

“SAY NOW SHIBBOLETH!”

By: Paul Kretzmann

The story from which our caption is quoted is well known. It is taken from the Book of Judges, chap. 12:6, where the Gileadites, who had fought against the Ammonites under the leadership of Jephthah, made the pronunciation of the word “shibboleth” a test for distinguishing the Ephraimites from the members of their own group. The word has therefore gained the connotation of a distinguishing mark, a decisive test by which people or things are placed in well-marked categories, especially as to their unqualified acceptance of and adherence to certain essential principles.

The orthodox Lutheran Church is known the world over as the church body which makes a threefold motto its first and foremost shibboleth, namely: *Sola Scriptura* the inspired Word of God as the only norm of doctrine and the sole rule of life; *Sola Gratia* by grace alone, this being the one and only basis of salvation; *Sola Fide*: by faith alone, and not by any works or attitude on the part of man, faith being the activity wrought by God in the heart of man, whereby the latter is enabled to receive the justification earned by the propitiatory sacrifice of Jesus Christ. So strong is our insistence upon this threefold shibboleth that we have not hesitated to call the doctrine of justification the *articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae*, the doctrine with which the Church stands and falls, that is, upon the acceptance or rejection of which the very essence of the Church, its true existence, depends.

But the orthodox Lutheran Church has, for more than four hundred years, called out “Say now shibboleth!” also with regard to another truth which is clearly and unmistakably based on Scripture and has, from the beginning, held the position of a doctrine on the part of all those who truly discerned the signs of the times and made the identification so definitely required by the Word of God. This is the truth that the pope, in his capacity as the head of the papacy, is the very Antichrist: *Papam ipsum verum Antichristum esse*.

It is true that even before the Reformation, especially among the so-called forerunners of this movement, a large number of men held the view that the pope is the Antichrist. Among these we find the Waldensians, the Wyclifites, and the Hussites. Of individuals we name in particular Savonarola of Florence, Geiler von Kaisersberg, and especially John Wyclif in and for his own person, who is said to have called out even shortly before his death: “Up! let us fight against the Antichrist!” In a treatise entitled *The Lantern of Light*, written in England about 1400, three chapters deal with the Antichrist, who is even then emphatically identified with the Court of Rome, this being the head, the prelates the body, and “those clouded sects, as monks, canons, and friars, the venomous tail of Antichrist.” It certainly must have taken a good deal of courage to make such bold statements in England about that time. (Cp. *Conc. Theol. Monthly*, XIII: 699-704.)

But it is Luther to whom the Church of the pure confession and teaching owes the full exposure and unmasking of the pope as the Antichrist. The process by which Luther, at first timidly and hesitantly, but later with all boldness, came to the knowledge of the truth, is well summarized in one section of a series of articles which appeared in the *Concordia Theological Monthly* (see XIII: 410ff). The first climax of Luther’s theological development in this field came in April 1521, in his reply to Ambrosius Catharinus (St. Louis Ed., 18: 1434 ff.) And his last terrific broadside was fired in the year before his death, in his classical treatise “*Wider das Papsttum zu Rom, vom Teufel gestiftet*.” (Vol. 17:1019-1132.) Luther’s final judgment is summed up in the paragraph: “Thank God, no good Christian can now believe differently than that the Pope is not and cannot be the head of the Christian Church nor the representative of God or Christ, but that he is the head of the accursed church of the worst knaves on earth, the representative of the devil, an enemy of God, an adversary of Christ and disturber of the Church of Christ, a teacher of all lies, blasphemy, and idolatry; an arch thief and robber of churches, of the power of the keys, of all possessions both of the Church and of earthly lords; a murderer of kings, an instigator of all manner of bloodshed, a pander above all dealers in prostitution and immorality, also of that which dare not be mentioned; an Antichrist, a man of sin and son of perdition, a real *Baerwolf*. Whosoever is unwilling to believe it, let him perish with his god, the Pope. As a called teacher and preacher in the Church of Christ, obligated to speak the truth, I have herewith done my part. He that wants to stink let him

stink, he that wants to be lost let him be lost; his blood be upon his own head” (17:1114). There can be no doubt of the fact that Luther is called to all believers: Say now shibboleth!

The conviction which was forced upon Luther as he noted the abominations of the papacy was shared by the other reformers, who did not hesitate to embody their conclusions in the Lutheran Confessions. Luther’s challenging cry in the body of the *Smalcald Articles* (Part II, Art. IV, Conc. Trigi., 475: “This teaching shows forcefully that the Pope is the very Antichrist,” is echoed by Melancthon in his “*Treatise of the Power and Primacy of the Pope*”, especially when he states: “And the marks (all the vices) of Antichrist plainly agree with the kingdom of the Pope and his adherents.” (P.515). And again: “The errors of the kingdom of the Pope are manifest. And Scripture with its entire voice exclaims that these errors are a teaching of demons and of Antichrist.” (P.517.) And these judgments are not incidental and irrelevant remarks in the Confessions; they are deliberately repeated in the *Formula of Concord*, pp. 1059 and 1061. There are at least seven other passages in the Lutheran Confessions in which the statement is made that the Pope, as head of the papacy, is the Antichrist, to be identified with the “man of sin” in 2 Thess. 2. Thus the Lutheran Confessions, in the matter of identifying the Pope with the Antichrist spoken of in the Holy Scriptures, call out to every one who professes to accept them: Say now shibboleth!

What about the teachers of the Lutheran Church in the sixteenth century and since that time? It seems clear that all Lutheran theologians of the 16th and 17th centuries without exception follow in Luther’s footsteps, accepting also the verdict of the Lutheran Confessions as a conclusion based on a Scriptural identification.

The names of Bugenhagen, Flacius, Hunnius, Lucas and Andreas Osiander, Balduin, Erasmus Schmidt, Ouisterp, Wolf, Spener, Joachim Lange, and others certainly bear enough weight in any company of Lutheran leaders. Bengel definitely states that Paul does not portray merely some one individual person, but a series or succession of men occupying the same position and bearing the same name, and that the Pope of Rome is the Antichrist, a thesis which remains irrefragable, evident and certain. Quenstedt offers the conclusion: “These marks of Antichrist are to be taken here not apart or separately, but unitedly and together, and thus taken they exactly coincide with the Pope of Rome is the great Antichrist, predicted by the Holy Ghost.” (IV: 526, quoted in Schmid, *Doctrinal Theology of the Ev. Luth. Church*: 649.) One of the strongest series of arguments showing conclusively that no other phenomenon in history will fit the description of the man of sin or the great Antichrist is offered by Spener in his monograph *Gerechter Eifer wider das antichristische Pabsttum*. (Quoted in *Baieri Compendium*, ed. Walther, 111: 681. Cp. the entire section, pp. 672-683.) Heinrich Brandt sums up the section of his dogmatics on the great *Widerchrist* or Antichrist in the words: “These are the signs of the Antichrist, which here had to be adduced and from which it can be concluded that the Roman pope is properly the true antichrist, just as we may, from this entire section, draw this conclusion: He who in the Christian Church in those latter days ... when the Roman Empire has gone into decline, exalts himself above God and all that is called God ... he is properly the true Antichrist. For the pope of Rome if he in whom all these traits are found expressly and clearly as the sun; hence the pope of Rome is definitely the true, the great Antichrist.”

This clear teaching concerning the Antichrist has been unequivocally adhered to by orthodox Lutheran teachers to this day. In fact, it was practically unheard of until comparatively recent times that any teacher of the Church should not be able to meet the challenge: Say now shibboleth! with an unmistakable declaration in full agreement with the Smalcald Articles and the other Lutheran Confessions. Hoenecke (*Ev.-Luth. Dogmatik*, IV: 219 ff.) has the following sharp remark: “The great Antichrist, foretold in the Scripture, the greatest enemy of the Church is not to be expected in the future, but is present in the papacy ... We do not deny salvation to one who does not believe this article, but we do deny him Lutheran church fellowship,” which we take to mean that the author would not recognize such a person as a genuine Lutheran. Francis Pieper (*Christl. Dogmatik*, III) writes in the same strain: “Every teacher in the Christian Church is weak in theology who, although familiar with the historical revelation of the Pope, does not recognize in the papacy the Antichrist as foretold in 2 Thess. 2.” The same great teacher of the Church writes (11: 668-670) “Why is it that men in our days do not want to recognize the Pope as the Antichrist? Whence this strange and sad fact that almost all the newer ‘believing’ theologians look around for the Antichrist, while he, in a great and powerful way, carries on his work in the

Church? They do not stand firm in the living knowledge of the doctrine of justification and the importance of this doctrine for the Church. I must confess from my own experience that only then did I receive the living persuasion in my conscience that the Pope is the Antichrist, when I understood, on the one hand what the doctrine of justification is, and on the other that the papacy has its real essence in the denial and condemnation of the doctrine of justification and by the pretext of piety and by the claim of being the only saving church binds the consciences to itself.” And again (1: 430): “Experience proves that the demand of a mere conditional liability *Verpflichtung* to the symbols is in most cases connected with a negative attitude against certain confessional doctrines. This is true also with regard to such Lutherans of our days who speak for a conditional liability regarding the Confessions because they hold a doctrinal position differing from the Confession, e.g., in the doctrine of the Church, of the ministerial office, of chiliasm, also in the doctrine of the Antichrist.”

In taking this position Pieper agrees fully with his great predecessor Walther. In the Milwaukee Colloquy of 1867, for example, Walther, after quoting Luther’s judgement “concerning the Pope, the accursed Antichrist,” continues: “This is Luther’s judgment concerning the Pope, which we Missourians with all our hearts subscribe, because in reviewing history we see that every word of Scripture finds its complete fulfillment in the papacy...Oh how is it possible that anyone can still doubt the fact: That is the Antichrist and God has revealed him!” (*Report*, p.59.) In the same book we find the following declaration by Walther: “I cannot explain how any one can say that he would accept the Symbolical Books and yet cannot find the Pope as the true Antichrist in them, as prophesied by the Apostle, 2 Tim. 2. We know that the Reformation stands thereon.” (P.160) That Walther adhered to this teaching to the end is evident from his ninth evening lecture on the Proper Distinction between Law and Gospel, delivered November 21, 1884. After speaking at length on the proofs for the fact that the Pope is truly the Antichrist, Walther emphasizes chiefly one point, which he designates of supreme importance: “Passing by those societies which deny the Triune God and which are outside of the pale of the Christian Church, I find that the Pope is the only one in the entire Christian Church who is an outspoken enemy of the free grace of God in Christ, an enemy of the Gospel under the guise of the Christian religion and aping its institutions.” (P. 69.) Walther most definitely subscribed to the dictum of Luther that the Pope is the very Antichrist.

And with this judgment the orthodox teachers of the Lutheran Church emphatically agreed, so that until fairly recently, few exceptions were noted, especially here in America, where Lutheran consciousness received a powerful stimulus, not only after the coming of the Saxons, but also during the negotiations preceding the formation of the Synodical Conference and by means of the synodical essays presented at district and national conventions. That the Pope is the true Antichrist was taught by all the members of the faculties at St. Louis, at Springfield, at Wauwatosa (now Thiensville), and in other theological schools. Thus Little, in his book *Disputed Doctrines* (p.35) states, in summing up his arguments on the question: “Now, as there is historical proof that the papal power rose upon the ruins of the Roman Empire; and that it is the only system that has prevailed through the centuries and gives promise to continue until Christ’s Second Coming, the plain sense of 2 Thess. 2, 3-10 is that the papacy is the Antichrist.” Lenski, prominent exegete in the theological department of Capital University, writes in his customary emphatic way: “Those are certainly right who find John’s coming Antichrist in Paul’s prophecy ... The great Antichrist is the Papacy.” And the most recent detailed presentation of the doctrine of the Antichrist, in an exposition of 2 Thessalonians 2, by Dr. L. Fuerbringer (*Conc.Theol. Monthly*, XIII: 265 ff.; 409 ff.) agrees exactly with the declaration of the *Brief Statement* of the Missouri Synod (C.T.M_IV,P.415,#43).

Nor do we need to confine ourselves to Lutherans as we look for declarations of individual teachers and church bodies concerning the obvious truth, based on Scripture in full agreement with only one phenomenon in history which has all the *notae Antichristi*. Even before the Reformation, as noted above, teachers in various parts of the Church had drawn the conclusion that the designation Antichrist in its full connotation could apply only to the papacy, with the Pope as its head. The Westminster Confession of 1647 of the Presbyterian Church (Philip Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom*, III) agrees exactly with the Confession of Faith included in the *Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America*. Paragraph VI in Chapter XXV, *Of the*

Church, states: “There is no other head of the Church but the Lord Jesus Christ. Nor can the Pope of Rome in any sense be head thereof, but is that Antichrist, that man of sin and son of perdition, that exalteth himself in the Church, against Christ and all that is called God.” (Edition of 1840, p.137f. And in a recent book by Woods, *Our Priceless Heritage*, the most damning evidence is adduced to show that even as early as the 10th century, the Pope was regarded as the Antichrist. Among others he quotes “*The Revelations of St. Bridget*,” who died in 1373, having openly declared: “The Pope and his clergy are forerunners of Antichrist, rather than servants of Christ.” (Pp.36.84)

But why this long array of witnesses from the Lutheran Church as well as from other church bodies and individuals? Is it really necessary, in upholding the Lutheran Confessions concerning the identity of the Antichrist, to issue the challenge: Say now shibboleth!? We are practically compelled to lay such unusual stress on this doctrine, although we know that it is not a fundamental teaching, because it has become a touchstone of sound understanding, particularly also with regard to the doctrine of Justification, as Dr. Pieper rightly states in his evaluation of the old Lutheran teaching. This appreciation of the situation is strengthened when we review the list of the opponents of this doctrine, for here we are dealing largely with rationalists, men who insist that they are holding the historical view. Hugo Grotius, Spitta, and J. Weiss thought of Caligula as the Antichrist, Wetstein of Titus, F.C. Baur, Doellinger, Weizsaecher, Holtzmann and Schmiedel of Nero; Hilgenfeld and Pfleiderer suggest an ancient heretic, Hammond had Simon the sorcerer in mind; Clericus referred to Simon the son of Gioras; Whitby regarded the entire Jewish people as the Antichrist; Schoettgen thought of the Pharisees and the rabbis; Harduin suggested the high priest Ananias. Closely connected with this so-called historical view is the chiliastic interpretation, as held by Oldshausen, v. Hofmann, Luthardt, Baumgarten, v. Gerlach, Thiersch, v. Oettigen, Auberlen Riggerbach and others. The climax and culmination of the arguments used by teachers of this type may well be given in the words of Kliefoth: “Only this is our claim, regardless of how many antichristian features the Papacy reveals, in the light of prophecy, finally another will come who will surpass these antichristian features.” (See the article by Dr. Fuerbringer referred to above, *Conc. Theol. Monthlx*, XIII: 265 ff., esp. 405-409.)

Unfortunately the chiliastic interpretation found acceptance also in America, particularly in the former Iowa Synod. In the Milwaukee Colloquy of 1867 the questions which were chiefly discussed were those of the Church and the Ministry, of the Millenium, of Open Questions, of the General Conversion of the Jews. While Walther and the Missourian speakers readily conceded that these teachings were nonfundamental doctrines, they at the same time very emphatically declared that excrescences connected with the presentation of these doctrines which were contrary to the analogy of faith could not be tolerated. The following passages are quoted from statements by Walther on these questions: “You have declared a number of doctrines to be problematic, although they are not, for example, the doctrines of the Church and the Ministry, of the Antichrist, of the Millenium. But these are certainly not doctrines which are not clearly revealed in the Word of God. If the Iowa Synod says: There is no exposition in the Symbolical Books which is not in agreement with the analogy of faith, then we are fully satisfied. We believe that nothing can be an open question which God has already decided in His Word ... If an error does not, directly or indirectly subvert the foundation of faith, it does not stamp a person as a heretic; but it may result in a schism, so that the Church will thereby be compelled to separate those who adhere to the error, even though the Church does not thereby declare that they are all condemned ... Everything that is laid down in the Symbols as a doctrine of the divine Word, that belongs to the *norma docendi* (the rule of teaching).” In spite of all the efforts of Walther to convince the Iowa colloquents, their chief spokesman in particular, Prof. Geo. Fritschel, with great tenacity adhered to the claim that one could well look for a personal Antichrist in the future and that the identification of the Pope with the Antichrist is not adequate. An agreement on this question was not reached, and the Missouri debaters finally declared: “So long as the Iowa Synod does not definitely and unequivocally retract what she, in the report of 1858 openly and solemnly confessed: ‘that the Papacy is antichristian or that one may call many Popes antichrist, in the particular sense in which, in 1 John 2:18, the reference is made to many antichrists. But the man of sin of 2 Thess. 2 is a definite human personality, therefore also to be expected only in the future ... This defection in

antichristianism, we must expect only in the future, because we understand, by the man of sin, not the Papacy, but a definite, individual human person,"...so long we cannot concede that the Iowa Synod is true to the Confessions on this point." (P.174f.) So an agreement could not be reached in 1867, because there was an evident wide divergence in doctrine between the two synods, not only in the doctrine of the Antichrist, but also in other doctrines which the Iowa Synod connected with eschatology.

Unfortunately, and in spite of the clear exposition of the *Brief Statement*, the leading theologian of the former Iowa Synod, and still a member of the theological faculty of the Seminary at Dubuque, holds the former Iowa position in its entirety, as his expositions on eschatology in his *Lutheran Dogmatics* clearly show. While Doctor Reu admits the antichristian character of the Papacy, he refuses to designate the Pope, as the head of the Papacy, as the Antichrist, and tries to defend in every respect the position of 1867. The climax of his intricate and inadequate discussion is reached in the statement: "It is not at all unlikely that the final Antichrist will disguise himself under the outward forms of Christianity in order to introduce a kind of worship which is the very opposite of the true worship of God. Recall, e.g. the liberalism contaminating large parts of the Church today, and its fundamental antichristian tendencies and aims." (*Lutheran Dogmatics*, 11: 238.) Unfortunately, the high esteem in which the author is held, far beyond the boundaries of his own church body, now the American Lutheran Church, has caused some to follow him in his defection from the Lutheran Confessions. It is all the more necessary, therefore, as we consider the testimonies of the first part of this paper, for us to send out the challenging cry: Say now shibboleth!

It is not our intention, at this time, to write a long treatise in defense of the Lutheran teaching on the Antichrist. The article repeatedly alluded to above (*Conc. Theol. Monthly*, XIII: 265 ff.) offers all the pertinent material in such a convincing manner that further efforts would be carrying coals to Newcastle. There is also a mimeographed brochure on the doctrine of the Antichrist available which offers a number of articles and studies that appeared in the publications of the Missouri Synod. One of the most comprehensive and convincing monographs on the question is that by Pastor Zapf of Chicago, which is, however, available only in German. However, for the sake of those who desire a brief enumeration of the *notae AntiChristi*, the following summary may suffice:

We are bound to conclude that the Pope, as the head of the Roman hierarchy, is the Antichrist, because the Papacy is the only phenomenon in the history of the Christian Church that has all the characteristics of the Antichrist as delineated in Scriptures:

- a. The Antichrist is not any particular individual, but a representative person, or a power represented by a person and in a person (this supported by the entire ductus of 2 Thess. 2:2 ff., especially by the fact that the man of sin is pictured as one who carried out his nefarious activities over a long period of time);
- b. He was in process of coming, or development, as early as the middle of the first century, when the mystery of lawlessness was already at work (its chief characteristics being a tendency to set aside the deity of Christ, the perfection of His atonement, and the obvious trend toward a hierarchical system);
- c. He is not an outside person or power, but arose in the temple of God, in the midst of the Christian Church, is included, in fact, in the body which is designated as the Christian Church;
- d. The revelation of his lawlessness was for a time hindered by a power headed by a restraining person (which is quite generally understood, by orthodox commentators, to mean the Roman Empire with its organization and administration of justice, CTM, XIII: 413 f.);

- e. After the removal of this hindering influence the Antichrist came out openly with his claims, thereby revealing his true nature as the one who would usurp the place of Christ, thereby setting himself in direct opposition to Christ;
- f. He was exposed before the world, both before and during the period of the Reformation, and he has continued his progress toward further heights of blasphemy against Christ, not only by the denial of the justification by faith alone, but also by his continued progress toward an absolute mariolatry (see CTK, XIII: 120 ff. and XIV: 157-159);
- g. He claims divine prerogatives for himself, vaunting himself and raising himself above the constituted authorities not indeed by arrogating to himself all the attributes of the true God (for that is not presupposed in the First Commandment either), but definitely assuming the prerogatives of divinity.

Note...Since this point has recently been questioned, we add some corroborative evidence. The first paragraph is taken from Woods, *Our Priceless Heritage*, 35 f. "Has not the Church of Rome been guilty of this great sin in paying to the Pope the reverence due to God along? It has been guilty of this great sin. In a gloss of the Roman Canon Law the words 'our Lord God the Pope' appear. It declares that "to believe that our Lord God the Pope has not power to decree as he has decreed is heretical." *Extravagantes* of Pope John XXII, *Cum Inter*, Tit. XIV, cap. IV, *Ad Callem Sexti Decretalium*, Paris, 1685...Writers on the Canon Law have said: 'The Pope and God are the same; so he has all power in heaven and earth.' (Barclay, Cap. XXVII, p.218.) Pope Nicholas I (died 867) declared, "the appellation of God was confirmed by Constantine on the Pope, who being God, cannot be judged by man." (*Lab. Dist.* 96, Can. 7.) The Doge of Venice declared that he would honor Clement VII 'as a deity on earth'. (Pastor, *History of the Popes*, Vol. IX, p.246.) The Pope on August 22, 1929, referring to the political troubles in Malta, which had been caused by the unjustifiable demands of the Roman Church authorities there, declared to Maltese citizens that 'to be with the Bishops and the Pope meant to be with Jesus Christ, of whom they must think when they looked at a Bishop, and that whosoever is not under the protection of the Pope shall be overcome!' Pope Leo XIII blasphemously said: "I occupy the place of Almighty God on earth!" (See also Dwight, *Theology Explained and Defended*, IV, 10.) Calov also has a paragraph which is short and to the point (*Biblia illustrata*, N.T., Tom. 11:908): *Quod in temple Dei vel Eccledi homo ille peccati facturus erat secundum Apostolum. Qui in jure Canonico Dominus Deus noster vocatur, canon, Satis, dist. 96 gloss. ad extr. cum inter. In concilio Lateranensi sess. IX in Papa implendum dicitur illud: Adorebunt eum omnes reges terrae, gentes servient ei. Seas I dictum est Pontifici: Tibi data est omnis potestas in caelo et in terra. Quod etiam exstat in Ceremonii libr I, tit. VII, sect. 7. In eodem concilio sees. VI Leo X dictus est Leo de trobo Juda, et radix David. Bellarminus praefatic in III. Controv. Gener. Pontifici applicat illud Esa. XXVIII, Ecce ego ponam. in fundamentis Sion lapidem. angularem. etc. Franciscus Panigorola dixit I, II. Part I. Papam esse unum illum Dominum, de quo Paulus loquitur Eph. 4. In Canonistarum libris passim legitur, quod Papa habeat coeleste arbitrium, quod habeat idem Deo consistorium, idem cum Christo tribunal, quod potestas ejus se extendat ad coelestia, terrestria, et infernaliam, quod Papae commissae Sit tota spiritualis machina, quod Papa sit omnia ... The passages referred to by Calov as occurring in the decrees of the councils, appear in *Mansi Amplissima Collectio* (32: col. 803. 892. 924); Fifth Lateran Council, 1512-1517: *Sed ne flevetis, filia Sion qui, a eace venit Leo de tribu Juda Radix David: Ecce suscitavit tibi Deus salvatorem, qui salvabit te manibus vastantium, et populum Dei de manu persequentium liberabit. Te, Leo, beatissime, salvatorem venturum speravimus ... In te uno, vero atque legitimo Christi et Dei vicario, propheticum illud debuerit rursus impleri: Adorebunt eum. omnes reges terrae, omnes gentes servient ei ... Quapropter Bernardus ad Eugenium tamquam ad summum hierarchicum in caelo ecclesiae virum, in quo erat onnis potestas supra omnes potestates tam caeli quam terrae, recte scripserat: Tibi data est omnis potestas; in qut totum dicit, nihil excludit.* (This section is taken from an*

oration of Archbishop Stephen of Torcelli in honor of Leo X.) Practically every volume of Mans offers additional evidence of the fact that divine honors were offered to the Pope and received by him. The closest parallel to this situation is found in Acts 12:21-23.

- h. His doctrine is, in the last analysis, a denial of the Father and of the Son as revealed in both their persons and their work in the Holy Scriptures (a fact which even a layman was able to see quite clearly, namely Mauro, in his monograph *Of the Things Which Soon Must Come to Pass*, 107 f.);
- i. He presumes to direct every object and every form of worship (witness the elaborate and allegedly authoritative tomes on the Roman order of worship, by which the papacy has driven out all other forms which were formerly in use, such as the Ambrosian, the Mozarabic, the Gallican, etc.);
- j. He operates with lying wonders, that is, such as are based on his lying teaching and connected with his false claims, although the occurrences may be in-themselves contrary to the course of nature, all in the interest of spreading his lies;
- k. He is constantly deceiving people who give credence to his false claims, the so-called converts to Romanism numbering many hundreds of thousands every year;
- l. He will not be destroyed until the Lord's great *parousia* though the Reformation dealt him a deadly blow.

In view of all these clear testimonies, based upon Scriptural and historical grounds, all the teachers of the Church who, with full persuasion of mind and heart, cling to the statement of our Lutheran Confessions: "The errors of the kingdom of the Pope are manifest. And Scripture with its entire voice exclaims that these errors are a teaching of demons and of Antichrist," (*Trigl.*, 517, #42) have every reason to issue the challenging cry to all who dissent from this teaching: "SAY NOW SHIBBOLETH!"