

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. XXI.

JULY, 1917.

No. 3.

WHY DO CATHOLICS ACCEPT THE DEITY OF CHRIST?

During the last two weeks of the Sunday campaign in Boston a small tract, or pamphlet, was distributed by mail, apparently by courtesy of the "Massachusetts State Council, K. of C.," since it was published by them, as stated on the title page. The tract is entitled "The Divinity of Christ," with the further information: "One of a Series of Lectures on the Fundamentals of Faith, Delivered in the Brooklyn Academy of Music before the Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Sciences, by Rev. Walter Drum, S. J., Professor of Scripture, Woodstock College. Imprimi Potest: A. J. Maas, S. J., Praep. Prov." On the second page we read: "Nihil Obstat: Patrick J. Waters, Ph. D., Censor Librorum." Below this: "Imprimatur: William, Cardinal O'Connell, Archbishop of Boston. November 2, 1916." The tract is officially censored and sanctioned, as you see. From a footnote on page three we gather that this lecture was delivered in December, 1915.

Naturally, the tract was read from cover to cover to ascertain if perchance there might be something new under the Jesuit luminary. But herein we were disappointed, which was to be expected. It is the same sleight-of-hand performance that these Jesuits, those brilliant logicians, have always practised to the confusion of their audiences. On receipt of the tract one was led to speculate, too, why these courteous Knights of Columbus distributed this tract at this particular time. Perhaps it was "Billy" Sunday's fervent and enthusi-

LUTHER'S CONDUCT TOWARD THE ROMAN CATHOLICS.

It was the 10th of December in the year of our Lord 1520. On the morning of that memorable day a large and curious crowd of people had gathered before the Elster-gate of the German university town of Wittenberg. The people had come to witness a most strange and startling spectacle. For the renowned Augustinian friar and professor of the town, Dr. Martin Luther, had boldly given out the news that at the time and place aforesaid he would publicly burn the bull of excommunication which the Pope of Rome had recently published against him. Promptly at nine o'clock, and surrounded by an enthusiastic following of students and fellow-professors, the intrepid monk appears. He is a man still in the prime of life, about thirty-seven years of age, but there is nothing heroic or impressive about his bodily appearance. He is below medium size, and his lean body still shows the severe effects of his former monastic life, where he nearly fasted and studied him-

2) Erasmus seems to allude to Julius II, then reigning, the military pope.

self to death. However, the bold cast of his rugged countenance, the ringing tones of his high-pitched voice, and the compelling look of his falcon-like eyes, all portray the heroic soul burning in this determined and courageous man.

Approaching the fagots already heaped and ignited by willing hands, Luther casts into them the papal bull and the canonical laws, exclaiming with flashing eyes: "Because thou hast offended the Holy One of the Lord" (namely, Christ, whose doctrine Luther had proclaimed, and which the Pope had condemned), "be thou consumed by everlasting fire!" It was a bold thing for Luther to do. By that act he publicly and forever withdrew from the Church of Rome—the Church of his fathers, the Church in which he had been born and raised. Since that eventful day the visible Church of Christ is torn into the great warring camps of Protestantism and Romanism. What shall we say to this act of Luther?

What Roman Catholic authorities think and say of Luther's conduct is known only too well. Owing to their persistent and malicious misrepresentations of his life and work, Luther has become the worst slandered man in history. In this year of jubilee Rome has flooded the market with cheap publications that revamp its old, time-worn charges against the great Reformer.

But how about Luther? Can he ever answer to God for his treatment of the Pope and the Roman Catholic Church? The answer concerns us very intimately, for we bear Luther's name and share his Gospel-doctrine. If Luther was wrong, then we are wrong and need to repent in sackcloth and ashes instead of arranging joyous commemorative festivities in this year of jubilee. If Luther was right, then we are right, provided we follow the example he left us in this matter.

Well, what are the facts, the true facts, that caused Luther to withdraw from the Church of Rome? We know facts are stubborn things, and the facts in Luther's case are so stubborn that even four hundred years of Roman falsification, vituperation, and bloody persecution have not been able to change

them, or wipe them from the annals of history. The facts, briefly, are these: Driven by his conscience, Luther had protested against certain glaring abuses practised by the indulgence-mongers of his day. But the Ninety-five Theses he published against these abuses still prove him to be an obedient and loyal son of Rome. There is not one hint of reform in them, nor one word on justification by faith, which afterwards became the watchword of the Reformation. No base, carnal motives prompt him, but as he declares: "Out of love for the truth, and the desire to bring it to light," he publishes his propositions on indulgences. Love and zeal for the truth characterize all his future conduct in the controversy. He is vilified and slandered by the indulgence-mongers, and appeals to the Pope, "I have heard evil reports about myself, most blessed Father, by which I know that certain friends have put my name in very bad odor with you and yours, saying that I have attempted to belittle the power of the keys and of the Supreme Pontiff: Therefore, I am accused of heresy, apostasy, and perfidy, and am called by six hundred names of ignominy." Then he tells the Pope how he had tried in vain to persuade some of the prelates of the Church to abolish these abuses by which the fair name of the Church and the power and honor of the Pope were defamed and sullied. But his appeal is in vain. Twice more does Luther in all humility and sincerity carry his case to the Pope; he even dedicates to him his immortal treatise "On Christian Liberty," and we challenge any Roman Catholic authority to find an unchristian word or thought in these three letters of Luther and his treatise. But the Pope has only one answer to his supplicant son, "*Recant,*" *i. e.*, deny the truth, "or be excommunicated and damned as a heretic!" Verily, the guilt for the present sad division in the Christian Church between Protestants and Catholics lies not at the door of Luther, but at the door of his Roman Catholic enemies, at the door of the Pope. That is the verdict of history.

But the question is not merely a question of history. It is more serious — it is a question of conscience with us. Hence

we ask: Can Luther claim God's sanction for his momentous step?

Let us ask what kind of Church was and is the Roman Catholic from which Luther withdrew, and millions of Christians with him since Reformation times? This Church claims to be the one true catholic Church, without whose pale there is no salvation. Is her claim founded on fact, incontrovertible Scriptural fact? Does this Church teach, believe, and confess all things which the ascending Savior commands His disciples faithfully to observe and teach to the world (Matt. 28, 20)? She does not. It is a fact, for instance, that the Roman Catholic Church openly practises the grossest kind of idolatry in her worship of Mary and the dead saints, whereas Christ commands: "Thou shalt worship the Lord, thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve" (Matt. 4). Again: "No one cometh unto the Father but by Me" (John 14, 6). It is a fact that the Roman Catholic Church corrupts and mutilates the blessed Sacrament of our Lord by robbing the laity of the cup, whereas Christ says: "Drink ye all of it." It is a fact that the Roman Catholic priest in his Mass daily offers up Christ anew for the sins of the living and the dead, whereas it is clearly written Heb. 9, 12: "Christ by His own blood entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us." And Heb. 10, 14: "For by one offering He hath perfected forever them that are sanctified." It is a fact that the Roman Catholic Church forbids its priests, monks, and nuns to marry, whereas the Word of God declares such a prohibition of marriage to be a doctrine of the devil (1 Tim. 4, 3). It is a fact that the Roman Catholic Church teaches that man must obtain forgiveness for his sins and eternal salvation by his own works, penances, confessions, and atonements, whereas the Word of God says: "But to him that worketh not, but believeth on Him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness" (Rom. 4, 5).

Lo, that was and is the character of the Church from which Luther seceded on that historic 10th of December, 1520,

when he publicly burned the papal bull. Did he have the right to do so? Not only the right, but it was his sacred, yea, an imperative duty; for here is the clear command of Christ Himself: "Beware of false prophets" (Matt. 7, 15), and of Christ's inspired Apostle: "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offenses *contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned, and avoid them*" (Rom. 16, 17); "A man that is an heretic, after the first and second admonition reject, knowing that he that is such is subverted and sinneth, being condemned of himself" (Titus 3, 10). No matter how much the Romanists revile Luther for leaving their Church, he treated them as God wants us to treat all obdurate false teachers and churches: "Come out from among them and be ye separate" (2 Cor. 6, 14—18). Even though that cause strife, we must obey God more than man.

But how? did not Luther go too far in his antagonism against the Pope? Is it not preposterous in him to inveigh against the Pope of Rome as the Antichrist in his writings? Was it not sheer fanaticism, unholy hatred in him to write such a book as his "The Papacy at Rome Founded by the Devil"? So many take offense at this "blind hatred," as they call it, in Luther against the Roman See. But what are the facts? Luther, before his conversion, was a zealous advocate of popery. He writes in his preface to his complete works, 1545: "Above all things I beseech the Christian reader and beg him for the sake of our Lord Jesus Christ to read my earliest books very circumspectly and with much pity, knowing that formerly I, too, was a monk, and one of the right frantic and raving papists. When I took up this matter against indulgences, I was so full and drunken, yea, so besotted in papal doctrine that, out of my great zeal, I would have been ready to do murder—at least, I would have been glad to see and help that murder should be done—on all who would not be obedient and subject to the Pope, even to his smallest word." But what happened? God, in His saving mercy, opened Luther's eyes, and he found Christ as his only Savior

in the blessed Gospel. From that day Luther ceased to be an abject slave of the Pope, and became a faithful servant and confessor of Christ. He now declared with David: "I believed, therefore have I spoken," and with the apostles Peter and John, when the high priests and elders at Jerusalem forbade them to witness of the crucified and risen Savior: "We cannot but speak the things we have seen and heard." Luther could not remain silent when members of his own flock were led astray by the shameful traffic in indulgences. He testified against it in his Ninety-five Theses, and with what result you know. He was attacked and defamed by Roman theologians, among them a certain Dr. Eck, with whom he held a public debate at Leipzig in July, 1519. In preparing for this debate, Luther was compelled to study the canon laws and decretals of the Popes, and among them found such laws and decisions as these: "The oath given by subjects to heretical [non-Catholic] princes is no oath, but perjury." (Gregory XIII.) "They are not to be adjudged murderers who, inflamed by love for our Mother-Church, kill the excommunicated." (Gregory XIII.) And among the canon laws stood and stands to this day the following: "When the Pope, unmindful of his and his brethren's eternal welfare, is found negligent, unprofitable, and slothful, and, moreover, secretly drags with him, as the first-born child of hell, countless numbers of souls away from what is good, which, indeed, will harm him most, but, nevertheless, also all the others, who will suffer great agony with him through all eternity,—yet in such an event no mortal may venture to reprove him for his sins, because he who is to judge all dare not be judged by any one else." (*Corpus Jur. Can. Rom.*, Part XI, dist. 1, chap. 6.) Studying these and similar blasphemous laws of the Popes in the light of the divine prophecies concerning Antichrist, especially the classical proof—passage of Paul in 2 Thess. 2, 3—12, where the characteristic mark of Antichrist is declared to be that he sits in the temple, *i. e.*, in the Church of God, and exalts himself above God, as the Pope evidently does in his laws and ordi-

nances,—I say it was then that Luther's eyes were opened to the mystery of iniquity, to antichristian popery. Hence, when Pope Leo X issued his bull of excommunication against him and the Gospel of Christ he was preaching, Luther in holy wrath burned the infamous bull, and on the following day, in his lectures, warned his hearers to beware of papal laws and statutes.

But right here, friends, let us learn the important fact that a fundamental difference exists between popery and the Roman Church as such. Popery in itself is not the Roman Church, but a foreign body, a deadly fungus growing on the Roman branch of the Church catholic, or universal. Long before popery arose, which was in the seventh century, there existed a Christian Church at Rome, to which Paul addressed the glorious epistle we still possess in our New Testament. Though in Luther's time the church at Rome and all other churches in Christianity had come under the baneful power and influence of antichristian popery, Luther had no quarrel with the honest Christian still to be found in these churches. When he withdrew from the pope-ridden Catholic Church on that eventful day in 1520, he did not withdraw from the Catholic or Christian Church as such. It is a baseless charge Roman Catholic writers, for instance, Cardinal Gibbons in his book *The Faith of Our Fathers*, make against Luther in declaring that he set up and founded a new church, which he calls the Lutheran sect. Luther victoriously answered this old, time-worn charge in his polemical treatise (1541) against Duke Henry of Brunswick, whom he calls the Buffoon (Hans Wurst), in which he clearly proves that the Church of the Pope has fallen away from the true Christian Church, whereas the Church of the Reformation is the old Catholic Church, built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus Himself being the chief corner-stone (Eph. 2). You know how vehemently Luther protested against calling the restored Gospel Church after his name. (Dau, *Four Hundred Years*, 304 ff.)

Supercilious critics take offense, when reading Luther's works, at the harsh and violent language he often uses against his papistical opponents. But what would these people have? The manners and the language of the sixteenth century were not as refined and polished as they are in this twentieth century. Shakespeare, who died on the first centenary of the Reformation (1616), uses language in his dramas you would not dare to use in the classroom or in polite society. Moreover, we must not forget Luther's peculiar mission, which was, as rightly declared by Elector John Frederick, the Mag-nanimous, the overthrow of popery. "Hence," says the Elector, "Luther uses such violent words not without good reason. His intention is not to convert popery, which is not possible, and therefore popery needs no fair words. Luther's avowed purpose is to show up popery so plainly that everybody may clearly recognize its abomination, and learn to beware of it." (Luther, *Volksbibliothek*, Band 25, Vorrede.) We may also add that for many of the harsh expressions Luther uses he is in good company, in the company of a Paul, who declares Gal. 1, 9: "If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed"; and who speaks of the enemies of the Cross as people whose "god is their belly" (Phil. 3, 19). Aye, Luther is in the company of our dear Lord and Savior Himself, who denounces the self-righteous, avaricious, and hypocritical Pharisees of His time in the most scathing terms (Matt. 23).

Luther never engaged in secret and underhand warfare against his opponents, as many of them did and do to this day by publishing anonymous and scurrilous attacks against him. He can declare boldly and truthfully: "Now I have openly published my name in all my books and acted in broad daylight, offered to stand trial, and still make that offer; and although I have attacked the government of the Pope, yet I have never assailed his person or that of any of his prelates or his subordinates, neither anybody's secret vices, but denounced the public, common vices, as a pastor must do and all the

prophets have done. If such books are slanderous libels, then no public vice dare any longer be rebuked, and the Gospel and entire Bible must be called a slanderous book; for in it are written so many and such harsh penalties against wickedness."

However, it must be said to Luther's lasting credit that he was not too proud humbly to admit that occasionally he had used intemperate language against his adversaries. In his defense before the Diet at Worms he confessed concerning the third class of his books, his polemical writings against individual enemies and private persons, that he had been more violent than good custom permitted, and at other occasions he declared that his old Adam put many a word on his tongue that his Lord Christ had to suppress.

In accordance with the clearly revealed doctrine of Holy Scripture, Luther believed and taught that the true Catholic Church is not the church of the Pope, but the invisible Church of Christ, which exists wherever true believing Christians are to be found; for it is faith in Christ, and this faith alone, that makes you a member of the one, true Christian Church, which alone is the communion of saints. And such true Christians are to be found even under Antichrist, in the Church of Rome. In his explanation of the 45th Psalm Luther writes: "Thus there have at all times been a few in popery who believed, and there are many such even to this day, whom we do not know, whom God preserves through the Word and Sacraments, in spite of the devil and the pope." And again, in his exposition of Galatians: "Wherever Word and Sacrament essentially remain, there also remains a holy Church, and it matters not if Antichrist also reigns there, who does not reside in a devil's stable, nor in a pig-sty, nor in the company of unbelievers, but in the noblest and holiest place, namely, in the temple of God (2 Thess. 2, 4). From which it is certain and clear that God's temple must be and remain also under the spiritual tyrants that rule and rage therein." From 1 Kings 19 we see how God had preserved a remnant of seven thousand elect among idolatrous Israel of whom even His prophet Elijah knew nothing.

And 2 Sam. 15, 11, we read of two hundred men who joined the rebellion of Absalom, but went in their simplicity and knew not anything. So there are untold numbers in the Church of Rome who sincerely believe in Christ, yet outwardly cling to their false teachers, because they have not discerned the depths of Satan (Rev. 2). There were many such in Reformation times; and how did Luther treat them? As Scriptures command, Rom. 15, 1: "We, then, that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak, and not to please ourselves." And 1 Thess. 5, 15: "Support the weak; be patient with all men." Luther writes in his "Admonition":

"In the second place: If you would contend for the Gospel in a Christian manner, you must pay due regard to the persons with whom you are speaking. These are of two kind. First: Some of them are hardened reprobates, who do not want to hear, and in addition seduce and poison others with their lying lips, like the Pope does and Eck, Emser, some of our bishops, priests, and monks. With these you are not to dispute, but act according to Christ's command, Matt. 7, 6: 'Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine, lest they trample them under their feet and turn again and rend you.' . . . But if you see that these liars instil their lies and poison into other people, then you are to valiantly oppose and do battle against them, just as Paul opposed Elymas, Acts 13, 10, with harsh and sharp words, and Christ denounced the Pharisees as a generation of vipers. That you are to do not on their account, for they will not hear, but for the sake of those whom they seek to poison. Likewise Paul commands Titus, chap. 1, 10, to sharply rebuke the vain talkers and deceivers.

"On the other hand, there are some who have not heard these things before, and would gladly learn them if instructed, or who are so weak that they cannot easily comprehend them. These are not to be browbeaten and stormed at, but instructed in a friendly and gentle manner, and shown the cause and reason, and borne in patience meanwhile if they cannot im-

mediately grasp it. Wherefore Paul says, Rom. 14, 1: 'The weak in faith receive.' Also St. Peter, 1 Ep. 3, 16: 'Be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you, with meekness and fear.' Here you see that in meekness and fear of God we are to give an account of our faith to every one who desires or needs it."

Though assailed and vilified on all sides by the papists, Luther would not repay them in kind, but, foregoing all thoughts of revenge, he wrote in his answer to the celebrated Romanist at Leipzig (Holman, 1, 393): "As for the slanders and evil names with which my person is assailed, although numerous enough, I will let my dear Romanists off without reply. They do not trouble me. It has never been my intention to avenge myself on those who rail at my person, my life, my works, my doings. That I am not worthy of praise, I myself know full well. But I will let no man reproach me that in defending the Scriptures I am more pointed and impetuous than some seem to like; neither will I be silenced. Whoever will, let him freely scold, slander, condemn my person and my life; it is already forgiven him. But let no one expect from me either grace or patience who would make my Lord Christ, whom I preach, and the Holy Ghost, to be liars. I am nothing at all. But for the Word of Christ I give answer with joyful heart and vigorous courage, and without respect of persons. To this end God has given me a glad and fearless spirit, which they shall not embitter, I trust, not in all eternity."

So Luther returned not evil for evil, but did good to them that hated him, and prayed for them that despitefully used him and persecuted him. When Tetzl lay mortally ill at Leipzig in 1519, Luther wrote him, comforting him and bidding him "not to be troubled, for the matter did not begin on his account, but the child had a different father." He writes his earnest "Admonition" to his followers at Wittenberg "to beware of tumult and rebellion" (January, 1522); and when Carlstadt with his fanatical spirits started disorder, demolishing images, abolishing the mass, etc., Luther, at the risk of his

life, left his safe retreat at the Wartburg and hurried to Wittenberg to quell the disorder. He refused the armed protection of the German knight Ulrich von Hutten and wrote to Spalatin: "I would not like to see men fight for the Gospel with force and bloodshed. I have answered the man accordingly. By the Word the world has been overcome, the Church has been preserved; by the Word it will also be restored." He inveighs against the murderous and thieving peasants, and writes emphatically that sedition is a deluge of all kinds of vice. In his defense over against his implacable foe Duke George of Saxony he declares: "Now a child of seven years knows and understands it to be true Christian doctrine when you teach the people to suffer, give way, risk life and goods, forsake them, and not rebel against their government and tyrants, for the sake of God, as my letter shows; in behalf of which I appeal to all Christians, yea, to all common sense in all the world. Verily, I would appeal to Bileam's ass and all asses and cows, if they could talk." Most urgently he advises his Elector John not to engage in war against the emperor, saying: "We would rather suffer a tenfold death than have that guilt burden our conscience that our Gospel was the cause of any bloodshed or injury whatever that arose for our sake; for we are to be those who suffer, as the prophet writes, and accounted as sheep led forth to slaughter, and not avenge or defend ourselves."

No, Luther was not the instigator of rebellion and sedition, as his Roman enemies like to paint him. Though the Pope and his henchmen persecuted the Evangelical Christians with fire and sword, Luther enumerates it as one of the proofs that the old Christian Church and truth is on his side when he writes in his polemic against "Hans Wurst": "In the tenth place, no one can deny that we do not in return likewise shed blood, kill, or hang [our enemies], as we often might have done or still could do, but as Christ, the apostles, and the ancient Church did, so do we—we suffer, admonish, and intercede for them, even publicly in the church, in the litanies and sermons, in every way as Christ, our Lord, has done and taught,

the ancient Church likewise, so that also in this matter we faithfully observe all the old ways of the ancient Church." (*Volksbibl.*, Vol. 30, p. 231.)

True, in his epoch-making "Letter to the Christian Nobility of Germany" (1520), Luther, as a patriotic German, inveighs against the fearful encroachments of the Pope on the political rights and liberties of Germany, advising reasonable and practical remedies; but the whole gist of the letter is an appeal to the God-ordained civil powers to so change political conditions that the souls who were going to destruction through the wicked rule of Rome might be saved. At all times and on all occasions the dear man of God has only the welfare of souls in mind; these he would save, save alone by means of the Gospel. The weapons of his warfare were not carnal, as with his Roman opponents, but only spiritual, the Gospel of Christ, and hence they proved so mighty to the pulling down of the papal strongholds.

To the question, then, How did Luther treat the Roman Catholics? we must answer: According to the clear and saving rule of God's holy Word. Against the heresies and false doctrines of the Roman Catholics, especially their Popes, he testified in holy fervor with the truth of Holy Scriptures. But as regards the persons of his enemies, he did not revenge himself on them, but prayed for them, did good unto them, and showed to the weak and erring among them Christian forbearance and sympathy.

Though popery received its death-wound in the Reformation at the hands of Luther, it will not be destroyed until, as Paul says (2 Thess. 2), the Lord Himself will do so with the brightness of His coming. Till then the Great Mystery of Wickedness will remain, and it is the sacred duty of all Christians at all times to contend for the faith once delivered to the saints also over against Rome. But how? Let us learn it from Luther. All secret organizations, all sensational and unfounded attacks on Rome in the A. P. A. press avail nothing. Such tactics only serve to pour oil on the smoldering flames of re-

ligious prejudice and hatred obtaining in wide circles between Catholics and Protestants in this country. All other countries have had their religious wars. God, in His mercy, has so far spared our country from such a fearful calamity; yet if unmistakable signs portend anything, it is this, that our country is drifting slowly, yet inevitably, to the awful brink of religious war. Doubly great, then, is our duty as loyal citizens of our country and as faithful subjects of Christ's saving kingdom to step into the breach, and to do all in our power to prevent so terrible a disaster as a religious war would be both for Church and State. On the one hand, it will be our sacred duty to oppose all Protestant fanatics of our days, who, like Carlstadt and his followers of old, would prevent our Catholic fellow-citizens from worshiping God after their own manner. That is their constitutional right, and we would be poor Americans and worse Lutherans indeed if we in any way would help to deprive them of that right. Let no Lutheran therefore join any political secret organization against the Catholic Church. There is no need of such organizations; they can only do harm. Whenever and wherever it becomes apparent that certain forces of Rome seek to encroach on the liberties of our Republic, and, for instance, demand a division of public money for the support of their church-schools, then we as citizens have the ballot to successfully oppose any and all such machinations. But our chief duty is, and will remain, to spread diligently and systematically the saving Gospel-truth as we possess it in our Lutheran Church, so that he who runs may read, be he Catholic, Jew, or Calvinist, what is the faith we hold. It was Luther's pious boast that through the Gospel-doctrine he succeeded where all church-councils, kings, and other great men before him had failed. Let us follow the example he left us. Let us spread God's pure Word in season and out of season among our countrymen. Much has been done here of late; much still remains to be done. Our National Lutheran Publicity Bureau is at present waging a very successful warfare against the prevailing ignorance in this country

on things Lutheran. Whoever loves his country, whoever loves his Church, let him support these brethren in their noble work, and join their ranks. Zealously spreading the Word, adorning our faith with a Christian life, loving our fellow-men, praying God to mercifully open the eyes of the enemies of His Gospel and bring them out of their darkness into the marvelous light of His saving grace, we shall be true followers of Luther, and may confidently sing with him:

The Word they still shall let remain,
And not a thank have for it.
He's by our side upon the plain
With His good gifts and Spirit.
And take they our life,
Goods, fame, child, and wife,
Let all these be gone,
They yet have nothing won;
The kingdom ours remaineth.

St. Louis, Mo.

F. W. HERZBERGER.