Consider whether we do not rightly teach you according to the Scriptures.

Twenty-eighth. Micron writes, "If the flesh of Christ were of the substance of the heavenly Father, as Menno dreams, then the heavenly Father must also have flesh and blood; or else Christ could have no flesh and blood; but would only be a Spirit, as God is a Spirit." Behold what blind reason, and no faith.

We testify and confess before God and all our readers, and that in accordance with the word of the Lord, that the eternal, inef-

fable word is of the eternal, ineffable substance of the Father, and must be, if it be God. For what can be God, with God and in God which is not of his substance or being? And, also, that this same word came down, in due time, and that it became truly man in Mary, by the Almighty power of God, Jn. 1:14. Behold, thus the Holy Scriptures teach, and thus we believe, notwithstanding Micron dares call it "dreaming."

The holy angel Gabriel, and the dear evangelist, together with John the Baptist, Peter, and all the apostles, nay, Christ himself certainly knew as well as Micron and the learned do, that God the Father was a Spirit, and that he was not of flesh and blood; yet they confessed before all the world that the visible, palpable, eating, drinking, speaking, sleeping, waking, walking, teaching, sighing, weeping, dying and resurrecting Christ Jesus was the invisible, eternal and living Son of God, as may be plainly seen by the general tenor of the whole New Testament. O God, what abominable snares to catch the poor souls and to drag them to the pit of destruction.

Twenty-ninth. The foundation and doctrine of our opponents is, "That the word was God from the beginning, and could therefore not suffer." They refer to Jn. 1:1. "It was flesh, and could, therefore, not become flesh." Mark, it is reason, and not faith.

We say and confess, and that by the strength of the Scriptures that this same Word, which was, in the beginning with God, and was God, in due time became man, and dwelt among us, Jn. 1:14. For "God so loved the world," says Christ himself, "that he gave his only begotten Son." He spared not his own Son, says Paul, but delivered him up for us all, Rom. 8:32; and John says, "He sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins," 1 Jn. 4:10.

All those who controvert this, deny first, the eternal love of God who so loved us that he gave his only begotten Son, Jn. 3:16; 1 Jn. 4:10.

Secondly, they deny the promise of truth whereby God promised that the Messiah should be our Immanuel, Isa. 7:4, our God,

Isa. 40:10, and the Lord Our Righteousness, Jer. 23:6; 33:16.

Thirdly, they deny the Almighty power of God, by which he can do whatsoever he will. They make Gabriel a false messenger, as he said that nothing was impossible with God, Luke 1:37.

Fourthly, they are in opposition to all the Scriptures which testify, without any separation, that Christ Jesus is the own, only and first-begotten Son of God, Jn. 1:14; 3:16; 1 Jn. 4:9; Heb. 1:5; Rom. 8:32.

Fifthly, they make the Father a liar; for they do not believe the testimony which he has given of his Son, 1 Jn. 5:10.

Sixthly, they have neither Father nor Son; for they deny the Son, 1 Jn. 2:22.

Seventhly, they remain under the wrath of God; for they believe not in the name of the only, begotten Son of God, Jn. 3:36.

Eighthly, they attach to Christ all the gross inconsistencies which neither Micron nor any other man can explain away, as may be clearly seen by his writings, if one has spiritual eyes. Consider whether we do not rightly teach you in accordance with the Scriptures. * * *

Thirtieth. Micron and Herman say, "That if the Word became flesh, and did not take on himself the flesh of Mary, there must have been a new creation in Mary. Mark, how diametrically they oppose the foundation of truth.

We say (note it) that if all miracles and powers of God, by which many things were changed into different beings or forms from what they were before, were to be called a new creation, then we would find many such new creations in the Scriptures, as when water was changed into wine, Jn. 2:9, it was turned into blood, Ex. 7:20. Lot's wife was changed into a pillar of salt, Gen. 19:26. All the dust of Egypt was changed into lice, Ex. 8:17; and many other miracles. The omnipotence of God was thereby acknowledged; yet it is not called a new creation in the Scriptures.

But we will let the polite, impartial reader judge according to the Scriptures, if there would not have taken place a new creation in the case of Christ being born of Mary, as was in the beginning the case with Eve

being made of Adam's rib, if our opponent's foundation were true. Consider whether we do not rightly teach in accordance with the Scriptures.

Thirty-first. Micron writes "That we place in the stead of the true Christ, a new, unknown Christ whom neither the patriarchs, prophets, apostles, nor the many thousands of martyrs, &c., ever confessed."

We say that Micron, as also all the false prophets, thereby lamentably slander the pious patriarchs, prophets, apostles, and witnesses of Christ; and that he thereby denies their sure, true testimony, left in the Holy Scriptures, concerning Christ Jesus the Son of God. For it is manifest that the prophets confessed him to be their Immanuel; and that he was to be the son of a virgin, who was to conceive of the Holy Ghost, Isa. 7: 14, for God himself was to be his Father, Luke 1: 31—35. They confess him to be their mighty God, and everlasting Father, Isa. 9: 6, their Jehovah who would make them and us righteous, Jer. 23: 6; 33: 16; that his goings forth were from everlasting, who was to be Lord and Prince of Israel; that he was the wisdom of God, and was to show himself on earth and dwell among men. David confessed him to be his Lord, Ps. 110: 2, he was to be the Lord, strong and mighty, and to be the Lord Sabbath, Ps. 24: 8, which no man of Adam could be. Also, all the holy apostles, Matt. 14: 33, the angel of God, Luke 1: 28, the Father, Matt. 3: 17; 17: 16; Mark 1: 11; 9: 7; Luke 3: 22; 9: 35, and Christ himself, Jn. 9: 35, John the Baptist, Jn. 1: 34; 3: 28. Nathaniel, Jn. 1: 49, and Martha, Jn. 11: 27, confessed him to be the true Son of the true and living God, nay, to be his only, and first-born, inseparable Son, all through the New Testament. I say *inseparable*; for, that the son of man was God's Son, and that the Son of God was the son of man, Peter plainly confessed, upon which, also, salvation was promised him of Christ; that the church would be built thereupon, and that flesh and blood had not revealed it unto him, but the Father which is in heaven, Matt. 16: 17.

And now these thoughtless people come and divide Christ, without Scripture for it; he must not be the Son of God, on account

of the flesh; but is only called so for the sake of their garbled union; rob us of both Father and Son, make false and untrue all the Scriptures, together with all the apostles and prophets, nay, also, the Father and the Son, and take the innocent apostles, patriarchs, and prophets, with whom we agree in all particulars, as a mere cover for their falsehood; they point us from the firm foundation of truth to the quick-sands of criticism, garbled Scriptures and glozing; build their church upon a man and creature of the impure, sinful seed and flesh of Adam, without father. And although they, poor children, are quite earthly and carnal, as may be seen by their writings and works, yet they boast that they rightly teach Christ; which none can do but by the revelation of the Father through the Holy Ghost, as Christ himself says, "No man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him," Matt. 11: 27.

Observe whether we teach a Christ to whom the prophets and apostles have not pointed us, as these unfaithful people falsely accuse us of, before all the world.

Oh! That they meant God! that they sought the glory of God and the salvation of their neighbors, and not their own vain honor and glory! How gladly would they confess that we had the pure, saving truth, and they the impure, accursed falsehood. But as it is, it is hid from them by their earthly, carnal vision.

Behold, honorable reader, here you have distinctly presented to view the principal differences between us and our opponents, concerning this article. And I will now faithfully show you, for further explanation, their unscriptural confessions, garblings and adulterations of the Scriptures, together with their principal glozings of which they make use without the Scriptures, or with a false and garbled understanding of them, whereby they quite obscure the brightness of Jesus Christ the Son of God, break the foundation of truth, ensnare the simple reader, deprive him of the Father and Son, and thus detain him in the curse, sin and death, as has been heard.

FORTY-FIVE UNSCRIPTURAL CONFESSIONS,

EXPLANATIONS, FALSE GLOZINGS, ADULTERATED AND GARBLED SCRIPTURES, PRESENTED TO THE READER FOR THE EXPLANATION OF THE MATTER.

First. We do not read in the Scriptures, that Mary, who was a natural daughter of the impure and sinful flesh of Adam, was without sin and pure, as Micron confessed before us all, at the discussion, or:

Secondly. That such pure, innocent, spotless and blessed fruit, as was Christ Jesus, was born of such impure, sinful flesh, guilty of death, as was the flesh of Mary, since she was a daughter of the impure seed of Adam, as Micron says, or:

Thirdly. That Adam had two seeds, of which the one was holy and pure, as was Christ, and the other sinful and impure, as we are; as must be concluded from the doctrine of Micron, or:

Fourthly. That Christ was born of the Father, from eternity, that he was seated separate from the Father, and outside of the Father, from eternity, as Micron and Herman confessed before us all, or:

* * * *

Eleventhly. That the Word, or the eternal Son of God, without mother (I write it according to their foundation), thus united himself with a son of man, without father; that he accepted, or took on the same, that he dwelt therein, and thus became one person and son, as is the foundation and doctrine of our opponents, or:

Twelfthly. That there were two sons in Christ, as was heard, of which one was visible, passive, and earthly—the other invisible, impassive, and heavenly, as is the foundation and doctrine of our opponents, or:

Thirteenthly. That the divine nature thus united itself with the human nature (whereby he means, two perfect sons) into one person, which he so often repeats, or:

Fourteenthly. That such a union of God's Son and Mary's son, as Micron says, should be compared to the union of the body and soul of man, or:

Fifteenthly. That such a divided, double, earthly and heavenly, righteous and unrighteous, pure and impure Christ was

promised by the prophets, and preached by the apostles, as Micron says, without any truth, or:

Sixteenthly. That Christ was God and man in such a sense as Micron teaches, or:

* * * *

Eighteenthly. That the Son of God is called the son of man, and the son of man is called the Son of God, by reason of such union, as our opponents assert, without any Scripture, or:

* * * *

Twentiethly. That the flesh of Christ was sinful, and guilty of death, as John A'Lasco (with whom Micron agrees) blasphemously teaches, or:

Twenty-firstly. That the word, which from the beginning was God, thus took its tabernacle, tent, or dwelling in our flesh, as John A'Lasco philosophizes, or:

Twenty-secondly. That the Son of God thus covered his divinity with humanity, so long as he was upon earth, as John A'Lasco writes, or:

Twenty-thirdly. That the one who had transgressed, also, had to requite it in his nature, as is the foundation of our opponents, or:

Twenty-fourthly. That the Son of God fulfilled the law and reconciled the Father in our flesh, as is the foundation of our opponents, or:

Twenty-fifthly. That we could not have partaken, unto salvation, of his heavenly and spiritual attributes, such as his life, holiness, righteousness, merits, &c., if Christ had not had our human nature, form and substance, as Micron writes, or:

Twenty-sixthly. That the son of man, who is confessed to be the Son of God by Peter, by John the Baptist, by the angel and by all the Scriptures, said in any part of Scripture: No, I am not the Son of God, but he that dwelleth in me whom you do not see, is the Son of God, and for his sake

I am called his Son, as is the doctrine of our opponents, or:

Twenty-seventh. That the angel Gabriel told Mary that such a divided son would be conceived in her, Luke 2: 28, as Micron garbles it, or:

Twenty-eighth. That Christ Jesus was not God's Son, according to his most holy humanity, as well as according to his eternal divinity, as our opponents teach, or:

Twenty-ninth. That the man Christ was of earth and was called heavenly, only, on account of some honorable attributes as Micron writes, or:

Thirtieth. That the flesh and blood of the seed of Adam, as our opponents say, that the flesh of Christ is the true bread of life, on account of some divine attributes as they garble the word of Christ, Jn. 6: 51, or:

Thirty-first. That Abraham and Isaac were called the *autores* or origin, in the Scriptures, that it should not be attributed to strange men, as Micron says, without the Scriptures, or:

Thirty-second. That Christ took on him our sinful form as John A'Lasco says, Phil. 2: 7, or:

Thirty-third. That Christ took on him the seed of Abraham, as Micron garbles the text of Heb. 2: 16, or:

Thirty-fourth. That Christ partook of the flesh and blood of the children by generation, as our opponents garble or falsely explain the text, Heb. 2: 14, or:

Thirty-fifth. That God was manifested in our flesh, as our opponents explain the Scripture of Paul, 2 Tim. 3: 5, or:

Thirty-sixth. That Christ dwelt in our flesh by generation, as our opponents explain, 1 Jn. 2: 4, or:

Thirty-seventh. That we are to compare

to purity the most holy flesh of Christ with the cleanness of the animals which were declared clean, as Micron compared Acts 10: 15, or:

Thirty-eighth. That the most holy flesh of Christ Jesus was flesh of our impure, sinful flesh, as our opponents make the poor people believe, or:

Thirty-ninth. That Christ would be the Immanuel in our flesh as our opponents claim, or:

Fortieth. That Christ and we, are brethren on account of the flesh, as Micron teaches the unrepentant, ignorant world, without the truth, or:

Forty-first. That the children of the devil, such as liars, haters, murderers, adulterers of the Scriptures, blasphemers, &c., are Christ's brethren and sisters as well as the children of God, as we must conclude from the teachings of our opponents, or:

Forty-second. That the Son of God united himself with human nature, that is, with a man of the flesh of Mary, and that he ascended with such flesh, as Micron unscripturally garbles Eph. 4: 10, or:

Forty-third. That our flesh is seated at the right hand of the Father, as is the doctrine of our opponents, or:

Forty-fourth. That Christ is our Head, and we, his body, members and brethren, on account of the flesh, as we must understand it from the teachings and foundation of our opponents, or:

Forty-fifth. That a man of the impure, sinful seed of Adam is our Advocate, Mediator, Reconciler and High Priest with God the Father; and, that with him we should worship, honor and serve him as the true and living God, as our opponents teach.

CONCLUSION.

HERE, observe, kind reader, that the whole foundation and belief of our opponents concerning this article is built upon mere carnal wisdom, philosophy, explanation, glozings, adulteration and garbled Scriptures whereby they make it appear as if

their anti-christian doctrine was the doctrine of the Son of God, and whereby they cause themselves to be called the true teachers, and us the deceivers, by the world who, alas, are little versed in divine matters. But how they will stand at the coming of

Christ, before his impartial judgment seat, I fear most of them will find out too late.

I will now point out to you, by the grace of the Lord, the inconsistencies that must follow from their doctrine and faith, in such clearness that you can see that their doc-

trine is not of the Fountain of the eternal Wisdom, as Micron dares boast, without any truth, but that it is exhaled from the abyss by the locusts of Apollyon. Take heed.

FOURTEEN INCONSISTENCIES, WHICH MUST RESULT AND FOLLOW FROM THE FOUNDATION AND DOCTRINE OF OUR OPPONENTS.

FIRST, it follows incontrovertibly from their doctrine and faith that there are two sons in Christ, of which one was the impassive, eternal Son of God, without mother, and the other the son of Mary or the son of man, without father. And whether or not such doctrine and faith is not an inconsistency, I will leave you to judge according to the Scriptures.

Secondly, it follows incontrovertibly that there are two persons in Christ; for where there are two actual sons there must be two persons. Or else the one must have taken unto him the other, and by the fictitious union quite absorbed the other. If this can not be called an inconsistency you may judge according to the Scriptures.

Thirdly, it follows incontrovertibly that the eating, drinking, sighing, weeping, passive, dying and crucified Christ Jesus was not the Son of God, notwithstanding he is confessed by all the Scriptures to be the first and only begotten, own Son of God; for, they say that he had no Father. You may judge by the Scriptures whether this may not be called a blasphemous inconsistency and denial of the Son of God.

Fourthly, it follows incontrovertibly that they utter a falsehood as often as they call the man Christ, the Son of God; for how can he be a Son of God according to their doctrine? for they publicly write and verbally confess that he was not of God but of Mary. You may judge according to the Scriptures whether this is not a blasphemous inconsistency, which is not conformable to the true God who deals according to truth, and does not use idle names.

Fifthly, it follows incontrovertibly that it

is a divided Christ, who became a Savior, and Jesus Christ, of God and man, of the heavenly and earthly, of the pure and impure, of the righteous and unrighteous, of the good and evil, and of the blessed and accursed, as was once heard above. You may judge by the Scriptures whether this may not, also, rightly be called an inconsistency.

Sixthly, it follows incontrovertibly that the eternal expiatory offering, once offered for all the world, is not the spotless lamb which the Scriptures confess him to be, but an impure, sinful, and accursed man of the impure, sinful and accursed flesh and seed of Adam. You may judge by the Scriptures whether this is not an abominable, blasphemous inconsistency.

Seventhly, it incontrovertibly follows that, as the holy apostle Thomas confessed the crucified, visible Christ to be his Lord and God, and, as all Scripture testifies that he is our Reconciler, Mediator, Advocate, High Priest, Savior, and Deliverer, and if he were a man of Adam's impure seed, as our opponents assert, then it is manifest that an earthly, impure, sinful and accursed creature, of the earthly, impure, sinful and accursed flesh of Adam is our Reconciler, Mediator, Advocate, High Priest, Savior, Deliverer, Lord and God. You may judge by the Scriptures whether this may not, also, be called a blasphemous inconsistency and anti-christian abomination.

* * * *

Tenthly, it incontrovertibly follows that if the man Christ were of the unclean, sinful flesh of Adam, as is the foundation of our opponents, that one of two things must be

true, either that the Scriptures do not rightly teach us, or that all are idolaters who worship, honor, thank and serve such an earthly, sinful and accursed Christ, as our opponents teach and advocate without the Scriptures; for they say, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve," Matt. 4: 10; Deut. 6: 13. The prophet, also says, I will give my praise to none other. And it is clear that one does not worship our Savior Christ any less than he does the Father himself. You may judge according to the Scriptures whether this is not also an idolatrous inconsistency and an infamous blasphemy.

* * * *

Twelfthly, it incontrovertibly follows, if I understand the writing of Micron, that the eternal Word became the Spirit of man, and that it only took on itself a tabernacle of Mary's flesh. For, as I think, he alleges Peter for such a purpose, and says he was put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit, 1 Pet. 3: 18.

If he understands the Spirit of Christ as being the Spirit which he commended to the Father, as also, being the immortal Son of God with which, according to his doctrine, he was united, then Peter did not write enough by merely saying "quickened by the Spirit," and not, "as also by the immortal Son of God with which he was united." Mark what I say.

And if he understand it as solely having reference to the Spirit of Christ, and not, also, to the immortal Son, as he confesses him to be, then the Son of God must have become, according to his doctrine, a spirit of man; or else I do not know for what purpose he adduces this Scripture. You may judge by it whether this is not an abominable inconsistency, and blind-folding of the poor, ignorant world.

Thirteenthly, it incontrovertibly follows, if the doctrine of the learned is right, that the Almighty Word, whereby heaven and earth were replenished, must have united itself with such a small body of the flesh of Mary, and thus sighed, wept, ate, drank, suffered and died with it and lay dead in the grave; or else it must have merely sheltered in Christ's Spirit, and thus, at death, departed therewith, and at the res-

urrection again united therewith, the second time, Wis. 18: 15. You may judge by the Scriptures, whether this may not rightfully be called a wonderful inconsistency.

Fourteenthly, it incontrovertibly follows that if the word or the eternal Son of God thus took on him such a man of Mary's flesh and blood, and united himself therewith into one person and son, as our opponents, by their philosophy pretend, then, God the Father, was not the true Father of Christ, Mary not the true mother, Christ not a true Son; and all the Scriptures are thereby denied, which confess Christ to be the first and only begotten, true Son of God, without any distinction between divine or human, between spirit and flesh, invisible and visible, immortal and mortal, as we have clearly explained above and shall still further explain below, by virtue of the word of the Lord. You may, in the fear of God, judge by the Scriptures whether this can not be rightfully called a blasphemous inconsistency, and a direct denial of both Father and Son.

Behold, chosen readers, it is such an unscriptural, divided, unclean, sinful and earthly Savior and Christ which our opponents teach and point to by their anti-christian, covert, garbled, mysterious and obscure reasonings of human wisdom. I place before you, in plain and clear words the mirror of their deceit. If you will, you may clearly see how lamentably you are deceived by them.

Inasmuch, then, as their doctrine and faith is nothing in fact but anti-christian deceit, and the temptation of the old serpent, for it is all *taking unto, uniting two into one, divine and human nature, honorable virtues* and the like whatever we read or hear from them, of which we find nothing in Scripture; and as they make these assertions and adorn them with many broken Scriptures, glozings and false explanations; therefore I say, first, in Micron's own language, that all they philosophize and teach avails us nothing, since it is not according to Scripture. And secondly, in the language of holy Paul, it is anathema, since it is a strange gospel of which not a single word is taught in the Scriptures, neither by the prophets, nor by Christ,

nor by any of his apostles, in such a sense as our opponents teach it. Take heed.

We will now, by the grace of the Lord, present to view, in the first place, the foundation of the confession and doctrine of our opponents, concerning this article, together with its proper contents, fruits, end, and promise, and, in the second place, the founda-

tion of our confession together with its proper contents, fruits, end, and promise, that you may, by such comparison in black and white, the more readily guard against the deceit of the old serpent, and find the sure and firm foundation of truth, and believe and follow it, with a sure conscience, without any fear.

THE FOUNDATION AND FAITH

OF OUR OPPONENTS CONCERNING CHRIST JESUS, TOGETHER WITH THEIR PROPER CONTENTS, FRUITS, ENDS, AND PROMISE.

HONORABLE reader, take heed. The following is the whole contents, conclusion, sense, explanation, foundation and meaning of the faith and doctrine of our opponents, concerning the incarnation of our Lord, whereby they, by their human wisdom and the cunning of the old serpent, proclaim that all the glorious promises concerning Christ, the Son of God, contained in Moses and the prophets, such as, of grace, mercy, remission of our sins, peace of conscience, reconciliation, and life eternal, are concluded, in the unclean, sinful flesh of Adam, which they call clean although they confess that it is of him without any Scripture.

They confess publicly (witness their own confession), that there are two Sons in Christ; of which the one is the Son of God, from everlasting, without mother, and impassive; and the other, the son of Mary, or the son of man, without father, and passive. Which two sons, they say (but without Scripture), are united into one; so that the man, Christ, who visibly walked, ate, drank, sighed, wept, and hung on the cross, and who cried to his Father: "Father into thy hands I commend my Spirit," and who lay in the tomb three days, was not the Son of God.

They make the Holy of holies, the ever blessed Christ Jesus, a sinful and accursed man; [one of their number asks publicly: If Christ were holy, why was he adjudged unto death by the judgment of the Father, on account of sin?] and say that he par-

took of sinful flesh, that he might be tempted and be subject to, or guilty of death. They place their salvation in an earthly, sinful creature of the unclean, sinful seed of Adam, and make Christ Jesus not alone of the sinful and accursed flesh of Adam, Abraham and David, but also, a gentile of the gentiles, namely, a Syrian of the daughters of Bethuel and Laban, Gen. 24: 20: 18, a Canaanite of Rahab, a Moabite of Ruth, Matt. 1: 5, and an Ammonite of the mother of Rehoboam, of the son of Solomon, 1 Kin. 14: 21.

They make a creature of the unclean, sinful flesh and seed of Adam, their seat of grace, and sin-offering, their High Priest, Mediator, Advocate, Intercessor, and Reconciler, and falsely call him the Son of God. I say falsely; for they publicly confess that he had no father. Call them their Lord and God, still, they say and write that he is of earth, and not of heaven. They worship, honor and serve him as they do the Father himself. Oh, abomination!

They garble and break the Scriptures, because they do not believe the testimony of John, that the Word was made flesh. They adulterate the plain confession of the angel of God, concerning the Father and the Son himself, of John the Baptist, of Peter and of all the apostles, of Paul, and of all the Scriptures, which unanimously testify that the conceived, born, suffering, whole Christ, outwardly and inwardly, visible and invisible is inseparable, the first and only begotten Son of God.

They break and contradict the whole gospel and the precious epistle of John in which he testifies more than sixty times that Christ confessed himself to be the Son of God and confessed God to be his Father. Also, frequently, that he went forth from the Father, that he was sent and came from heaven.

They garble and profane the Holy Scriptures quite lamentably, heap one abominable flattery and fictitious explanation upon another. Christ, say they, has taken on himself our human nature of Mary; then, there are two sons and natures combined into one person and Son. Now the Son of God has put on the flesh and blood of Mary, dwelt therein, placed his tabernacle or tent therein.

One of their learned writes, "That the Son of God has brought all his attributes to the son of man." Another writes, "That the man Christ was God's *adoptivus filius*, that is, the adopted and well-pleasing Son of God." Still another, "That the one nature in Christ was quite divine, and the other half divine and half human." Some write, "That the divine nature also suffered." Others write and say, "That he only suffered in his human nature and not in his divine nature. Micron says, "That Mary's blood became in her, our flesh; that Christ's flesh is of our flesh, and that, notwithstanding he is of earth, and of Adam's seed, he is still called heavenly, on account of certain virtues," and other like anathe-

matic words and self-conceited glozings and abominations, of which not a word is found in the Scriptures.

Is it not a pity, nay, a horrible thing, to wade in such pure, limpid waters, with such filthy feet, and thus to obscure the precious and bright sun of righteousness with such infernal exhalations of the anti-christian doctrine? Rev. 9: 2. And that for no other reason than that they do not trust the testimony of John and of the angel; do not believe the Almighty power of the Father, judge every thing according to nature and not according to the Scriptures, and attribute more to Mary than belongs to a true mother, according to the ordinance and word of the Lord.

From which it incontrovertibly follows, and is manifest, according to the doctrine and testimony of John, that they, alas, have neither the Father, nor the Son; "Who-soever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father," 1 Jn. 2: 23, that the wrath of God abides on them, and that they shall not see life; for they do not believe in the name of the only begotten Son of God; that they must die in their sins; for they do not believe that it is he, Jn. 8: 24; that they do not vanquish the world, that they are not in God, nor God in them; for they do not confess that Jesus is the Son of God, 1 Jn. 4: 3. Oh! how well it would be if these poor people would take heed, rightly confess Christ, the Son of God, and give him his due praise and honor.

OUR DOCTRINE AND FAITH IN JESUS CHRIST,

THE SON OF GOD, TOGETHER WITH THEIR PROPER CONTENTS, FRUITS, END, AND PROMISE.

OUR foundation and faith is, and that, according to the Scriptures, in power and truth, that the whole Christ Jesus, visible and invisible, outwardly and inwardly, mortal and immortal, is the first and only begotten Son of God, Heb. 1: 6; Jn. 1: 14; 3: 18; 1 Jn. 4: 10, as the angel, John the Baptist, the apostles and all the Scriptures confess him to be; that he is the ineffable, eternal word, by which all things are created, ineffably come from heaven, and that,

by the power of the Holy Ghost he became man in Mary, the virgin, who was promised to a man of the house and generation of David, named Joseph, above all human understanding, and that, according to this flesh he was generated in her, and in due time born of her, an only, undivided person, Son, and Christ, God's true and natural Son, by virtue of his origin; and Mary's supernatural son, by virtue of his conception, I say, supernatural; for it was not

brought about by the will of man; who was promised that he should be born of the generation of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Judah and David; as it also happened; that he is, also, by reason of his mother, Joseph's wife, called in the Scriptures the righteous branch of David, a rod out of the stem of Jesse, the fruit of the loins of David, represented by the literal Solomon; that he is the Wonderful, Counsellor, The Mighty God, The everlasting Father, our Immanuel, our God, The Lord Our Righteousness, The Wisdom of God, the Lord of David, the Strong and Mighty God, who in the beginning founded the earth, and made the heavens; our new and spiritual Solomon, seated upon the new spiritual throne in the new and spiritual kingdom and reign of David; God's true Son, I say, by reason of his Father; Abraham and David's son, by reason of his mother; an only, undivided Son of God and Mary, gone forth from the Father, come down from heaven; conceived in Mary, born of her, a true man, like unto us, poor children of Adam, in all things except sin; that he hungered and ate, thirsted and drank, tired and rested; that he was made in the likeness of men; that he has fulfilled the law for us; that he sought the lost sheep; taught the kingdom of God, and that he confirmed his sending by miracles; and that he, at last died the bitter death, innocently, for us who were guilty (when we were yet ungodly and enemies); that he has thus purchased, sanctified and cleansed us by his own blood, and not by the blood of another; that he has reconciled us with God, our Father, nay, made us kings and priests; that he was delivered and resurrected from the bonds of death, and ascended to his Father, where he was before, and that, by his precious innocent blood, he became our only and eternal High Priest, Intercessor, Mediator, Advocate and Reconciler, with God his Father; that he is our Lord and God, whom we, in our weakness, should honor and praise because of his ineffable love and merits, even as we honor the Father himself, Gen. 1:1; Ps. 33:6; Jn. 1:3; 3:13; 8:23; 16:28; 1 Cor. 15:47; Eph. 4:10; Matt. 1:20; Luke 1:23; Jn. 1:14; Rom. 1:3; Gal. 4:4; Luke 1:30; Gen. 12:3; 18:18; 22:18; 26:4; 28:14;

49:10; 2 Sam. 7:12; Rom. 1:3; 9:5; Matt. 1:18; Luke 2:7; 3:23; 2 Tim. 2:8; Jer. 23:6; 33:16; Isa. 11:1; 1 Kin. 5:5; Ps. 89:37; Matt. 1:16; Luke 3:23; Acts 2:30; Isa. 9:6; 7:14; Matt. 1:23; Isa. 40:3; Jer. 23:6; 33:16; Prov. 8:12; Bar. 3:36; Ps. 110:1; 24:8; Heb. 1:10; Isa. 9:5; Luke 1:28; Jn. 16:28; 6:32; Eph. 4:10; Matt. 1:18; Luke 1:31; Jn. 1:14; Luke 2:7; Gal. 4:4; Heb. 2:14; 4:15; Jn. 4:6; Phil. 2:7; Matt. 5:17; Rom. 8:3; Eph. 2:13; Col. 2:13; Ezek. 34:23; Matt. 18:11; 4:17; Jn. 2:11; Rom. 5:8; 1 Jn. 1:7; 1 Pet. 1:19; Heb. 9:12; Eph. 2:15; Col. 1:20; 1 Pet. 2:9; Rev. 1:6; 5:10; Matt. 28:6; Mark 16:6; Luke 24:6; Jn. 20; Eph. 1:20; Mark 16:19; Acts 1; Jn. 6:62; Rom. 3:25; Heb. 3:1; 5:1; 6:20; 7:24; 8:1; 9:11; 10:11; Rom. 8:27; Heb. 7:25; 1 Tim. 2:5; 1 Jn. 2:1; Heb. 9:11; 12:24; Jn. 20:28; 5:22.

We confess and believe that, as the Almighty, eternal Father, through mere grace and love, has, in the beginning, created Adam and Eve by Christ, his Almighty, eternal word, Gen. 1:27. He, also, now by pure love and grace, has again raised them and all their seed (since they fell) by the same word, now incarnated by his Almighty power, and that he has again accepted them as his children, Jn. 1:14, that we may give the eternal honor and praise to God, for his grace, by his Word or Son, and not to the sinful flesh of Adam, of which they are.

And behold, such a confession concerning this matter leaves the whole Scriptures unbroken and unchanged. Not an inconsistent flattery, nor an adulterated Scripture is found, as is, alas, the case with the confession of our opponents.

The Almighty, eternal God alone, retains his glory and honor, by his Word or Son. The Father remains the true Father of the whole Christ, the mother the true mother, and the Son the true Son of both his Father and his mother, which Son is from above and not from beneath, who is from heaven and not of earth; pure of the pure God, an only Son and person, the Potentate and Lord of heaven and of earth, the Savior of all the world, in whom all the present and future promises are fulfilled, and by whom they are given and received. Eternal praise

be to his adorable, glorious, and exalted name, Amen.

All those who can thus firmly believe this miraculously high work of the ineffable, great love of God, and who can confess, with Peter and all the Scriptures, that Christ Jesus is the true Son of the true and living God, they have both the Father and the Son, 1 Jn. 2: 23; they vanquish the world; they are in God, and God is in them, 1 Jn. 4: 15; they are freed from the wrath of God, and have eternal life; they acknowledge the severe justice and the merited curse which came upon Adam and all his descendants through Adam's disobedience. They, therefore, fear God, bury their sins, and turn from evil. They also acknowledge the inexpressible love of God, so richly shown us in Christ Jesus; they enter into newness of life with Christ, Rom. 6: 4; they believe in the name of the only begotten Son of God, Jn. 3: 18.

Honorable reader, take heed. I warn you in sincere and faithful love; for it avails eternal life, or eternal death. If you be not quite blinded you must observe the deceit of Micron by these "Thirty-one differences," "Forty-five unscriptural confessions,

explanations, fictitious glozings, adulterated and garbled Scriptures," and by these "Fourteen insolvable, blasphemous inconsistencies;" and you must observe that his inconsistencies, together with the foundation of their confessions concerning this matter, which I have faithfully and plainly set forth, are nothing but anti-christian deceit of the old serpent; and that our foundation and faith, on account of which we must, alas, hear and suffer so much, are the firm, immutable, invincible rock and stone of the eternal truth which the holy apostles and prophets, together with all the pious witnesses of God in the primitive, corrupted church, before the man of sin entered into, and was seated in the temple of God, who cannot bear this foundation, as may be seen, 1 Jn. 2: 22; 4: 3; 2 Jn. 1: 7, confessed with us.

Not a single Scripture is adulterated or broken by us. We make use of no glozing. No inconsistency is the result. It is the plain Scripture and its foundation which we present to the reader, as you may feel and see.

* * * *

OF GEN. 3: 15, "I WILL PUT ENMITY BETWEEN THEE AND THE WOMAN, AND BETWEEN THY SEED AND HER SEED."

MICRON, in his writing, reports that I said that we should not understand the seed of woman, Gen. 3: 15, in a carnal, but in a spiritual sense only. To this I reply unreservedly, that the assertion is without foundation. For never in my life was it my intention that I would exclude Christ from this promise. For, as deceived Eve was a literal woman, thus also, was the deceitful serpent a literal serpent, through which the devil deceived her. For the Lord said, "Upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life," Gen. 3: 14, something which the devil, who is a spirit, could not do. If we, now, are to understand the seed of woman as a generative seed, as does Micron, then also, the seed of the serpent must be understood as

being a generative seed, between which two the enmity would exist, solely; for the one seed must be after its own kind, for the reason that it is of one name. In that sense the literal serpent, only, was vanquished by Christ. Understand rightly what I write.

On the other hand, if the serpent be a spiritual serpent (as it indeed is) represented by the deceitful serpent, then the woman must also be a spiritual woman, represented by the deceived woman, and thus, again, the seed be after its own kind; for as the serpent is spiritual, so also, is her seed spiritual, which is falsehood, Jn. 8: 44, of which alas, she begets such children as write such deceiving, lying, infamous, and partial books as Micron and Herman have done in this instance.

In the same manner, as the woman is spiritual, Eph. 5 : 25; Rev. 12 : 6; 19 : 7, thus, also, is her seed spiritual, that is, the truth of which (eternal glory be to God for his grace), she begets such children as walk in the truth, sincerely speak the truth, and for the sake of the truth, willingly submit to death with yea, and nay.

And behold, between these two, the children of truth, and the children of falsehood, there is an eternal enmity. The seed of woman vanquishes, and that by sincere, firm faith, in christian patience by the Spirit and word of the Lord; yet it receives many stings in the heel from the vanquished seed of the serpent. For their name is slandered, their doctrine is ridiculed, their life is hated unto death, their effects are stolen, their flesh is burned, and they are drowned, and must expect to be daily bitten by the venomous, bloodguilty seed, as I, in my weakness, have experienced for more than twenty years.

Behold, if we understand it in such a sense as we have here shown, the spiritual things remain spiritual, carnal things, carnal, and the Scriptures remain unbroken. But the Lord save me from hereby excluding Christ from the promise. For I am aware, by the grace of the Lord, that Christ is the power, the beginning, means and end of the whole promise, and that he will remain such forever. For he is the spiritual husband of this spiritual woman, Jn. 3 : 6; Rev. 19 : 7; Eph. 5 : 25. His Word is the seed of woman, which Word he is himself, as he says, "Even the same that I said unto you from the beginning," Jn. 8 : 25. He spoke and taught the truth and he is the truth, Jn. 14 : 6. He spoke and taught love, and he is love, 1 Jn. 4 : 8. In short, he spoke of wisdom, righteousness, holiness, and deliverance, and he is himself Wisdom, Righteousness, Sanctification and Redemption, 1 Cor. 1 : 30.

He alone is the victorious Prince, and triumphant Conqueror who was promised by those words, who has bruised the serpent's head for us, and also, we in him, by him, as Paul says, "In all these things we are more than conquerors, through him that loved us," Rom. 8 : 37. And "I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth

me," Phil. 4 : 13, and, "Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?" 1 Jn. 5 : 5.

Inasmuch as it is manifest from all this, that Christ and his Spirit, word, wisdom, truth, righteousness, sanctification, peace, deliverance, and all other attributes can never be separated in power and truth; and as it is manifest that where the one is the other must be also, therefore I will not leave it to the judgment of Micron and Herman, but to the judgment of the impartial reader, whether I exclude the man Christ, in whom our salvation is, from this promise, and say that it should only be understood spiritually, notwithstanding the allegory is spiritual in him, as Micron reports.

It has always been my understanding that he was hereby promised unto us of a woman, and have so stated it in some of my books; yet he must thus misquote my writings, as alas, he often does. I would not know for what reason I should contradict it, as he is not here promised of a man, but of a woman, Isa. 7 : 14, of a virgin; from which we must deduce that he was not to be the impure seed of mortal man, but the Son of the Most High.

* * * *

Behold, here you have our incontrovertible reply, founded on the Scriptures, to all the unfounded, wordy, sophistic and powerless arguments which Micron and Herman adduce in their writing about the seed of woman.

I do not see why the godly women, of which he writes and to whom he complains, should not submit to this, as I allow their husbands and lords, whose honor, all virtuous and honorable wives should gladly maintain, and to themselves each in her sphere, according to the measure of eternal truth, that which their God the Lord, has allowed them himself, by his word, by the works of his creation, according to his divine pleasure.

I will not say anything about what shame Micron commits against all honorable women by his unseasoned writing; I do not delight in chiding and upbraiding. It suffices me to assert the foundation of our doctrine, to the praise of the Lord. He must once in a while maliciously pierce me, that

he may thereby the more embitter some hearts against me, and that he may make truth still more hated and abhorred by our hated name.

MICRON'S CONFESSION, IN HIS NARRATIVE, THAT CHRIST IS THE SON OF GOD AND OF MAN.

Micron writes: Jesus Christ is called the Son of God on account of his eternal and ineffable generation of God the Father, according to his divine form. Thus he is also called the son of man on account of his being born in the fullness of time, of a human being, of Mary, according to the flesh or human nature, Matt. 1. HAC ILLE.

Answer. I would here faithfully admonish the kind reader earnestly to consider my reply to Micron's confession, and to judge it with a frank, impartial heart. I trust, by the grace of God, that if he do so he will discover the adulteration and deceit of our opponents in great clearness; and he will see, on the other hand, that the truth is with us.

In the first place, if we compare the verbal confession which he made to us, with his confession in writing, he appears to be as slippery as an eel. For at the time of the discussion he confessed repeatedly before us all, that the crucified Christ Jesus had no father or near father; and says so yet at different places in his writing. Nevertheless he now comes and writes, but without the truth, that they repeatedly confessed before us, that the Son of God died for us. He repeats the same song, but he sings it to the unintelligent, and to a little better tune.

It would sound too much out of tune thus bluntly to forsake the crucified Christ Jesus, and say, that he had no Father, as he did before us.

In fact, I do not know what to say or to think of this man. Now the man Christ is the Son of God, then again he is not; now God is his Father, then again, he had no father. For he writes pointedly that the man Christ, who died for us was generated not of God, but of the seed of Mary, and that he had no father. If he then, be of her seed, and not generated of God, and if he had no father, as he says, then it is plainly falsehood, lies and deceit, to say that the

Son of God died for us. If we take the best view as to his meaning he can be no more than an adopted, or a nominal Son, without truth, let him gloze the matter over as much as he can. I will leave the impartial reader to consider whether this is a simple and plain reasoning according to the truth, or an equivocal and dark argument of falsehood.

Now observe, first, his equivocation together with the unconformable, wavering, lightminded foundation of his doctrine, and his intolerable error, to teach that the crucified Christ Jesus was not God's own true Son, but merely a nominal Son, as was heard. I do not see what greater blasphemy one could commit. Yet he is a good teacher and writer, and that for the reason that he has so finely, but falsely, portrayed the old heretic, Menno.

* * * *

Thirdly, so long as they do not prove to us by the Scriptures that the Son of God is called the son of man, and the son of man, the Son of God for the reason that there was a union of the two as they frequently assert without the Scripture, so long, they mistake the truth as often as they call the Son of God the son of man, and the son of man the Son of God; for the name is given, as Micron himself confesses, in truth and in fact. And how this assertion of his agrees therewith, the reader may consider. To mock man is disreputable; but to mock God is too abominable and blasphemous.

Fourthly, so long as they do not prove to us by the Scriptures, that such union took place, as they assert, so long it is the lies and deceit of the old serpent, as it is not according to Scripture. For it is manifest that it is no union, as they call it, but a fearful division of the most holy and undivided person of Christ, whereby he mani-

festly makes two persons and sons in Christ, which are born of two different persons, at two different times, in two different forms; that he robs the crucified Christ Jesus of his beloved Father, and the Father of his only begotten, beloved Son; that he makes the greater part of the most holy flesh of Christ of gentile origin; that he esteems the man Christ no higher than an adopted or nominal Son of God; that he points us to an unholy, sinful, accursed offering, to an impure seat of justice, High Priest, Savior, Mediator, Advocate, and Christ, of the unholy, sinful, accursed and created flesh of Adam; that in fact, he makes Mary both the father and mother of Christ; that he breaks and disputes the whole Scriptures,

together with the ordinances of God concerning generation; and that he includes so many abominable inconsistencies in Christ that a feeling heart is pained thereat, when the matter is earnestly considered.

Behold, upon such a foundation has Micron built his false doctrine of the union of the Son of God, which he teaches all through his book, in so many smooth sentences and garbled Scriptures. It is easily perceived what kind of an abomination, Babylon, the mother of whoredom, pours from her golden cup, by her messengers and servants. Woe unto those that drink thereof; for she will so enchant them that they will become drunk, and fall.

HOW CHRIST, THE SON OF GOD, IS ALSO THE SON OF ABRAHAM AND DAVID, ACCORDING TO THE SCRIPTURES.

If we would have the true understanding of Christ being also the son of Abraham and David, and not break or go beyond the Scriptures, then we must keep in view the ordinances of God, and as it is manifest that Christ Jesus is not in truth confessed to be the Son of Joseph, but the Son of God, by the Scriptures, therefore it may be easily discerned how or in what manner Christ is also the Son of Abraham, and of David, and why he is thus called in Scripture, because of his human birth, as Paul says, "To Abraham and his seed (that is, his sons), were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, and to thy seed, which is Christ," Gal. 3: 16; Rom. 1: 3; 9: 5; 2 Tim. 2: 8.

In the same manner we should consider also that both the evangelists, Matthew and Luke, count the genealogy up to Joseph, and not to Mary. Luke makes no mention at all of Mary, but says, "Being (as was supposed), the son of Joseph, which was the son of Heli," &c., Luke 3: 23. Mark what the evangelists mean. From this it is plain that they do but show the generation of which, according to the promise, is born he who is forever the Jehovah, Immanuel, Savior, and Lord of the world.

For, if such a man as was Christ, should have been begotten of human seed, as our opponents say he is, who was to be the Deliverer of the whole world, as is Christ Jesus, then the Scriptures would point to the one of whom he was generated and originally came, and not to the one of whom he was not. For the Holy Ghost is a Spirit of truth, which teaches and instructs rightly. According to the foundation of the learned, our salvation would not be attached to the Scriptures, but to an uncertain meaning. For it is manifest that there is not a word found in them, which shows that Mary was of David's generation. Luke says that she was a cousin to Elisabeth who was a daughter of Aaron, Luke 1: 5, 36.

* * * *

Kind reader, understand me. I do not mean that Mary was not a daughter of David, but I say that the Scripture does not say so. But, inasmuch as our opponents found their whole structure upon the ground that the man Christ was to be a natural seed and son of David, and that by Mary, therefore they must have the sure testimony of the Holy Scriptures whereby they can prove it to be as they assert, before one can accept such an important thing concerning

the salvation of all the chosen. Since it is founded on mere presumption and not on the Scriptures, it may be that she was a daughter of David, and again, it may be that she was not, inasmuch as they did not follow one rule in regard to marriage, as may be seen by sacred history, and whereas it has nothing to do with the matter, and was, according to the evangelists sufficient that she was the wife of a son of David, that the promise might be fulfilled in the generation to which it was promised, as was frequently said, therefore I do not contradict it in the least that she was a daughter of David. But a sure testimony of the Holy Scriptures, on which the foundation of eternal salvation should be built, they can not adduce, to prove their doctrine.

* * * *

If they should say that it was to be a virgin, according to the word of the prophet, and that therefore, it could not be of the seed of man, then I would answer in plain words that they thereby pronounce their own sentence that Christ was not the natural seed and son of Abraham and David, but their supernatural and promised seed. For he was not of one of Abraham and David's sons, but of one of their daughters, who was a virgin, and knew no man, but was promised to one of David's sons, begotten of the ineffable, eternal word of the Almighty, great God, which she conceived by faith, Jn. 1: 14. Being the first and only begotten, true Son of God, on account of his eternal Father, and the promised, given, and born son of Abraham, Judah and David, on account of his mother, who was a daughter of Abraham, and the wife of Joseph, the son of David, as heard, Heb. 1: 2; Jn. 1: 14; 3: 16; 1 Jn. 4: 16.

I will now conclude all the passages of the Holy Scriptures which treat about the seed, fruit and branch of Abraham and David, with the following remarks. Inasmuch as the Savior, King, Prince, Conqueror, and Prophet, graciously promised to Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Judah and David, Gen. 12: 3; 18: 18; 22: 18; 26: 4; 28: 14; 49: 20; 2 Sam. 7: 12, was, in due time, born a true man of one of their daughters, according to the promise, Luke 2: 7, to whom the kingdom and throne of David was promised before-

hand by Isaiah, and again at his conception, when it was already fulfilled in the letter by the angel, that he was to reign forever therein, Isa. 9: 6; Luke 1: 29, which kingdom and throne he did not receive literally, but spiritually, for it was then already fulfilled; his kingdom is eternal, Luke 19; and shall not be left to other people, Dan. 2: 44; and as he is acknowledged all through the Scriptures as the first and only begotten Son of God, which he could not be if he were generated of impure human seed, as our opponents say, and not of God; and as his house or temple which he builds, is not a literal house, of literal wood, stone, metal, gold, and silver, as was the perishable house of Solomon; but as it is built of living precious stones, of the imperishable gold and silver, 1 Cor. 3: 12, upon the immutable foundation of the holy apostles and prophets, put together by the Holy Ghost, Eph. 2: 19; 1 Pet. 2: 4, 19, therefore it is thereby manifest that the promise made to David, should be understood in the old, literal form, as fulfilled in Solomon, and in the new spiritual being, Christ, 1 Kin. 5: 5; Ps. 89: 37; 132: 11; for if we measure the genealogy of his blessed flesh the most minutely, in the line of David, then we find that he was no more than the son of the daughter of David, while there is not a word in all the Scriptures to prove that she actually was one of David's daughters.

Behold, such a foundation has the strong argument of Micron, as he boasts, that the gates of hell will not prevail against it, something which they, doubtlessly, will not; for they would rather strengthen and aid him in such a cause; it is the strongest fortification and shield of hell, as may be clearly seen by John. But it takes a heavenly gate to prevail against it, the strong Spirit and word of the Lord, against which neither the gates of hell, nor the devil can prevail.

Whosoever desires to have more information upon this subject may examine our reply to John A' Lasco, impartially, and by the grace of God, he will find the true foundation and meaning thereof.

And behold, thus our foundation and doctrine remain firm and invincible; that

Jesus Christ is the only, first-born, and undivided Son of God, Heb. 1: 6; Jn. 1: 49; 3: 16; 1 Jn. 4: 9; Rom. 8: 32, by whom he has created heaven and earth, and the sea with their fullness, Gen. 1: 1; Ps. 33: 9; Jn. 1: 1; Eph. 3: 9; Col. 1: 16; and that he is not the impure, sinful, accursed, earthly seed of Abraham and David, as our opponents philosophize it.

Truly, he is the new Melchisedec, the King of perfect righteousness and of eternal peace, whose Father, mother, and genera-

tion, according to the true foundation of the Holy Scriptures are unknown to the whole world, the glorious Prince and wise Lord, the peaceful Solomon, who is seated upon the spiritual throne of his father David, prepared for him by his eternal Father, in eternal glory, and shall reign forever over the house and kingdom of Jacob, Isa. 9: 6, 7; Luke 1: 29. Consider whether we do not rightly teach you in accordance with the Scriptures.

CONCERNING THE TWO NATURES IN CHRIST, HOW IT SHOULD BE RIGHTLY UNDERSTOOD
ACCORDING TO THE SCRIPTURES.

MICRON criticises my sixth point, and remarks concerning my saying, That God's Son did not die for us according to their doctrine, is caused by a misconception on my part, that I do not, or will not understand the union of the two natures, the divine and the human, into one person, Christ; and says, That in both discussions they have repeatedly stated that God's Son died for us.

To which I reply thus: First, that they can not truthfully say that they once stated, during the discussion, that the Son of God died for us. For they have distinctly asserted, all the time, that the man Christ had no father, or as Micron sometimes said, that he had no near father, and repeats it in different places in his book, as any one may read and see.

O, dear Lord, what a terrible abomination that mortal man and an earthly creature dares so boldly lie against his own conscience, that he dares so lamentably belittle the King of all honor, so unrestrainedly deceive the poor souls, and commit such great deceit and shame against the word of the Lord! O, that they could see what they are doing!

Secondly, I reply as I did before him, that there can not be a word found in all the Scriptures about this union of the two sons, of God's Son and the son of man, in one person, Christ, which he, generally, artfully calls two natures, and which he

compares to the union of the body and soul of man.

That the body and soul of a living man are one person, is as clear as the light of the sun.

But, that such a man, body and soul, which is a perfect person, was thus united into one with the Son of God who is eternal; or, that the eternal Son of God thus united himself with the son of man (which two sons they call two natures, without Scripture), may be read in the flatterings of Micron, but we do not find it written in the Scriptures. You may further consider what kind of a Christ they teach you, by comparing this criticism of ours with the Scriptures.

Thirdly, I say that if Micron desired to deal with the readers as a faithful teacher, he would not make use of such equivocal and dark reasoning, but would express and explain his foundation and meaning without any duplicity, and say that the eternal, immortal Son of God put on a temporal, mortal son, body and soul, of the flesh and blood of Mary, and that he has thereby delivered us; for this is, in this matter, the proper meaning, sense and understanding of all their writing, flattering, and teaching, as their public confession, before us all, clearly testified and implied, as was heard.

But now he deals unfaithfully; for he means two actual sons, of which one was divine and the other human and calls them

but two natures, that the unsuspecting reader may not be offended at the harshness; which nature is but a property of him who possesses it, and which is not the one himself who possesses it. For, if one sees a man, he does not say that is a human nature, but that is a man; for the property is not the being itself, but the being possesses the property. And if Christ had but the properties, namely, the natures, and if he had not the being itself, which are the substances, then he was neither God nor man; for the natures are not the being itself, but the being possesses the nature. Therefore it would be becoming in Micron to deal unequivocally, and not to deceive his readers and hearers by such incomprehensible, strange words, that they might comprehend the foundation of his doctrine, and understand what he means. For we teach in such a manner that it may be understood.

But it would offend the thoughtful reader thus boldly to confess and teach that there are two Sons in Christ, and say, that the crucified Son was not God's Son, but a sinful, accursed man, of the sinful, accursed flesh or seed of Adam. And therefore they must fix it so as to retain their honor and name with the world, and enjoy their salaries and liens at ease.

Behold, thus we must, by virtue of the Scriptures, lift the fine cloak of the Babylonian whore, which Micron and the preachers would keep down by their glozings, wrong explanations and adulterated Scriptures, since they live off her table, that you may rightly observe and see their infamy, loathsome diseases, lumps, and deadly leprosy, understand it spiritually, and that you may, in the fear of your God beware thereof.

I cordially admit, however, that Christ had two natures; but not in such a sense as Micron believes, but in a scriptural sense; in this manner Peter writes to the church of God, and says, Ye are partakers of the divine nature, 2 Pet. 1: 4; whereby he clearly testifies that there are two natures in a christian; the one, the human nature with which he is born of Adam, and the other, the divine nature of which he partakes by faith, in the birth which is of God, by the Holy Ghost.

If there are, then, two natures in one chris-

tian, as there are in truth, why then not in Christ? For, as he is the only and true Son of God, having no other origin but of God, then he must also have the nature of the one of whom he is, this is too plain to be controverted. That he had the divine nature he has proven by these manifest, apparent attributes of a true, divine nature; as by his perfect righteousness, truth, holiness, love, and miracles.

As he had the divine nature, I say, on account of his divine origin, thus he also had the unblemished, pure, human nature (like unto the nature of Adam, before the fall), and that by reason of his true humanity. For as truly as he was the Father's Almighty Word from everlasting, so truly also, he, in the fullness of time, became a true, passive, mortal man, Jn. 1: 14; 1 Jn. 1: 1. And as he thus became a true man he must also have had the property of a true man, which is a true, human nature (though not corrupted), or else he would not have been a true man; this is incontrovertible.

Although the Scriptures say nothing about the two natures in Christ, yet I admit it with the above understanding; for I am sure that one can not separate the nature from any thing any more than he can separate the light from the sun, the heat from the fire and humidity from water.

That he had the true, human nature as well as the divine, he has shown by the apparent fruits of the real, human nature, as by hungering, thirsting, being weary, sighing, weeping, suffering and death.

Behold, thus I plainly confess according to the style and ordinance of the holy, divine Scriptures, that there were two natures in the only, undivided person and Son of God, Christ; and not as Micron does, who makes one Son of two sons, and one person of two persons, without the Scriptures, which he calls two natures, and according to his glozings, were born at two different times, of two different persons, in two different forms, and which several natures remained distinct, and were incomprehensibly united into one person, Christ, according to his writing, without the Scriptures. Observe which of us points you to the Scriptures.

It is hardly necessary to reply to some Scriptures which he adduces, whereby he tries to prove that not the Son of God, but the son of man, suffered. Of these Scriptures, in my opinion, the strongest is, that Peter says, Christ was "put to death in the flesh, but quickened in the Spirit," 1 Pet. 3: 18. For who ever suffered but in the flesh? Also, "Forasmuch then as Christ hath suffered for us in the flesh, arm yourselves likewise with the same mind: for he that hath suffered in the flesh hath ceased from sin," 1 Pet, 4: 1. Mark, Christians also suffer in the flesh, as Christ himself did, yet they are not one son, composed of two sons, as Micron says that Christ is.

Nobody can suffer otherwise than in the flesh, for Christ himself says, "Fear not them that kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul," Matt. 10: 28; Luke 12: 4. Again, to the murderer, "To-day thou shalt be with me in paradise," Luke 23: 43. His flesh hung upon the cross, and was afterward buried, from which it is very plain that it was said in regard to his immortal Spirit.

Again, Christ said, "Father, into thy hands I commend my Spirit." He did not cry, Father, into thy hands I commend thy Son with whom I have been united into one

person, and which was my Spirit. For one of three conclusions must be drawn from Micron's writing. Either the indwelling Son of God whom he generally calls the divine nature, and the son of Mary, whom he generally calls the human nature, together, must have had one Spirit or soul, and this Spirit he must have commended into the hands of the Father; or that the two remained alive at the death of Christ. First, the immortal, eternal Son of God, which had dwelt in him. Secondly, the Spirit or soul which he had received of Mary, or else the eternal Son of God must have become the Spirit of a mortal man, which had put on a dwelling place or tabernacle of Mary, which he offered for us, as was said in treating about the inconsistencies.

From which it follows that it is mere quicksand upon which they build their doctrine of the two natures, or two sons in Christ, according to their manner; and that it can stand no better before the power of the divine word, than the stubble can stand before the fire. And thus we firmly hold our ground that Jesus Christ is the only, undivided, and true Son of God; and that he is not one Son composed of two different sons, as is the anti-christian, false foundation and doctrine of our opponents.

THAT GOD THE FATHER IS THE TRUE FATHER OF THE WHOLE CHRIST, HIS SON; AND THAT THE WHOLE CHRIST IS A TRUE SON OF GOD, HIS FATHER, WHICH MICRON CONTRADICTS IN MANY PLACES, AND SAYS THAT IT IS NOT SO.

MICRON writes at some places, "That the son of man had no father, or near father." He often said so at the time of the discussion, too. Something which is so diametrically opposed to all Scripture that one must be astounded and ashamed thereat.

Since he so indiscreetly denies the Father of Christ Jesus, according to his humanity—therefore, I trust I will show to the reader, who is the Father of Christ, by a number of scriptural references and by their power that he must say, if he be not entirely given up, that Micron and the learned, by their writings, have lamentably deceived

him, and that they have taught nothing but an anti-christian foundation.

Thus spake the angel of the Most High to Mary, when she wondered how this should be, as she knew not a man: "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God," Luke 1: 35.

Which plain Scripture Micron has obscured by his infernal smoke, saying, "The angel meant to say to Mary, that her child should not be man, only (he means of her

flesh), but also truly God, and his Son, according to his eternal, divine being." Not a single word did the angel say to that effect; nor did he make such a division in Christ, as does Micron. But the angel merely made it known that she should conceive, and that the fruit should be the Son of God, and that God should be the Father of the child. Behold, thus Micron breaks the testimony of the holy angel, which he, at God's command, bore to Mary from high heaven, that the holy thing which should be born of her, should be the Son of God.

Again, the heavenly Father himself testifies of Christ Jesus, saying, "This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased. Hear ye him," Matt. 17: 5; Mark 9: 7; Luke 9: 35. Here the Father proclaims him to be his beloved Son, without any division. And Micron says that he is not.

Again, Christ said unto the blind man, "Dost thou believe on the Son of God? He answered and said, who is he, Lord, that I might believe on him? And Jesus said unto him, Thou hast both seen him, and it is he that talketh with thee," Jn. 9: 35. Here the palpable, visible Christ, who, according to the foundation of Micron, was only the son of man, confesses himself to be the Son of God, without any division; and Micron says that he is not. Again, at another place Christ says, "What and if ye shall see the son of man (mark, he says the son of man) ascend up where he was before?" Jn. 6: 62. Here Christ himself confesses that the son of man was from heaven; and Micron says that he was of earth, and that he is called heavenly, on account of some virtues, as if Christ was a nominal Christ and not a Christ in truth.

Again, when Christ asked his disciples, saying, "Whom do men say that I, the son of man, am?" (mark, he asks about the son of man). Then Peter said, "Thou art the Christ (without a division), the Son of the living God," Matt. 16: 16, &c.; and Micron says that the son of man was not the Son of God.

Again, John the Baptist says, "He that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with

the Holy Ghost. And I saw and bare record that this is the Son of God," Jn. 1: 33. Here John confesses the visible Christ (who, according to our opponent's foundation, was only the son of man), to be the Son of God; and Micron writes that he is not.

Again, the centurion, on Golgotha said, "Truly, this man (mark, he says, this man) was the Son of God," Mark 15: 39; and Micron says, he is not. Paul says, "God sent forth his Son, made of a woman," Gal. 4: 4; and Micron writes, God sent forth his Son, who came of a woman. At another place, Paul writes, "He that spared not his own Son," Rom. 8: 32. Mark, he says, *His own Son*, and we are reconciled to God by the death of his Son. Rom. 5: 10. John says, "The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin," 1 Jn. 1: 7. At another place, "He (God) sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins," 1 Jn. 4: 10, which reconciliation, according to Micron's false doctrine, is not brought about by the blood of the Son of God, as John and Paul teach, but by the blood of the son of man, who, according to Micron, had no father, as has often been heard.

Kind reader, if you closely observe it you will find more than sixty instances in the New Testament where Christ Jesus confesses God the heavenly Father to be his Father, and himself to be his Son. And from the beginning to the end, you will not find anything about such a division and union as our opponents teach, neither in Christ's words, nor in those of any of the holy apostles or evangelists.

Micron writes at more than one place, "If God, the Father, is the Father of the man Christ, then he must have also had flesh and blood." From which it is manifest, first, that he does not allow the crucified Christ a Father. Whereby the angel of God, the Father, and the Son, themselves, also John the Baptist, Peter, John, Paul, Nathaniel, Martha, and the whole Scriptures are made bare-faced liars and false witnesses, by him, Luke 1: 31; Matt. 17: 5; Jn. 9: 36; 1: 33; 3: 16; Matt. 16: 16. For they have repeatedly confessed him to be the true Son of the true and living God.

Secondly, it is manifest that all such writing is not of the living Fount of the

Holy Ghost; nor of an enlightened, firm, believing heart which, without all wavering, trusts, with Joshua and Caleb, in the power and true promise of the Almighty God; but that it is solely of human wisdom and an unbelieving, carnal heart, which can not judge but according to nature; and yet, through excessive blindness, destroys the ordinances of this same nature, which God established in the first creation.

Kind reader, take heed! The Almighty power of God, the ineffable miracle of his divine love, and the undeceiving, sure word of his eternal truth should avail more than the blind intellect of our corrupted nature, if we would rightly learn to know Christ, and follow and obey his holy word.

The dead body of Adam, created of the dust, by the breath of God, became a living soul, Gen. 1: 27, and the water gushed forth from the rock, Ex. 17: 6. Yet the earth, from which the living Adam was made, was no living soul, neither was the rock from which the water flowed for Israel to drink, the ingredients of water. If they should now say that this was done by the power of God, by supernatural means, as is the case, too, then I would reply again: Thus was also brought about the miraculous incarnation of Jesus Christ, in Mary, by the omnipotence of God by which he can do any thing he pleases, as the angel says, "The power of the Highest shall overshadow thee;" for with God nothing is impossible, Luke 1: 35.

I entertain the opinion that all those who believe, in power and in truth, that God was able, in the beginning, to create heaven, earth and sea, and the fullness thereof, by his mighty word, and now, by the same word, rules, disposes and maintains all this; and who believe that he is able to raise Adam and all his descendants, at the end, by the same power, from the dust, and reclaim them from the undermost parts of the earth and the depths of the sea, and place them before the sight of his majesty, will also believe that this same God had the power to send his ineffable, eternal word from heaven and to let it become, by the power of his Holy Spirit, a true, passive, mortal man, in Mary, as John says, "The Word was made flesh," Jn. 1: 14.

I repeat it, in Mary, for in the Father, or in heaven, before he was conceived, he was not flesh. This I have often confessed in plain language, and thoroughly proved by the Scriptures. Notwithstanding this he is not ashamed so to garble my words as if I should have said that the Word was flesh in the Father, or in heaven. Something which I can say with a good conscience never to have thought of in all my life.

I do not see what difference there can be between the spirit of our opponents and the spirit of the Pharisees and of the false prophets. For as *they* always garbled the words of the pious prophets and of the Lord Christ, and were always intent upon making them disreputable, and thus, out of mere hatred and envy of the truth, make way with them by violence, falsehood and wrong; thus *these*, out of mere hatred and envy of the truth, deal with me, old, afflicted man; for, alas, they have portrayed me all through their book, in such colors, that I do not see how they could have depicted Behemoth and Beelzebub in more unpleasant colors than they have depicted me; notwithstanding that, I have never in my life, wished them any harm and much less done them any; but have shown them all christian faithfulness and discretion by giving them good counsel in their need, as the love which is of God teaches all true christians to do. Yet, however, they have written this lying, infamous and slanderous falsehood against me, undeservedly, as thanks for my faithfulness, whereby they cause me to be tenfold more obnoxious in all countries than I was before. And this for no other reason in fact, than that we confess Christ Jesus to be the true Son of the true and living God, with the angel Gabriel, with the Father, with Christ himself, with John the Baptist, with Peter, and with all the Scriptures, and that we, in our weakness, would gladly hear and follow his word, commandments, prohibitions, ordinances and unblamable example, that we might thus be saved by his grace, which our opponents utterly hate and oppose. For they publicly avow that the son of man, whom we confess to be the Son of God, according to the Scriptures, was not the Son of God. They

contradict his express ordinance of baptism, which he taught and commanded us with his own mouth, whereby all the regenerated, believing children of God submissively testify before Christ and his church that they are prepared and willing to follow his holy word and divine will, unto death.

Beloved, do observe what abomination and poisonous draught it is which they pour out for you from the Babylonian cup! True and immutable remains the testimony of the Father: "This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased," Matt. 3: 17; 17: 5; Mark 1: 11; 9: 7; Luke 9: 35; 2 Pet. 1: 17.

HOW THE DIVINE WORD, IN THE FULLNESS OF TIME, ACCORDING TO THE SCRIPTURES, WAS MADE FLESH.

* * * *

You have heard that God, the Father, is a true Father of the whole Christ, and that the whole Christ is the true Son of God, his Father. We will now show you, by the grace of the Lord, by virtue of the holy, divine Scriptures, what kind of divine substance, matter, seed, or being it was of which this same Son of God and Mary was brought forth, that you may confess and see the clearness of the human birth of Jesus Christ, according to the Scriptures, through the smoke of the bottomless pit, cleared away by the power of the strong word and scattered by the breeze of the Holy Ghost.

Thus John teaches us, saying, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made. In him was life, and the life was the light of men." "And the Word (which was in the beginning) was made flesh, and dwelt among us (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father), full of grace and truth," Jn. 1.

Behold, dear reader, here John shows us as a true witness of the truth, the divine being of the man Christ, the ineffable, eternal Word.

If you would have an immutable, true and firm foundation of faith, and the true sense of these words of John, and not be deceived by the lying seed of the old serpent, nor be robbed of your Savior by the subtle deceit of anti-christ, you must well observe and hold to these facts.

First, that God the Father is confessed to be the true Father of his Son Christ, by the Scriptures, Matt. 3: 17; 16: 16; 17: 5; Luke 1: 31; Jn. 1: 45; 3: 16; 5: 22.

Secondly, that Christ Jesus is confessed to be the true Son of God, his Father, by all the Scriptures, Matt. 3: 17; 14: 33; 16: 16; 17: 5; Mark 1: 11; 9: 7; 15: 39; Luke 2: 48; Jn. 9: 37.

As it is plain that God the heavenly Father is a true Father of Christ, his Son, and that Christ is a true Son of God, his Father, as is testified all through the Scriptures; therefore it is sure and manifest that we should leave the testimony of John unglorized and unbroken, where he says, "The word was made flesh." For since Christ is God's true Son, and God the Father, Christ's true Father, the Father must also have had his ineffable Word, by which all things were made that are made, as was heard.

If our opponents should say, "That the Word was Spirit from the beginning, and could therefore not become flesh," then you may answer, first, If the Word could not become flesh, as you say, the power of the Father is made less and his arm is shortened, by which he can do anything he pleases; and the angel bore a false testimony to Mary, when he said that there is nothing impossible with God, Luke 1: 37.

Secondly, you may answer: If the Word was not made flesh, as you say, then all the Scriptures deceive us, which testify and teach, without any division, union, or exception as to nature, sons or persons, that Christ Jesus is God's Son, and that God is his Father, as was said.

Thirdly, you may answer: If the Word

was not made flesh, as you say, then the Holy Scriptures testify falsely, that he is of heaven and not of earth, Jn. 3: 31; 8: 23; Eph. 4: 10, that he came forth from the Father, Jn. 16: 28, that he is the bread and Lord from heaven, Jn. 6: 35; 1 Cor. 15: 47, that he is the Alpha and Omega, Rev. 1: 8; 22: 13, and other like Scriptures.

Fourthly, you may answer: If the Word could not become flesh, as you say, then one or the other of you must be wrong. Either you who say that he could not become flesh, or John, who says that he was made flesh, as was heard.

If they should further say, that the Word put on, by generation, of Mary's seed, as they actually do, you may answer then thus: First, Then we desire that you show to us where this is written in the Scriptures or else we say, that it is the flattering and falsehood of the old serpent, and not the Lord's truth.

Secondly, you answer: By such acceptance you rob the Father of his Son, and the Son of his Father. You divide Christ into two parts, into good and evil, into righteous and unrighteous, into heavenly and earthly. You point us to a sinful creature and an impure offering. You idolize the earthly and sinful flesh of Adam. You make all the pious witnesses of Christ, such as John the Baptist, Peter, &c., false and lying, and yourselves anti-christ; and make the Scriptures contradictory.

Thirdly, you may answer: Becoming is *becoming*, and putting on is *putting on*; nor will it be found otherwise in the Scriptures. Thus when Christ became twelve years of age, he did become twelve years of age, counting from the time of his human birth. Christ became a curse, Gal. 3: 13. He became such, so as to be hung between two murderers, on the cross, Matt. 27: 38; Mark 15: 27; Luke 23: 32. Water was made wine, and it was made, John 2: 9; Lot's wife became a pillar of salt, and she did become one, Gen. 19: 26. For becoming I say, is becoming, and cannot be explained in any part of the Scriptures as meaning *putting on*.

If they would still follow their intellect and say, "If the Word is become flesh, it has lost its first being by the change," you

might answer, first: John has taught us that it was made flesh, and he has not said a word further, as to how or to what extent it was changed; something that you, inquisitive ones, want to know and hear of us, without any Scripture.

Secondly, you might answer: Adam was made a living soul, 1 Cor. 15: 45; yet he remained dust, for the Lord said unto him, "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return, Gen. 3: 19.

Thirdly, you might reply: We ought to believe sincerely, and not intellectually comprehend. For Paul says, that "Faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen," Heb. 11: 1.

Fourthly, you might reply: Paul says, That he is God, and Christ says that he is a Spirit. Zophar the Naamathite says, "It is as high as heaven; deeper than hell; longer than the earth; and broader than the sea," Job 11: 8, 9. And the prophet says, that he comprehended the dust of the earth in a measure, Isa. 40: 12; also, "saith the Lord, The heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool," Isa. 66: 1. There is no man born of Adam who is so intellectual and wise that he can measure this God and Spirit, or comprehend his being, therefore it would be well for them to abandon their high, soaring intellect to search such ineffable profundity, to humbly bow themselves under the word of the Lord, and to ponder on the saying of Solomon, "It is not good to eat much honey; so for men to search their own glory is not glory," Prov. 25: 27. Read also Syrach 3: 21.

Kind reader, if intellect were to avail in this ineffable, deep matter, and not the Scriptures, then I would ask them an intellectual question concerning their faith, of which they could scarcely extricate themselves. It would be this: Whether or not they believe that the Almighty, ineffable Word, of which heaven and earth are full, Wis. 18: 15, and which is also, the eternal wisdom and power of the Almighty, eternal Father, has placed itself out and out in such *concreto sanguine*, as Micron calls it at one place, as is his doctrine now? I presume they will leave the question unanswered. For if they say that it was therein, out and out, then they make a Father

who has separated his word, wisdom and power from himself, and placed it outside of himself. And if they say that it was not all therein, then they make their own foundation untrue and false; for they say and teach that the Son of God (which is God's eternal Word, wisdom and power) has put on the son of man or of Mary, and that he has united himself therewith into one person.

Therefore I repeat that it would be well for them to leave such ineffable profundity unsearched, to stay under the clouds, and not to soar above heaven, with their earthly, ignorant intellect; for, I presume that when they have measured the height of the heavens and the depth of the abyss, have weighed the mountains and enumerated the drops of rain, then they will give me an intelligent answer, and explain how this thing is, about which I asked concerning their faith, foundation and doctrine. And therefore I say that I do not at all charge my mind with this incomprehensible miracle, but adduce the word of the Lord, whereby I am plainly taught that Mary, the Lord's mother, conceived the Almighty, eternal Word of the Father (by which all things were made that are made), by faith, Luke 1: 31, and that the same, by the great power and operation of his Almighty, eternal Spirit, became a true, visible, palpable, passive, mortal, pure and holy man, not of her, but in her, above the comprehension of all mankind. And thus he who was already the first-born of every creature, and, also, according to his human form, the first and only begotten, true Son of God, was supernaturally born unto God, his Father, of Mary, according to the flesh, as Isaac was naturally born unto Abraham, by Sarah; Solomon unto David, by Bath-sheba, and John the Baptist unto Zacharias, by Elisabeth, Gen. 21; 2 Sam. 12: 24; Luke 1: 12; which first and only begotten, true Son of God became also, according to the promise, a son of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Judah, and David on account of his mother (but in the genealogy of Christ, Joseph's son, Matt. 1: 16; Luke 3: 23), who graciously fulfilled the spiritual law which no flesh of Adam could fulfill, for all of the descendants of Adam, in perfect righteousness, Rom. 8: 2; and who innocently trod the wine press of

bitter death, Isa. 63: 3; Rev. 19: 15, to whom the law and all the prophets point, and in whom all the glorious promises of the inexpressibly great grace and love of God are fulfilled. And thus, after he had done the service of his divine love he again ascended up where he was before, Jn. 6: 62. He has all power in heaven and upon earth, Matt. 28: 18, and is, through faith in his blood, our only and eternal Propitiator, Reconciler, High Priest, Mediator, Advocate, and Peace-maker with God, his Father, Rom. 3: 25; Jn. 4: 25; 1 Tim. 2: 5; 1 Jn. 2: 1.

Behold, thus the most high, most gracious, and most merciful God and Father retains his glory, praise and honor through his blessed, eternal Word and Son; and not through the unclean, sinful flesh of Adam, as our opponents teach and pretend.

Mark, now, beloved reader, how our opponents are deceived in this matter by their earthly, carnal intellect which would explain this miracle, not according to the Scriptures, but according to the laws of nature, and therefore, do not believe that the Almighty God had the power to let his eternal Word become flesh, and a true man; for which reason they have depicted me in such unbecoming colors, although these poor souls are doubly what they would make us to be, namely, false teachers, and perverse heretics. For they say and teach without any Scriptures, that the man Christ who died for us, was not the Son of God, and that he had no Father; and we say that he is God's Son, and that God is his Father, according to all Scripture.

They say and teach, without any Scripture, "That the Word has put on a whole man of Mary's flesh and seed;" and we say and teach, according to the plain testimony of John, That the Word was made flesh, not of Mary, but in Mary.

They teach, "That there are two different persons and sons, one divine, the other human, in the one Christ," without Scripture; and we say that there is but one undivided person and Son, according to the Scriptures.

They say and teach, "That the visible Christ was earthly, of the earth," without the Scriptures; and we say and teach that

he is heavenly, of heaven, according to the Scriptures.

They say and teach, "That he is pure of impure Adam," without Scripture; and we say and teach that he is pure of the pure God, according to the Scriptures.

They point us to an "accursed, sinful offering," without Scripture; and we point to a spotless, innocent offering, according to the Scriptures.

They worship an Adamitic flesh, contrary to all Scripture; and we, the Almighty, eternal Word which became man by the infinite power of God, according to the Scriptures.

In short, they place their whole salvation in the unclean, sinful seed of Adam, that is, in a man, who, according to their fabu-

lous writing, and contrary to the word and ordinance of God, was generated from the seed or blood of Mary, without father; and we, in the Almighty, eternal Word, which became man in the fullness of time, by which all things are made, ruled, and have their being, forever, which was from everlasting the eternal wisdom, power and glory of God, his Father, one with God, his eternal Father and the eternal Holy Ghost, blessed forever, Amen.

Invincible and firm remains the word: "The word was made flesh," Jn. 1: 14; 1 Jn. 1: 1. O, merciful, gracious Lord, enlighten the eyes of all the blind, that they may see thy heavenly brightness and rightly confess the majesty of thy honor, Amen. Dear Lord, Amen.

CONCLUSION.

HONORABLE reader, here you have our fundamental explanation and plain reply to the untrue, and partial narration, and anti-christian, false doctrine concerning Jesus Christ the Son of God by Micron and Herman, wherewith I am now and at all times willing and ready to appear before God and his angels, before friend and foe, and before the whole world, unto water, fire, sword, and before the coming judgment.

I would pray you all, reasonable readers, through Jesus, as if before God, to reflect earnestly what kind of spirits and people they are who have written the "Narration" and its appendix and articles concerning us, as they have kept quite silent about the beneficence so faithfully shown them in their need; nor said anything about the distinct confessions which they made, as above stated, whereby they had already lost the whole point in discussion, as also, that they were frequently so puzzled that they knew not what to say, and as they have not written a single, discreet word about me in their whole book; and from the beginning of the discussion to the end of their writing, they have only studied and aimed how they might most expertly de-

fame me, and thus make our doctrine, which is the pure doctrine of Christ, a stench to many.

In several instances they have lamentably garbled and misinterpreted my words; have added to, or subtracted therefrom, and changed the meaning of their own. The order of the discussion they have changed, made many unscriptural glozings, adulterated the Holy Scriptures, made false witnesses of the Father himself and his blessed Son, of the angel of the Lord, of John the Baptist, of all the evangelists, apostles and of all the Scriptures, as may be seen.

However, they fill the measure of their predecessors, the false prophets, who, from the beginning, have praised and taught falsehood by hypocrisy, have hated the truth, and upbraided the faithful servants of God, and defamed them; who have taken amiss the faithful service of their love, accused them before lords and princes, have hindered them in the doctrine and true religion, and at last, have taken their lives and confiscated their goods. It is but little to me, that they have thus trampled upon me, and caused me to be a stench to many; for I am aware that I am unworthy of honor, since I am born of Adam, of impure

seed, an unworthy sinner; as all those have complained, from the beginning, who were rightly overshadowed by the glory of the Lord. But, the Lord forbid that I am such an unsteady falsifier, and artful rogue, as I am depicted to be by our opponents through the infamous, false, indiscreet and bitter spirit of envy. Many pious people of both the Old and the New Testament had to hear this same thing, with me. Christ promises us a great reward in heaven; for it is done for his name's sake, Matt. 5: 11; Luke 6: 22. But it pierces my soul night and day that they so lamentably blaspheme the Son of God, adulterate the Scriptures, and so falsely console the poor, unenlightened souls by such open falsehood, and thus encourage and keep them in their accursed blindness. For which reason I was urged to write this reply, to the praise of the Lord, and to your service.

I would, therefore, that you would earnestly consider what a pure, clear and unadulterated foundation of truth we have pointed out to you and to all the world, concerning Christ. And, on the other hand, also, how plainly and convincingly we have discovered and manifested unto you and all reasonable readers the anti-christian foundation and doctrine of our opponents. Whosoever has but half sight may see where the deceit is hidden.

We now and at all times willingly offer, that if they can prove to us by the unbroken and unadulterated Scriptures, that Adam had two kinds of seed, of which one was pure and the other impure, or, that the Scriptures any where call that holy, pure, and heavenly which is unholy, impure and earthly in itself, or, that two sons can be one Son, or, that the Scriptures any where mention such a union, as our opponents falsely pretend, or, that ever any one was the true son of another without his being generated of his substance or seed, or, that God is a God of falsehood, so that he would call the man Christ his Son, without his actually being such, then we will gratefully and diligently reconsider the matter, in all love. Behold, before God, it is the truth that I write. And, in case they cannot do so (something which they surely never can), then our opponents, if they be reason-

able men, should acknowledge that they have the impure, deceitful doctrine of anti-christ, and we the wholesome doctrine of Christ; notwithstanding we must hear and suffer so exceedingly much.

Dear reader, if we consider the Scriptures of John the evangelist, we clearly find that the spirit and doctrine of our opponents already existed in his time. For, at that time they denied that Jesus Christ was the Son of God, and that he was made flesh; something which these, also, often did in their writings and verbal discussion which they had with us. From which it is manifest that it is the roguery and deceit of the old serpent.

I would, therefore, humbly beseech all the godly, pious hearts who sincerely and diligently seek Christ and eternal life, for the Lord's sake, first, to pray for all of our opponents, both of high and low station in life, learned or unlearned, rich or poor, who ignorantly err, and who are encouraged and consoled in their impenitent, reckless life, by such false teachers and writers as are our opponents, that the merciful, gracious Lord may give them eyes to see his glorious, exalted origin, and rightly confess his truth, that *that* may not be lost with which they are so dearly bought.

And secondly, pray that the Lord may grant me, and all our fellow laborers of the house of God, together with the whole church, the Spirit of his wisdom; grant that we, by his grace, may remain wholesome in doctrine; steady in faith; ardent in love; quickened in hope; unremittent in the work of the Lord; unblamable in life, and patient in all oppression and tribulation; of which alas, we do not experience a little by the infamous crying and writing of our opponents; that we may set a living example to the world; that many may see our new, christian walk in the truth and examine it, repent, and thus be eternally saved.

I beseech you in the same manner not to leave these our writings idle and hidden, but to send them east, west, north and south, into the hands of all men, and to let many read them, that the bright sun of righteousness which, alas, has been obscured for so many centuries by the smoke of the bottomless pit of the anti-christian, false

doctrine, may shine forth with the power of truth, and that our glorious and holy Savior, the first and only begotten, true Son of the Almighty, living God, the ever blessed Jesus Christ, may be rightly confessed by many, in his glory.

To this only and eternal Savior, together with his heavenly Father and Holy Ghost be the praise forever, Amen.

MENNO SIMON.

October 5.

A LETTER.

From Menno Simon to Margaret, wife of Rein Edes.

CHOSEN beloved sister in Christ Jesus, Mercy, grace and peace be to thee! Most beloved sister whom I sincerely love in Christ. From your beloved husband's letter I understand, that during all the winter you have been a sick and afflicted child, which I very much regret to hear. But we pray daily: Father, thy will be done. By which we commit ourselves to the Father to treat with us as is pleasing in his blessed sight. Therefore bear with your affliction resignedly. For all this is his paternal will for your own good; that you may put your trust in the eternal living God alone, and not in any perishable things. Be consoled in Christ Jesus; for after the cold of winter, comes summer; and after death, comes life. O, sister! rejoice that you are a true daughter of your beloved Father. Soon will the inheritance of his glorious promise be due; a little while yet, says the word of the Lord, and he who is coming shall come and his reward will be with him. May the Almighty, merciful God and Lord, before whom you have bent your knees, to his honor, and whom, according to your weakness you have sought, grant you a strong and patient heart, a sufferable pain, a lovely refreshment, a gracious cure or godly dissolution, through Christ Jesus whom we daily expect with you, my beloved sister and child in Christ Jesus.

Secondly, I understand that your conscience is troubled because you have not and do not now walk in such perfection as the Scriptures direct us; on which account I write the following to my faithful sister, as a fraternal consolation, from the true word and eternal truth of the Lord: The Scripture,

says Paul, hath concluded all under sin. There is no man on earth, says Solomon, who does righteously and sinneth not, Eccl. 7. At another place, "A just man falleth seven times, and riseth up again," Prov. 24: 16. Moses says, "The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, longsuffering, and abundant in goodness and truth; keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin, and that will by no means clear the guilty," Ex. 34: 6, 7. O, dear sister! Observe, he says, None are guiltless before God. Again, David says, "Lord, enter not into judgment with thy servant; for in thy sight shall no man living be justified;" "If they sin against thee (for there is no man who sinneth not);" "We are all as an unclean thing, and all our righteousness are as filthy rags;" Christ, also, says, "There is none good but one, that is, God;" "The evil which I would not, that I do;" "In many things we offend all;" "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us," Ps. 143: 2; 1 Kin. 8: 46; Isa. 64: 6; Matt. 19: 17; Mark 10: 18; Rom. 7: 19; 1 Jn. 1: 8.

As it is plain from all these Scriptures that we must all acknowledge ourselves to be sinners, as we, also, are in fact; and as no one has perfectly fulfilled the righteousness required of God but Christ Jesus alone; therefore none can approach God, obtain grace and be saved except by the perfect righteousness, reconciliation and advocacy of Jesus Christ; however godly, righteous, holy and unblamable he is. We must all acknowledge, whosoever we are, that we are sinners in thoughts, words and works. Yea, if we had not before us the righteous

Christ Jesus, no prophet nor apostle could be saved. Therefore, be of good cheer and be consoled in the Lord. You can expect no greater righteousness in yourself than all the chosen of God had in them from the beginning. In and by yourself you are a poor sinner; and by the eternal righteousness, banished, accursed and adjudged to eternal death; but in and through Christ you are justified and pleasing unto God, and accepted of him in eternal grace as a daughter and child. In this all saints have consoled themselves, trusted in Christ, esteemed their own righteousness as unclean, weak and imperfect, with contrite hearts approached the throne of grace, in the name of Christ, and with firm faith prayed the Father: O, Father, forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those that trespass against us, Matt. 6; Luke 11.

It is a very precious word which Paul speaks, "When we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly;" yea, when we were yet ungodly, and thereby he manifests his love toward us. "For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life, Rom. 5: 6, 10. Behold, my chosen, beloved child and sister in the Lord, this I write from the sure foundation of eternal truth. I herewith pray you, and desire that you will wholly commend all your doings outward and inward unto Christ Jesus and his merits; believing and confessing that his precious blood, alone, is your cleansing; his righteousness your piety; his death your life; and his resurrection your justification; for he is the forgiveness of all your sins; his bloody wounds are your reconciliation; and his invincible strength the staff and consolation of your weakness, as we have, in former days, ac-

ording to our small gift, often shown you from the Scriptures. Yea, most beloved child and sister, so long as you find and feel such a spirit in yourself which is desirous of following that which is good, and abhorring that which is evil, notwithstanding the remnant of sin is not entirely dead in you, as also all the saints complained of from the beginning, so long you may rest assured that you are a child of God, and that you will inherit the kingdom of grace in eternal joy, with all the saints. "Hereby know we that we dwell in him, and he in us, because he hath given us of his Spirit," Jn. 4: 13. I sincerely pray that you may, by faith, rightly understand this ground to the refreshment, strengthening and consolation of your conscience and soul, and remain firm unto the end. I commend you, most beloved child and sister, to the faithful, merciful and gracious God, in Christ Jesus, now and forever. Let him do with you and with all of us according to his blessed will. Either in the flesh, yet to remain a little while with your beloved husband and children; or out of the flesh, to the honor of his name and to the salvation of your soul. You before, and we after, or we before and you afterward. Separation must once come. In the city of God, in the new Jerusalem there we will wait on each other, before the throne of God and of the Lamb; there sing hallelujah! and praise his name in perfect joy. Your husband and children I commend to him who has given them to you, and he will do with them justly. The saving power of the most holy blood of Christ be with my most beloved child and sister, now and forever, Amen.

Your brother, who sincerely loves you in Christ.

MENNO SIMON.

