

Please note, direct quotations (in italics) and page and line references are from *Institutes of the Christian Religion* by John Calvin. Edited by John T McNeill. Used by permission of Westminster John Knox Press. www.wjkbooks.com

PREPARATION

HOW FAR FROM THE PURITY OF THE GOSPEL IS ALL THAT THE SOPHISTS IN THEIR SCHOOLS PRATE ABOUT REPENTANCE; DISCUSSION OF CONFESSION AND SATISFACTION		
<i>The Scholastic doctrine of confession and contrition, with its alleged Scriptural basis, examined, 1-6</i>		
1	Errors of the Schoolmen in delivering the doctrine of repentance. 1. Errors in defining it. Four different definitions considered. 2. Absurd division. 3. Vain and puzzling questions. 4. Mode in which they entangle themselves.	The Scholastic Doctrine of Penance
2	The false doctrine of the Schoolmen necessary to be refuted. Of contrition. Their view of it examined.	The Scholastic doctrine of penance torments the conscience
3	True and genuine contrition.	Not the sinner's contrition, but the Lord's mercy awaits.
4	Auricular confession. Whether or not of divine authority. Arguments of Canonists and Schoolmen. Allegorical argument founded on Judaism. Two answers. Reason why Christ sent the lepers to the priests.	Confession not enjoined: refutation of Scholastic allegorical argument from the lepers that were cleansed
5	Another allegorical argument. Answer.	The unbinding of Lazarus misapplied
6	A third argument from two passages of Scripture. These passages expounded.	Scriptural confession
<i>Evidence for late origin of auricular confession, 7-8</i>		
7	Confession proved not to be of divine authority. The use of it free for almost twelve hundred years after Christ. Its nature. When enacted into a law. Confirmation from the history of the Church. A representation of the ancient auricular confession still existing among the Papists, to bear judgment against them. Confession abolished in the Church of Constantinople.	Compulsory confession unknown in the ancient Church.
8	This mode of confession disapproved by Chrysostom, as shown by many passages.	Chrysostom does not enjoin confession to men
<i>Scriptural confession of sins, public and private, 9-13</i>		
9	False confession being thus refuted, the confession enjoined by the word of God is considered. Mistranslation in the old version. Proof from Scripture that confession should be directed to God alone.	Confession before God
10	Effect of secret confession thus made to God. Another kind of confession made to men.	Confession of sins before men

11	Two forms of the latter confession—viz. public and private. Public confession either ordinary or extraordinary. Use of each. Objection to confession and public prayer. Answer.	General confession of sin
12	Private confession of two kinds. 1. On our own account. 2. On account of our neighbor. Use of the former. Great assistance to be obtained from faithful ministers of the Church. Mode of procedure. Caution to be used.	Private confession in the cure of souls
13	The use of the latter recommended by Christ. What comprehended under it. Scripture sanctions no other method of confession.	Private confession for the removal of an offence
<i>The power of the keys, and absolution, 14-15</i>		
14	The power of the keys exercised in these three kinds of confession. The utility of this power in regard to public confession and absolution. Caution to be observed.	Nature and value of the power of the keys
15	Popish errors respecting confession. 1. In enjoining on all the necessity of confessing every sin. 2. Fictitious keys. 3. Pretended mandate to loose and bind. 4. To whom the office of loosing and binding committed.	Summary of the Roman doctrine of confession
<i>Criticism of Romanist errors and injurious practices related to confession and satisfaction, 16-25</i>		
16	Refutation of the first error, from the impossibility of so confessing, as proved by the testimony of David.	The enumeration of all sins is impossible
17	Refuted farther from the testimony of conscience. Impossible to observe this most rigid obligation. Necessarily leads to despair or indifference. Confirmation of the preceding remarks by an appeal to conscience.	The requirement of complete confession is a measureless torment
18	Another refutation of the first error from analogy. Sum of the whole refutation. Third refutation, laying down the surest rule of confession. Explanation of the rule. Three objections answered.	The pernicious effect of demanding complete confession
19	Fourth objection—viz. that auricular confession does no harm, and is even useful. Answer, unfolding the hypocrisy, falsehood, impiety, and monstrous abominations of the patrons of this error.	Against auricular confession
20	Refutation of the second error. 1. Priests not successors of the Apostles. 2. They have not the Holy Spirit, who alone is arbiter of the keys.	Baseless appeal to the power of the keys
21	Refutation of the third error. 1. They are ignorant of the command and promise of Christ. By abandoning the word of God they run into innumerable absurdities.	The uncertainty of priestly binding and loosing
22	Objection to the refutation of the third error. Answers, reducing the Papists to various absurdities.	The difference between perverted and right use of the power of the keys

23	Refutation of the fourth error. 1. Petitio principii. 2. Inversion of ecclesiastical discipline. Three objections answered.	Perverse claims exposed
24	Conclusion of the whole discussion against this fictitious confession.	Summary
25	Of satisfaction, to which the Sophists assign the third place in repentance. Errors and falsehoods. These views opposed by the terms,—1. Forgiveness. 2. Free forgiveness. 3. God destroying iniquities. 4. By and on account of Christ. No need of our satisfaction.	General presentation and refutation of the Roman doctrine
<i>The grace of Christ alone provides true satisfaction for sin and peace to the conscience, 26-27</i>		
26	Objection, confining the grace and efficacy of Christ within narrow limits. Answers by both John the Evangelist and John the Baptist. Consequence of these answers.	Christ has provided full satisfaction
27	Two points violated by the fiction of satisfaction. First, the honor of Christ impaired. Secondly, the conscience cannot find peace. Objection, confining the forgiveness of sins to Catechumens, refuted.	The Roman doctrine deprives Christ of honour, and the conscience of every assurance
<i>Various distinctions and objections critically examined, 28-39</i>		
28	Objection, founded on the arbitrary distinction between venial and mortal sins. This distinction insulting to God and repugnant to Scripture. Answer, showing the true distinction in regard to venial sin.	Venial and mortal sins
29	Objection, founded on a distinction between guilt and the punishment of it. Answer, illustrated by various passages of Scripture. Admirable saying of Augustine.	Forgiveness of sins involves remission of penalty
30	Answer, founded on a consideration of the efficacy of Christ's death, and the sacrifices under the law. Our true satisfaction.	Christ's unique sacrifice can alone remove both penalty and guilt
31	An objection, perverting six passages of Scripture. Preliminary observations concerning a twofold judgment on the part of God. 1. For punishment. 2. For correction.	Misinterpretations exposed: God's judgments, penal and corrective
32	Two distinctions hence arising. Objection, that God is often angry with his elect. Answer, God in afflicting his people does not take his mercy from them. This confirmed by his promise, by Scripture, and the uniform experience of the Church. Distinction between the reprobate and the elect in regard to punishment.	God's judgment in vengeance has a wholly different purpose from that of his judgment in chastisement: the distinction
33	Second distinction. The punishment of the reprobate a commencement of the eternal punishment awaiting them; that of the elect designed to bring them to repentance. This confirmed by passages of Scripture and of the Fathers.	Judgment of vengeance serves to punish; judgment of chastisement to improve
34	Two uses of this doctrine to the believer. In affliction he can believe that God, though angry, is still	The believer undergoing God's chastisement is not to lose heart

	favourable to him. In the punishment of the reprobate, he sees a prelude to their final doom.	
35	Objection, as to the punishment of David, answered. Why all men here subjected to chastisement.	The punishment of David
36	Objections, founded on five other passages, answered.	Good works as redemption of punishment
37	Answer continued.	The woman who was a sinner
38	Objection, founded on passages in the Fathers. Answer, with passages from Chrysostom and Augustine.	The Roman doctrine cannot claim the authority of the Church fathers
39	These satisfactions had reference to the peace of the Church, and not to the throne of God. The Schoolmen have perverted the meaning of some absurd statements by obscure monks	The Schoolmen corrupt the teaching of the fathers

EXPLORATORY

<i>The Scholastic doctrine of confession and contrition, with its alleged Scriptural basis, examined, 1-6</i>		
1	Errors of the Schoolmen in delivering the doctrine of repentance. 1. Errors in defining it. Four different definitions considered. 2. Absurd division. 3. Vain and puzzling questions. 4. Mode in which they entangle themselves.	The Scholastic Doctrine of Penance

What simile does Calvin use for the voluminous writings of the Scholastic Sophists on repentance? (622, 8)

- a. ...*slime*

What does he mean by this?

- a. It conjours up images of clinging mud, treacherous and through which it is difficult to make progress.

What characterises repentance as defined by the Scholastics? (622, 12ff; 623, 6ff)

- ...to repent is to weep over former sins, and not to commit sins to be wept over;*
- ...it is to bewail past evil deeds and not again to commit deeds to be bewailed;*
- ...it is a certain sorrowing vengeance that punishes in oneself what one is sorry to have committed;*
- ...it is sorrow of heart and bitterness of soul for the evil deeds that one has committed, or to which one has consented.*
- ...repentance is a discipline and austerity that serves partly to tame the flesh, partly to chastise and punish faults.*

How do the Scholastics come up with this definition? (622, 9ff)

- a. ...*they have never understood what repentance is.*

- b. *...they take certain clichés from the books of the ancient writers, which do not express the force of repentance at all*

Give examples of the *clichés* the Scholastics misunderstand and misapply. (622, 12ff)

- a. *...to repent is to weep over former sins, and not to commit sins to be wept over;*
- b. *...it is to bewail past evil deeds and not again to commit deeds to be bewailed;*
- c. *...again, it is a certain sorrowing vengeance that punishes in oneself what one is sorry to have committed;*
- d. *...again, it is sorrow of heart and bitterness of soul for the evil deeds that one has committed, or to which one has consented.*

Calvin comes back to the above phrases, which he regards as the Scholastics' *definition* of repentance.

Why should the Scholastics not have understood the above to be the characteristics of repentance? (622, 21ff)

- a. *...they were not spoken with the intent to define repentance, but only to urge their hearers not to fall again into the same transgressions from which they had been rescued.*
- b. *...if they would turn all statements of this sort into definitions others also ought with equal right to have been patched on. Such a one is this statement of Chrysostom: "Repentance is a medicine that wipes out sin, a gift given from heaven, a wondrous power of grace surpassing the might of laws."*

Based on this misunderstanding, how do the Scholastics define repentance? (623, 6ff)

- a. *...a discipline and austerity that serves partly to tame the flesh, partly to chastise and punish faults.*

What part of repentance do the Scholastics neglect? (623, 8f)

- a. *They are wonderfully silent concerning the inward renewal of the mind, which bears with it true correction of life.*

Into what component parts do the Scholastics divide up penance? (623, 15f)

- a. *...contrition of heart*
- b. *...confession of mouth*
- c. *...satisfaction of works*

(IJ: The following headings are from the section of Thomas Aquinas's *Summa Theologica*, Books 3 & 4 that deals with Penance. It shows how Thomas's treatment of Penance is arranged and helps us to understand the analysis of repentance that Calvin is responding to in this section. The numbers in brackets are page numbers. You can find the *Summa* online at the New Advent website.

PENANCE ITSELF: Penance as a sacrament (84) and as a virtue (85).

EFFECTS: Pardon of mortal (86) and venial (87) sins. The return (88) of sins already forgiven. The

recovery of virtues (89).

PARTS (GENERAL): The parts of Penance in general (90).

PARTS (CONTRITION): Definition (1) of contrition. Its object (2), degree (3), duration (4) and effect (5).

PARTS (CONFESSION): Its necessity (6), nature (7), minister (8), quality (9), and effect (10). The seal (11) of confession.

PARTS (SATISFACTION): Its nature (12), possibility (13), quality (14), and means (15).

RECIPIENTS: Recipients (16) of the sacrament of Penance.

KEYS (GENERAL): The keys: their nature and meaning (17), effect (18), ministers (19) and recipients (20).

KEYS (EXCOMMUNICATION): Definition, congruity and cause (21) of excommunication. Who (22) can excommunicate or be excommunicated. Communication (23) with excommunicated persons. Absolution (24) from excommunication.

KEYS (INDULGENCES): Indulgences in itself (25). Those who grant (26) and receive (27) indulgences.

RITE: The solemn rite (28) of Penance.)

What is the problem with this division (*This division is no more logical than the definition...*)? (623, 19ff)

- a. *Suppose someone reasons from their definition – a kind of argument prevalent among dialecticians – that anyone can weep for previously committed sins and not commit sins that ought to be wept over, can bewail past evil deeds and not commit evil deeds that ought to be bewailed, can punish what he is sorry to have committed etc., even though he does not confess with his mouth. How, then will they maintain their division?*

Why would this entirely conceivable set of circumstances make it difficult for them to maintain their concept of penance, complete with all its parts? (624, 1ff)

- a. *...if he does not confess though truly penitent, there can be repentance without confession.*

How might the Scholastics attempt to evade this problem with their definition? (624, 3ff)

- a. *...this division applies to penance only in so far as it is a sacrament, or is understood concerning the whole perfection of repentance.*

What does Calvin regard as, *the hinge and foundation of the whole debate*? (624, 9f)

- a. *...the definition itself*

What is it that the Scholastics 'chatter about', revealing, as far as Calvin is concerned, that true repentance is something unknown by them? (624, 21ff)

- a. *...whether repenting of one sin is pleasing to God when in others obstinacy remains*
- b. *...whether divinely inflicted punishments are able to make satisfaction*
- c. *...whether repentance may be frequently repeated for mortal sins, when they foully and impiously define that men daily practice penance for venial sins only*

2	The false doctrine of the Schoolmen necessary to be refuted. Of contrition. Their view of it examined.	The Scholastic doctrine of penance torments the conscience
---	--	--

What statements in this section indicate to us that pastoral and practical concerns are at the forefront of Calvin's mind when dealing with the subject of repentance? (624, 31ff; 625, 5ff, 17f, 22ff, 32ff)

- a. *...I would have my readers note that this is no contention over the shadow of an ass, but that the most serious matter of all is under discussion: namely, forgiveness of sins.*
- b. *...if there is anything in the whole of religion that we should most certainly know, we ought most closely to grasp by what reason, with what law, under what condition, with what ease or difficulty, forgiveness of sins may be obtained! Unless this knowledge remains clear and sure, the conscience can have no rest at all, no peace with God, no assurance or security; but it continuously trembles, wavers, tosses, is tormented and vexed, shakes, hates, and flees the sight of God.*
- c. *...they do not determine when a man can have assurance that he has in just measure carried out his contrition.*
- d. *...when a bitterness of sorrow is demanded that corresponds to the magnitude of the offence, and which may truly balance in the scales with the assurance of pardon, here truly miserable consciences are tormented in strange ways, and troubled*
- e. *...when consciences have for a long time wrestled with themselves, and exercised themselves in long struggles, they still do not find a haven in which to rest.*

What three things do the Scholastics say *...are necessary to attain forgiveness of sins?* (625, 2f)

- a. *...compunction of heart*
- b. *...confession of mouth*
- c. *...satisfaction of works*

Why does Calvin say *...if forgiveness of sins depends upon these conditions...nothing is more miserable or deplorable for us?* (625, 15ff, 22ff, 29ff)

- a. *They make contrition the first step in obtaining pardon, and they require it to be a due contrition, that is, just and full. But at the same time they do not determine when a man can have assurance that he has in just measure carried out his contrition.*
- b. *...when a bitterness of sorrow is demanded that corresponds to the magnitude of the offence, and which may balance in the scales with assurance of pardon, here truly miserable consciences are tormented in strange ways, and troubled when they see due contrition for sins imposed upon them.*
- c. *If they say we must do what is in us, we are always brought back to the same point. For when will anyone dare assure himself that he has applied all of his powers to lament his sins?*

Given that this uncertainty comes between us and ...*a haven in which to rest*, to what do we turn? (625, 35ff)

- a. *...to calm themselves, at least in part, they wrest sorrow from themselves and squeeze out tears that they may thereby accomplish their contrition.*

(IJ: lines 19ff. I cannot make sense of the sentence beginning, *We must, I admit...* Possibly, *what*, in line 20 should be, *whet*.)

How does Calvin, quoting Paul, describe and even encourage true contrition? (625, 21f)

- a. *...we ought not to repent this sorrow which begets repentance unto salvation.*

3	True and genuine contrition.	Not the sinner's contrition, but the Lord's mercy awaits.
---	------------------------------	---

In this section a careful distinction is drawn between the necessity of repentance and repentance as the reason for salvation.

Why is repentance necessary? (626, 7ff)

- a. *...forgiveness of sins can never come to anyone without repentance, because only those afflicted and wounded by the awareness of sins can sincerely invoke God's mercy.*

Does God forgive us in response to our repentance? (626, 10f, 24ff)

- a. *...repentance is not the cause of forgiveness of sins.*
- b. *...it makes a great difference whether you teach forgiveness of sins as deserved by just and full contrition, which the sinner can never perform; or whether you enjoin him to hunger and thirst after God's mercy to show him – through the recognition of his misery, his vacillation, his weariness and his captivity – where he ought to seek refreshment, rest, and freedom; in fine, to teach him in his humility to give glory to God.*

How does this distinction liberate us from ...*those torments of souls which they would have us perform as a duty*? (626, 13ff)

- a. *...the sinner does not dwell upon his own compunction or tears, but fixes both eyes upon the Lord's mercy alone.*

4	Auricular confession. Whether or not of divine authority. Arguments of Canonists and Schoolmen. Allegorical argument founded on Judaism. Two answers. Reason why Christ sent the lepers to the priests.	Confession not enjoined: refutation of Scholastic allegorical argument from the lepers that were cleansed
---	---	---

Taking issue in particular with the Scholastic theologians, Calvin now turns to the subject of auricular confession (*ie* audible confession of sin to another human being).

What argument used by the Scholastics to support the necessity of auricular confession does Calvin take issue with? (627, 15)

- a. *The Lord...sent the lepers to the priests [Matt 8:4; Mark 1:44; Luke 5:14; 17:14]*

What conclusion does Calvin come to with regard to the Scholastics' method of interpreting scripture? (627, 18f)

- a. *They therefore take refuge in allegories*

How does their allegorical reasoning run? (627, 19ff)

- a. *...it was laid down by the Mosaic law that priests should distinguish between stages of leprosy [Lev 14:2-3]. Sin is spiritual leprosy; it is the duty of priests to pronounce concerning this.*

Calvin has two responses to this line of thought. What are they? (627, 29f, 37f)

- a. *"When the priesthood is transferred, there is necessarily a transference of the law as well" [Heb. 7:12]*
 b. *...their allegory, which reckons the merely civil law among the ceremonies, is unsuitable.*

What is the implication of Calvin's first response? (627, 30ff)

- a. *All priestly offices have been transferred to Christ and are fulfilled and completed in him. The whole right and honour of the priesthood has therefore been transferred to him.*
 b. *If they are so fond of chasing after allegories, let them set before themselves Christ as their sole priest, and in his judgments seat concentrate unlimited jurisdiction over all things.*

Why then does Christ send lepers to the priests? (627, 39f; 628, 5f, 9ff, 16ff)

- a. *That the priests may not charge him with breaking the law*
 b. *Truly, this miracle was to be a proof for them*
 c. *...because they still try to evade, this work serves for them as a testimony.*
 d. *...if they prefer to agree with Chrysostom, he also teaches that this was done by Christ on account of the Jews, that He might not be regarded as a transgressor of the law*

5	Another allegorical argument. Answer.	The unbinding of Lazarus misapplied
---	---------------------------------------	-------------------------------------

What is the Scholastics' second argument for auricular confession? (628, 31f)

- a. *...they say that the Lord bade the disciples unbind the risen Lazarus and let him go [John 11:44].*

What are Calvin's responses to this assertion? (628, 32ff; 629, 4ff)

- a. *...they falsely declare this, for nowhere does one read that the Lord said this to his disciples. It is much more probable that he said this to the Jews...*
 b. *...suppose we regard this statement as made to the disciples, what then will our opponents maintain? That the Lord gave the apostles the power of loosing? How much more aptly and skillfully this could be treated as allegory if we should say that by this figure God willed to instruct his believers; to loose those raised up by him, that is, so that they should not recall to memory their sins, which he himself had forgotten, nor damn as sinners those whom he*

himself had absolved, nor still upbraid them for those things that he himself had condoned, nor be harsh and captious to punish where he himself was merciful and ready to spare!

Why should it be our practice to comfort those Christians who labour under too strong a sense of their own sinfulness? (629, 14ff)

- a. *...nothing ought to incline us more to pardon than the example of the judge, who warns that he will be implacable to those who are too severe and inhuman.*

6	A third argument from two passages of Scripture. These passages expounded.	Scriptural confession
---	--	-----------------------

The Scholastics produce two more proof texts, feeling that they are, armed with these texts, on stronger ground. What are they and what do they say? (629, 19ff)

- a. *...those who came to the baptism of John confessed their sins [Matt 3:6]*
- b. *James would have us "confess our sins to one another" [James 5:16]*

Calvin's explanation of the first text is – what? (629, 23ff)

- a. *No wonder if those who wished to be baptised confessed their sins! For, as it was said before, "John...preached a baptism of repentance" [Mark 1:4]. He baptised with water unto repentance. Whom, therefore, would he have baptised except those who had confessed themselves sinners? Baptism is the symbol of forgiveness of sins. Who would have been admitted to this symbol but sinners and those who recognise themselves as such? Therefore, they confess their sins in order to be baptised.*

His explanation of James 5:16 is a bit more complex. Set out the steps by which it proceeds? (629, 32ff)

- a. *...if they had paid attention to what follows immediately, they would have understood that this also gives them little support. "Confess," he says, "your sins to one another, and pray for one another." [James 5:16]*
- b. *He combines mutual confession and mutual prayer*
- c. *If we must confess to priestlings alone, then we must pray for them alone. What?*

What are the possible alternative renderings for the word translated, *one another*, in James 5:16? (The word is ἀλλήλοισ, pronounced *allālois*.) (630, 2f)

- a. *..."mutually," "in turn," "interchangeably," or, if they prefer, "reciprocally."*

<i>Evidence for late origin of auricular confession, 7-8</i>

7	Confession proved not to be of divine authority. The use of it free for almost twelve hundred years after Christ. Its nature. When enacted into a law. Confirmation from the history of the Church. A representation of the ancient auricular confession still existing among the Papists, to bear judgment against them. Confession abolished in the Church of Constantinople.	Compulsory confession unknown in the ancient Church.
---	---	--

8	This mode of confession disapproved by Chrysostom, as shown by many passages.	Chrysostom does not enjoin confession to men
---	---	--

Scriptural confession of sins, public and private, 9-13

9	False confession being thus refuted, the confession enjoined by the word of God is considered. Mistranslation in the old version. Proof from Scripture that confession should be directed to God alone.	Confession before God
---	---	-----------------------

10	Effect of secret confession thus made to God. Another kind of confession made to men.	Confession of sins before men
----	---	-------------------------------

11	Two forms of the latter confession—viz. public and private. Public confession either ordinary or extraordinary. Use of each. Objection to confession and public prayer. Answer.	General confession of sin
----	---	---------------------------

12	Private confession of two kinds. 1. On our own account. 2. On account of our neighbor. Use of the former. Great assistance to be obtained from faithful ministers of the Church. Mode of procedure. Caution to be used.	Private confession in the cure of souls
----	---	---

13	The use of the latter recommended by Christ. What comprehended under it. Scripture sanctions no other method of confession.	Private confession for the removal of an offence
----	---	--

The power of the keys, and absolution, 14-15

14	The power of the keys exercised in these three kinds of confession. The utility of this power in regard to public confession and absolution. Caution to be observed.	Nature and value of the power of the keys
----	--	---

15	Popish errors respecting confession. 1. In enjoining on all the necessity of confessing every sin. 2. Fictitious keys. 3. Pretended mandate to loose and bind. 4. To whom the office of loosing and binding committed.	Summary of the Roman doctrine of confession
----	--	---

Criticism of Romanist errors and injurious practices related to confession and satisfaction, 16-25

16	Refutation of the first error, from the impossibility of so confessing, as proved by the testimony of David.	The enumeration of all sins is impossible
----	--	---

17	Refuted farther from the testimony of conscience. Impossible to observe this most rigid obligation. Necessarily leads to despair or indifference. Confirmation of the preceding remarks by an appeal to conscience.	The requirement of complete confession is a measureless torment
----	---	---

18	Another refutation of the first error from analogy. Sum of the whole refutation. Third refutation, laying down the surest rule of confession. Explanation of the rule. Three objections answered.	The pernicious effect of demanding complete confession
----	---	--

19	Fourth objection—viz. that auricular confession does no harm, and is even useful. Answer, unfolding the hypocrisy, falsehood, impiety, and monstrous abominations of the patrons of this error.	Against auricular confession
----	---	------------------------------

20	Refutation of the second error. 1. Priests not successors of the Apostles. 2. They have not the Holy Spirit, who alone is arbiter of the keys.	Baseless appeal to the power of the keys
----	--	--

21	Refutation of the third error. 1. They are ignorant of the command and promise of Christ. By abandoning the word of God they run into innumerable absurdities.	The uncertainty of priestly binding and loosing
----	--	---

22	Objection to the refutation of the third error. Answers, reducing the Papists to various absurdities.	The difference between perverted and right use of the power of the keys
----	---	---

23	Refutation of the fourth error. 1. Petitio principii. 2. Inversion of ecclesiastical discipline. Three objections answered.	Perverse claims exposed
----	---	-------------------------

24	Conclusion of the whole discussion against this fictitious confession.	Summary
----	--	---------

25	Of satisfaction, to which the Sophists assign the third place in repentance. Errors and falsehoods. These views opposed by the terms,—1. Forgiveness. 2. Free forgiveness. 3. God destroying iniquities. 4. By and on account of Christ. No need of our satisfaction.	General presentation and refutation of the Roman doctrine
----	---	---

The grace of Christ alone provides true satisfaction for sin and peace to the conscience, 26-27

26	Objection, confining the grace and efficacy of Christ within narrow limits. Answers by both John the Evangelist and John the Baptist. Consequence of these answers.	Christ has provided full satisfaction
----	---	---------------------------------------

27	Two points violated by the fiction of satisfaction. First, the honor of Christ impaired. Secondly, the conscience cannot find peace. Objection, confining the forgiveness of sins to Catechumens, refuted.	The Roman doctrine deprives Christ of honour, and the conscience of every assurance
----	--	---

Various distinctions and objections critically examined, 28-39

28	Objection, founded on the arbitrary distinction between venial and mortal sins. This distinction insulting to God and repugnant to Scripture. Answer, showing the true distinction in regard to venial sin.	Venial and mortal sins
----	---	------------------------

29	Objection, founded on a distinction between guilt and the punishment of it. Answer, illustrated by various passages of Scripture. Admirable saying of Augustine.	Forgiveness of sins involves remission of penalty
----	--	---

30	Answer, founded on a consideration of the efficacy of Christ's death, and the sacrifices under the law. Our true satisfaction.	Christ's unique sacrifice can alone remove both penalty and guild
31	An objection, perverting six passages of Scripture. Preliminary observations concerning a twofold judgment on the part of God. 1. For punishment. 2. For correction.	Misinterpretations exposed: God's judgments, penal and corrective
32	Two distinctions hence arising. Objection, that God is often angry with his elect. Answer, God in afflicting his people does not take his mercy from them. This confirmed by his promise, by Scripture, and the uniform experience of the Church. Distinction between the reprobate and the elect in regard to punishment.	God's judgment in vengeance has a wholly different purpose from that of his judgment in chastisement: the distinction
33	Second distinction. The punishment of the reprobate a commencement of the eternal punishment awaiting them; that of the elect designed to bring them to repentance. This confirmed by passages of Scripture and of the Fathers.	Judgment of vengeance serves to punish; judgment of chastisement to improve
34	Two uses of this doctrine to the believer. In affliction he can believe that God, though angry, is still favourable to him. In the punishment of the reprobate, he sees a prelude to their final doom.	The believer undergoing God's chastisement is not to lose heart
35	Objection, as to the punishment of David, answered. Why all men here subjected to chastisement.	The punishment of David
36	Objections, founded on five other passages, answered.	Good works as redemption of punishment
37	Answer continued.	The woman who was a sinner

38	Objection, founded on passages in the Fathers. Answer, with passages from Chrysostom and Augustine.	The Roman doctrine cannot claim the authority of the Church fathers
----	---	---

39	These satisfactions had reference to the peace of the Church, and not to the throne of God. The Schoolmen have perverted the meaning of some absurd statements by obscure monks	The Schoolmen corrupt the teaching of the fathers
----	---	---

FOR REFLECTION

1.