

The Northwestern Lutheran

The Lord our God be with us, as He was with our fathers; let Him not leave us, nor forsake us. 1 K 57.

Vol. 3.

Milwaukee, Wis., May 7, 1916.

Jan 17
Rev C Buenger
65 N Ridge
Tosha
No. 9.

JESUS LIVES

Jesus Christ, my sure defence,
And my Savior, ever liveth;
Knowing this my confidence
Rests upon the hope it giveth,
Tho' the night of death be fraught,
Still with many an anxious thought.

Jesus, my Redeemer lives!
I, too, unto life must waken:
He will have me where He is:
Shall my courage then be shaken?
Shall I fear? Or could the Head
Rise and leave its members dead?

Nay, too closely am I bound
Unto Him by hope for ever;
Faith's strong hand the Rock hath found,
Grasped it, and will leave it never:
Not the ban of death can part
From its Lord the trusting heart.

What now sickens, mourns, and sighs,
Christ with Him in glory bringeth:
Earthly is the seed and dies,
Heavenly from the grave it springeth.
Natural is the death we die,
Spiritual our life on high.

Savior, draw away our heart
Now from pleasures base and hollow,
Let us there with Thee have part,
Here on earth Thy foot-steps follow,
Fix our hearts beyond the skies,
Whither we ourselves would rise.

Tr. by Catherine Winkworth.

COMMENTS

"The Vampire of Movieland" She is known as the "Vampire of Movieland"; some call her a "Love Pirate". This she tells us in a series of articles in which she takes the public into her confidence. Though we do not take them too seriously, her words set us athinking. Here is a woman whose chief part on the stage is to ruin men. And she is very serious about this business. She dresses the part: "The psychology of the long, clinging, revealing robe, is to suggest the sinuosity of the serpent, the patron reptile of the human vampire". This actress avoids, even off the stage, everything that would seem incompatible with her stage character. She identifies herself as far as possible with the person she represents: "I have been asked in thousands of letters: 'Is it difficult to feign emotion?' My answer is: 'I don't know. I never feign it.'" Her acting is so realistic

that her fellow-actors complain that she is 'wreaking her temper out on them—that she is trying to injure them.' This she finds absurd. 'I have no desire to injure anyone. But when I am playing, I am not myself. If my part demands that I choke a man, I cannot go through facial contortions of hatred, revenge, etc., and allow my fingers to rest lightly upon his throat. I must go as far toward choking him as I can without inflicting actual injury, of course'. "A wild cat woman, mad with jealousy, or hate, springing at her rival, must not tap her innocently upon the cheek and run on to play in the garden. That is farce-burlesque"—is her retort to women who have claimed that she scratched their faces and bruised them.

She admits: "I realize that every time I allow myself to become exhausted in some tense scene, I am subtracting a month, maybe more, from my span of life".

This actress shortens her life by her frenzied acting, and others of her profession daily risk life and limb in order to be able to offer the public a new "thriller". Are they not wantonly endangering and destroying that body for whose care they are responsible to the Lord who says, "Thou shalt not kill", the body which He wants for His service? 1 Cor. 5:19: "What! know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own?"

Then think of the soul! Christ bled for it upon the cross. He would draw it to Himself, comfort it, and fill it with His peace. He desires to pour into it His Holy Spirit and sanctify it to the pure and holy God. "The fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, long suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance." Instead of surrendering to the influence of the Spirit of Holiness, this actress daily pollutes her soul with "the works of the flesh, adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, . . . hatred, wrath, strife, . . . envyings, murders, etc". She lives the part of an abandoned wretch, the deeper she steps her soul in sin, the greater her success.

This may be art—but we ask, can the work of the Spirit of God continue in a soul that is so frequently made the scene of horrible carnal debauches? Vampirism indeed, this abuse of body and soul, the sucking of one's own life blood. And a vampire she is to others, for by her acting she raises in their hearts the thoughts that so mightily move her own. She is sapping the vitality of their soul.

It is absolutely silly for her to speak of those "who are not broad-minded, or far-sighted enough to realize I am benefiting humanity by appearing in pictures in which righteousness triumphs and vice is annihilated". Mr. Percy Hammond, a dramatic critic of the Tribune, having discussed two plays, "Damaged Goods" and "Experience", from this angle, says: "Well then, let us admit that the theater as a forum of morals is a joke, convincing nobody who is not already convinced. An honest sermon by an honest expounder of the Word is worth, as a moral catholicon, all the happy endings that ever turned a play into a lie. Let us remember the belief of Sir Arthur Wing Pinero, the wisest of playwrights, that the exhibition of the most miserable of his transgressing heroines never deterred a woman from doing what her passions told her to do".

But there is another phase to the matter. The actor seeks gain and honor and he looks to the public for them. If the public would not applaud and pay him, he would not continue very long in his profession. The public leads him on. We shudder when we read of the Roman ladies who with great complacency watched the bloody combat of the gladiators in the arena and who by turning down their thumbs sealed the fate of the vanquished one. Are we who pay the "movie actor" for doing what is so dangerous to his body and often harmful to his soul less brutal than the old Romans were? Could not the "movie"-going public with equal right be called the "Vampire of Movieland?"

J. B.

* * * * *

Another Advertiser We re-print the following, part of an editorial, because it shows us what people will do in our day to draw attention to themselves and, incidentally, "further the cause" of Jesus by applying new methods.

"In the way of innovatory church services a New York minister, the Rev. Christian F. Reisner, of Grace Methodist Episcopal Church, seems for the moment to have distanced all competitors. When his congregation gathered last Sunday assistants went up and down the aisles not for the usual purpose of taking up a collection, but to distribute juicy red apples, fourteen hundred of which were disposed of—one to every worshiper.

"Then the minister announced the subject of his sermon, which was 'God and Apples'. 'It takes faith to grow apples', said the preacher. 'Once they were gnarled and repugnant. But men worked at them until today they are a joy to the taste, to the stomach and to health'. With this exordium, he went on to argue that what can be done in the case of apples can be done in the case of men, and is certainly as well worth doing.

"Boys, he suggested, sometimes present a difficult problem, but if properly cultivated they become good men and useful citizens. Developing their good qual-

ities is worth the trouble. He went on to disparage the habit of laying too much stress on heredity, and assuming that unless a boy's parents were 'somebodies' he will not amount to much. He praised Mrs. Finley J. Shepard, formerly Miss Helen Gould, for adopting a youngster concerning whose parental antecedents research had failed to reveal anything tangible. She has decided to give the boy a chance, and possesses faith that something can be made of him that will be worth the effort. In the pastor's opinion her faith is justified by what has been achieved by the cultivators of the apple.

"Who shall say that he is wrong? Such faith is the basis of the system of education maintained at immense cost by the people of the United States, and eminent historians have declared that in the making of nations much depends on institutions—that heredity, while a factor, is not more important than environment.

"Innovatory church services sometimes make the judicious grieve; but it must be confessed that the Rev. Mr. Reisner contrived a novelty not lacking in dignity and calculated to attract the attention of his hearers and to make them think."

The above shows us not only how undignified the sensation-seeker becomes, but also an example of how favorably he is judged. Yes, give the world something new! But why not let the old Gospel alone? That stands above all improvement. G.

THE SACRAMENTS, TWO, FIVE, OR NONE?

The term sacraments is not as old as the thing it signifies; it came into use in the Christian church when the Latin language replaced the Greek in the use of writers and theologians. Even then it was not always used in the sense that is most familiar to us. It does not occur in the Bible. When we speak of sacraments it is most necessary to agree to a certain meaning. To us it may mean a very definite thing, to others it conveys no more than the word rite or ceremony. If we hear that another church has sacraments, we never may assume that they are those that we know by that term.

It is equally certain that sacraments in any case are much more than distinguishing marks of different churches. It was not the church that developed the sacrament, it was the sacrament that made the church. If any church today uses the sacraments in a way peculiar to itself the merits of its practice must not be judged by a comparison with the practice of other churches, but rather by a strict accounting and comparison with the one standard of Christianity—the Word of Revelation.

If the Lutheran understanding of sacraments differs from that of some others, perhaps all others, as we shall have occasion to find, it differs with them be-

cause they have left the clearly indicated course given by Holy Writ. If in the course of historical Christianity there have been aberrations from the original purity and intention of these divine institutions, if they have been multiplied without warrant, or have been modified and adulterated out of interest for other things than scriptural fidelity, then it is well to look at the Lutheran doctrine and practice in regard to the sacraments as a return to apostolic simplicity and original Christianity. The Lutheran doctrine may have been born out of stress and combat with conflicting opinions, but these militant studies were most compelling reasons to go back to the only source that could be accepted as an authority, to the Bible. The Lutheran church had no reason to shade the doctrine of the sacraments for its own ends; it was free from every consideration but that of the truth.

The Roman Catholic church counts seven sacraments. It started with two, but in the course of centuries it was found expedient to add the others, not because new light was shed on Scripture but because the light of Scripture was being more and more obscured by human aims and considerations and the additional sacraments were very useful in constructing that imposing political organism known as the Roman church. At the council of Florence in 1439 the seven sacraments were formally made the official doctrine; at the council of Trent this doctrine was reasserted and amplified in view of the new conditions brought about by the Reformation. They have remained essentially unaltered ever since.

The seven sacraments of the Romanists are: Baptism, Lord's Supper, confirmation, penance, extreme unction, holy orders, and matrimony. The first three are readily identified. The fourth is not so easily recognized as a sacrament; we do not associate an act or a ceremony with penance. What is meant is this: Penance is first of all the act of contrition in the Christian, he feels sorrow and shame for his sin; the second action is his confession of sin to his father confessor and the church demands that this be the auricular confession in which the penitent makes mention of his particular sins; thereupon the confessor priest imposes certain penances as a means of expiating the sins, if there were many and great ones the penance will be correspondingly severe and may consist of gifts or of certain performances, according to the discretion of the confessor. This formidable weapon wielded by the church for greater power over its members becomes a sacrament according to the doctrine of the Romanists when the priest pronounces the absolution and forgives the sins of the penitent. You will now recognize in this Roman sacrament a caricature of our Office of the Keys. It is supposed to apply to all those sins committed after baptism.

The fifth Roman sacrament finds a Lutheran entirely ignorant; rather safe evidence that its connec-

tion with Scripture is extremely farfetched. Late in the history of the church the oriental medicinal practice of using olive oil in cases of sickness, perhaps not without certain good physiological results, was made a sacrament. To be sure, there are allusions to the use of oil in Scripture, and St. James even refers to this as quite the self-evident thing in sickness, but if he adds the injunction that the elders are to pray for the sick this, if it shows anything, shows that the Christian should trust God more than olive oil, just as the Christian of today should trust God more than prescriptions. But the Romanists made a sacrament of it. They use olive oil, prepared with certain prayers and ceremonies on Maundy Thursday. Using a certain formula the priest anoints eyes, ears, nose, mouth, hands, and feet of the sick man. The result is supposed to be the forgiveness of venial sins. Provided the patient demanded it while still conscious, he may even receive it during delirium. We saw it administered to a dead man immediately after an accident; his body was still warm, that may have been sufficient ground for administration to the priest. It is to be used by the faithful especially in serious illness and may assist toward the regaining of health if that should be beneficial to the soul of the sufferer.

Holy orders, which is the solemn elevation to the dignity of priesthood, is the sixth Roman sacrament. We know the ceremony as practiced by us, but can scarcely conceive its far-reaching significance in the Roman hierarchy. It is a very impressive and ceremonial function, made up of various blessings and charges and is marked during its course by the gradual investiture of the candidate with the various garments of the priesthood. It prepares him to perform the offices of the Roman priest, he may now give absolution and administer the other sacraments. He is especially forever invested with the power to celebrate the sacrificial mass. For misconduct or other reason, he may be restrained from acting as parish priest, but he can never lose this indelible character which gives him the power to perform the sacraments; he can never become a layman again.

The last Roman sacrament, that of matrimony, is significant of the determination of Rome to control absolutely its own members and as many others as it may. We can feel the workings of its doctrine in this respect every day. Having made a sacrament of it, their insistence that any other than a Roman marriage is invalid is supported by the weight of their whole influence and feeble Christians of other denominations often feel compelled to accede to Roman demands and submit to the priest's ministrations. Needless to add, the Roman doctrine of matrimony is as little based on Scripture as that of the extreme unction or of confirmation.

It was deemed necessary to mention thus briefly

THE NORTHWESTERN LUTHERAN

Edited by a committee under authority of the Ev. Luth. Joint Synod of Wisconsin, Minnesota, Michigan, and other States, and published biweekly by Northwestern Publishing House, Milwaukee, Wis.

Address all communications concerning the editorial department to Rev. John Jenny, 637 Mitchell St., Milwaukee, Wis.

Address all news items to Rev. F. Graeber, 3709 Sycamore St., Milwaukee, Wis.

Send all business correspondence, remittances, etc., to Northwestern Publishing House, 263 Fourth St., Milwaukee, Wis. Subscription Price: \$1.00 per year in advance.

Entered as second class matter December 30th, 1913, at the post office at Milwaukee, Wis., under the Act of March 3d, 1879.

the compass of the Roman Catholic teachings on sacraments.

Among Protestants, if we are to accept this unfortunate grouping of non-Romanist Christians for purposes of comparison, there are commonly never more than two sacraments, baptism and the eucharist, or Lord's Supper. The Episcopal church is inclined to consider a few of the Romanists' seven besides as subordinate sacraments. With the possible exception of the Episcopal church, which leans strongly toward the Roman view, and of the Lutheran church, which has a view of sacraments all its own, the tendency of other Protestant churches is to reduce the sacrament to an empty ceremony. The more candid ones of their number have in our day followed the example of the Quakers, who acknowledge no sacraments even in name and practice neither baptism nor the eucharist. In spite of the fact that certain denominations have taken their name from the sacrament of baptism, like the Baptists, their zeal and interest is entirely negative. One is not saying too much if he bluntly asserts: To all the reformed Protestant churches the sacraments mean absolutely nothing. In fact, that is precisely what we heard from the mouth of one of the foremost Baptist clergymen of America. He said, and we remember his words well: "The Quakers are the only ones that are consistent and logical—they have no sacraments."

Against both Romanist and Reformed, the Lutheran clings to the sacraments as he clings to the Bible itself. He has the two—baptism and the eucharist. He has a hard time to steer clear between the superstition of the Romanist and the indifference of the "Protestant"—but he has an unflinching guide to keep him in the right way—the Word.

The modern critic may be right if he says scornfully: The Roman sacraments are nothing but adaptations of the old heathen mysteries and secret practices of the Greeks and Egyptians. He may applaud the action of the Protestant who discards the sacraments as something that his reason will not permit him to accept. But he will have to admit, or lie if he doesn't,

the Lutherans have two sacraments and they take them from the Bible just as they are found there.

H. K. M.

"HOW OLD IS MAN?"

The National Geographic Magazine for February contains an article by Theodore Roosevelt on the above topic. The article is really a review of a book: "Men of the Old Stone Age: Their Environment, Life and Art," by Harry Fairfield Osborn. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons. The views expressed both in the article and in the book are practically a re-statement of the theories held in certain scientific circles ever since the publication of Darwin's "Descent of Man" in 1871. The only difference seems to be that the imaginations of the writers are a little more vivid and their conclusions a little more "cock-sure" than Darwin's were.

Some of the statements are:

"During Pleistocene or Quaternary Age man was slowly developing from the half-human to the wholly human."

"In France are found records which show a continuous human occupation of the region for at least a hundred thousand years."

"This is the crucial period in the evolution of man from a strong and cunning brute into a being having dominion over all brutes and kinship with worlds lying outside and beyond our own."

"The changes indicated in the geological formations of Europe were not cataclysms, but earth movements so gradual as to be impossible of notice by any individual or generation."

"The Heidelberg man appeared during this period."

"This was 250,000 years after the ape-man of Java lived."

"The Heidelberg man was a chinless man whose jaw was still so primitive that it must have made his speech imperfect."

"Next, something over 100,000 years later, we come to the Piltoun man, seemingly little farther advanced than the man of Heidelberg, and in some ways less so, for he possessed apelike canine teeth." (It is admitted by Mr. Roosevelt that "in regards to all of these very early near-human remains, there is room for considerable difference of opinion not only as to their exact relationships and their standing in the man-phylum, but as to their age, both absolutely, and relatively to other human remains and to the remains of the great Pleistocene faunas." We wish that the article had been written without ignoring the import of this admission.)

"The next race was that of the Neanderthal men, much more modern and more advanced, but lower than any existing savage, and specifically distinct from modern man."

"This is the 'missing link,' which Darwin practically ignored. The *perverse ingenuity* of the great anatomist Virchow, who, with *wrong-headed insistence*, declared its peculiarities to be pathologic, delayed for a generation the full understanding of its importance." (Italics ours.)

"Other skulls and skeletons were found, however, and *there is now no more doubt of the racial existence of the Neanderthals than of the racial existence of the ancient Egyptians.*" (Italics ours.)

"*Some of their favorite caverns were lived in by them and by their ancestors for fifty thousand years.*" (Italics Roosevelt's.)

"The most profound change in the whole racial (not cultural) history of western Europe was the sudden and total supplanting of these savages, lower than any existing human type, by the tall finely-built Cro-Magnon race of hunters who belonged to the same species of man that we do."

"Geologically, these were modern immigrants into western Europe; for there is reasonably good ground to believe that they entered that region only twenty-five or thirty thousand years ago."

"For a time there was another race associated with them in southern Europe, and very curiously, this was a race akin to the negro pygmies of present-day Africa."

"Then the Cro-Magnons in their turn succumbed. This fine race disappeared, almost or quite completely, and in its place there came, seemingly from Asia, four or five different types of humanity, all of which can today be discerned in Europe's ethnically very mixed population."

These extracts will indicate the trend of thought in the article and the scientific school to which the noted publication belongs.

We may be possessed of the "perverse ingenuity" and "wrong-headed insistence" which Mr. Roosevelt regrets to have observed in Virchow; we may belong to that class of relics, which he mentions, who lived "when it was still necessary to argue with those who disbelieved in the antiquity of man, their reasons being substantially similar to those of the other conservatives who a couple of centuries earlier treated as impious the statement that the earth went round the sun,"—be that as it may (as Corporal Nym would have said); but we hope the Colonel will pardon us for saying that we fear to venture on adopting his conclusions as to the age of man, for certain reasons of our own.

For instance, we have our doubts about some of the "records" upon which Mr. Roosevelt and his teachers base their conclusions. Prof. L. T. Townsend, L. L. D., says concerning the wonderful "ape-man of Java": "In the month of September, 1891, Dubois, a Dutch physician, discovered a tooth on the island of Java, about forty-five feet below the surface

of the earth. One month later he found the roof of a skull about three feet from where was found the tooth. In August, 1892, he found a thigh bone forty-five feet further away, later, another tooth. That is all that is known of the wonderful pithecanthropus-erectus, the link that connects man with the lower animals." In the National Geographic Magazine article by Mr. Roosevelt we find an illustration, reproduced from a photographic likeness in Osborn's "Men of the Old Stone Age," of the bust of the ape-man of Java, as natural as life. Let us remember that this living likeness was reproduced from two teeth and the roof of a skull found forty-five feet apart, where they were supposed to have been buried for a little matter of 500,000 years.

Dr. Townsend continues: "A year or two after these discoveries, a convention of famous zoologists met at Lyden, and among other things examined were these bones. *Ten* of those scientists concluded that they were nothing but the bones of an ape, *seven* held that they were those of a man, and *seven* concluded that they *may* have been the missing link connecting man and ape. So that of twenty-four eminent European scientists only seven, not one-third, ascribed any importance whatever to this pithecanthropus-erectus." Judging from Mr. Roosevelt's manner of reasoning, when you wish to get at the truth of a scientific statement, all you have to do is to submit your evidence to a competent jury,—and then to accept the verdict of the *minority*, modifying it to suit yourself.

Prof. D. C. Cunningham, of Dublin, one of the highest authorities in Great Britain on questions of comparative anatomy, has recently made the statement that these different bones did not belong to the same animal at all, some of them being those of a monkey or baboon, the rest human. There certainly seems to be "room for considerable difference of opinion."

In the magazine article under consideration we find also illustrations of the famous Piltdown Man, the Neanderthal Man and the "Old Man of Cro-Magnon." The pictures are photographic reproductions of heads modeled in clay and supposed to represent the specimens of ancient men as they looked in real life. In all cases, however, the models have been made from small fragments of bone,—often only a few square inches in extent,—plus the imagination of the artist, alias, *scientifically assured facts*. As Dr. Townsend says: "Incidentally the remark may be made that in all such cases, the smaller the fragments of the skull discovered the easier it is to imagine it to be the skull of a pithecanthropus-erectus, or some other like personage." And yet Mr. Roosevelt and his school consider these fragments of skulls and skeletons (not one of which is sufficiently complete to enable any one to say positively that they are not those of modern men) as trustworthy "records." Yet, hearing some learned

gentlemen discourse so positively about the *assured results* of their theories one would imagine that their "records" were at least as clear and accurate and numerous as those of the ancient Egyptians. What then is the reason that they consider some us so "wrong-headed" and "perverse" when we are disappointed with their "records" of a few fragments of bone, so small that no competent jury can agree as to their ownership? Why do they expect us to believe without question, on their mere say-so, that a fragment of human bone found in a cave with other bones is proof positive that once upon a time a prehistoric race lived and was contemporary with certain extinct animals? Are we to close our eyes to the thousand and one explanations which might account for the presence of a human bone in an open cave, or even for the presence of a human bone forty-five feet below the surface of the earth? Relics of Napoleon's expedition to Egypt have been found eighty-five feet below the surface of the Nile Valley, yet no one would reason therefrom that the great Corsican must have lived 200,000 years before the ape-man of Java.

Who informed Mr. Roosevelt so accurately that he can lay it down as *dogma* that the various changes indicated in the earth's strata were "not cataclysms, but gradual movements, impossible of notice by any individual or generation"? Have we no right to believe, if the evidence seems to warrant it, that a layer of earth could have been formed in a vastly shorter time after the receding of various great ice-caps, than during a period of erosion by normal causes? Can we not with just as much authority make the statement, if we choose to do so, that the changes indicated in the strata of the earth's crust *were* cataclysms and not gradual movements imperceptible to individuals or generations? What scientific law can forbid it? The theory that man is hundreds of thousands of years old stands or falls with the theory of evolution, which in turn rests upon "records" no more clear or trustworthy than the Cro-Magnon skull fragment. Mr. Roosevelt gravely assures us that "man was slowly developing from the half-human to the wholly human throughout this immense period of time," etc. Pray, who proved this evolution and revealed it to certain scientists so clearly that to doubt their statements is to be "perverse" and "wrong-headed"? Where are the mathematical demonstrations which are supposed to make it as solidly established a fact as the revolution of the earth around the sun?

It is pitiful to witness the blind faith of some so-called scientists who insist upon it that "the theory of evolution is clearly proved" by the classic example of the series of skeletons assembled to show the evolution of the horse from a four-toed creature the size of a small dog to the one-toed horse of today." The same Prof. Osborn mentioned above now declares that there was even a five-toed horse before this. Not to mention

the objection that in making their selection of skeletons the scientists *might* have been mistaken the skeleton of a dog for the skeleton of the supposed four-toed horselet (no one can tell the difference between them), there remains the other formidable objection, that this one and only complete series of skeletons, which is said to be the "demonstrated evidence of evolution," antagonizes one of the fundamental tenets of progressive evolution. Dr. Townsend says on this point: "The formula of Herbert Spencer, adopted by Mr. Darwin and Professor Haeckel, is thus stated by Mr. Spencer: 'Evolution *without exception* (N. B.) must tend from the homogeneous to the heterogeneous, from the simple to the complex, from the few parts to the multiplicity of parts.' But the evolutionists' horse reverses this law,—the development taking the opposite direction." It is unfortunate that the only "record" we have is so "perverse" as deliberately to disobey the law of evolution.

But, why take more time? When one reads articles of the above type it makes one feel like writing a history of the "Credulity of Scientific Unbelief." That type of mind is a puzzle to us. It will deny the reality of the existence of Abraham in the face of the Biblical Record, and gravely assure us that said Record is too incomplete and doubtful to be believed; and then it will turn around and ask us to believe that "the racial existence of the Neanderthals is as clearly established as the racial existence of the ancient Egyptians"; and these "clear records" are a few fragments of skeletons found in caves. We care little what motives these scientific gentlemen may attribute to us for being unconvinced "conservatives". What we do care about is that the name of fair Science is so often brought into disrepute by those who would call "theory"—"ascertained facts," and "conjecture"—"history." When you write your articles, gentlemen, don't say: "This is so," when you mean: "Some of us *think* it is so."

If it is proper that manufacturers should be compelled to tell how much alcohol there is in their patent preparations and how much adulteration there is in their tomato sauce, certain scientists should likewise be compelled to tell us plainly how much humbug there is in their "scientific" articles.—The Lutheran Companion.

PURGATORY

Since, according to Roman Catholic doctrine, a more or less lengthy sojourn in "purgatory" awaits all Protestants at death, it might interest our readers to obtain information concerning the location, etc., of the place, especially as "Protestants are obliged to remain there for a longer period of time than Catholics, it taking so much longer to purify heretics."

Together with other "rubbish", this doctrine was "invented" many years after the Apostles preached

the Gospel of Christ. It is one of the principal avenues through which the Roman church derives its large income from the "Faithful", who have been forced to believe in it since the year 1438 A. D.

Roman Catholics claim that the souls of the righteous who have not completed their penance, must finish their sentence in purgatory, and therein be cleansed, before they can enter heaven. The more the living do for them the sooner they are saved from it, but they "cannot help themselves." (Take notice.)

As this doctrine finds no place in Protestantism, the "most reliable" information concerning it must needs come from Catholic sources, and to these the writer will confine all efforts to procure it,—directly or indirectly.

An extract, taken from O'Sullivan's Catholic History of Ireland, called "Purgatory of St. Patrick", and published in the October, 1911, issue of "The Theological Quarterly", pages 213 and 214, contains the following:

"The Creed of Pope Pius IV says,—'I constantly hold that there is a purgatory, and that the souls therein detained are assisted by the suffrages of the faithful'."

"As to the place, Eckius will have it to be at the bottom of the sea, some will have it in Mount Aetna, and Bernardus de Bustis in a hill in Ireland."

"As to the torments, Sir Thomas More will have them only by fire, but Fisher, his fellow-sufferer, by fire and water."

"As to the executioners, Bishop Fisher will have them to be holy angels, but Sir Thomas More to be the very devils."

"As to the sins, some will have them to be venial (pardonable) only, others say mortal, too."

"As to the time, Dionysius the Carthusian extends it to the end of the world, whilst Dominicus a Soto limits it to ten years, and others make it depend upon the number of masses done in their behalf, or if the pope would but speak the word."

But if the reader wishes additional information regarding the time, here it is:

"Let nobody ever think of placing the limit of the sufferings of purgatory on this side of the final and formidable day of general judgment." (Month of the Dead) page 63, by Abbe Cloquet.

"There are souls condemned to burn in purgatory till the day of judgment". Id. page 63.

"In this subterranean prison many souls will be punished for some fault till the time of resurrection." Id. page 64.

"How long are souls in purgatory? How long will you be there? Let us give to each venial sin one day in purgatory, and suppose that each day you commit thirty faults. Therefore, to every day of your life thirty days in purgatory will answer, to every year thirty years, to fifty—1500 years, to sixty—1800. Im-

mortal God, what an astonishing payment! Add to the venial sins some mortal sin, absolved indeed, so far as the guilt goes, but not paid for entirely as far as the punishment goes. How many other centuries of years in purgatory!—Month of Mary, by Muzzarelli, page 75.

"St. Magdalene de Pazzi once saw a soul suffering in purgatory for having through carelessness omitted one communion." Alphonsus de Liguori in "The True Spouse of Christ", Vol. 2, page 80.

"Palafox relates that he suffered severely in Purgatory for not having kept in his cell a walnut desk." (Same work, Vol. 1, page 268.)

"A nun went there for something said in a whisper in the choir."—Month of Mary, by Father Muzzarelli.

"A Holy Virgin for washing her face with too much nicety upon a Friday." Idem.

"A holy preacher for some excessive attachment to his writings." Idem.

"The Sabbatine Indulgence, first published by John XXII, and then republished by many of his successors, means that "Our Lady" (The Virgin Mary) will obtain the deliverance from Purgatory on the Saturday after their death, of those who during life shall have worn the Scapular and faithfully complied with the other conditions required."—Cardinal Vaughan.

"The promise made by our Blessed Lady to Pope John XXII is well known. She appeared to him, and ordered him to make known to all that on the Saturday after their death she would deliver from Purgatory all who wore the Carmelite scapular. This, as Father Crasset relates, was proclaimed by the same pontiff in a bull, which was afterwards confirmed by Alexander V, Clement VII, Pius V, Gregory XIII, and Paul V.—From "Glories of Mary" by Liguori.

This author also states that "Mary not only consoles and relieves her clients in purgatory, but she delivers them by her prayers".

Gerson states that on the day of Mary's assumption into heaven purgatory was entirely emptied.—Id. page 236.

Numerous other quotations from Catholic writers could be quoted, among them a treatise on purgatory by Father Thimelby, S. J., in which he describes the various torments in a manner which would make the reader's hair "stand on end", but the above will suffice. The only authority these writers can give for their doctrine is tradition, as it is found nowhere in the Holy Scriptures. Cardinal Vaughan is quoted in the Catholic Dictionary as saying: "We would appeal to those general principles of Scripture rather than to particular texts often alleged in proof of purgatory, and Cardinal Wiseman states "that a Roman Catholic could not discover one word of Purgatory in the Bible."

According to Virgil, the Buddhists have pictures showing people suffering from the torments of hell, where all must go for a time to be purified, unless one's

merit is greater than one's sin. A speedy passage to heaven can be obtained, however, by the payment of a certain sum to the priest.

As the Bible, and nothing but the Bible, is the religion of Protestants, we will endeavor to disprove the existence of a purgatory by plain Scriptural statements:

(1) "The Blood of Jesus Christ, His Son, cleanseth us from all sin."—1 John 1, v. 7.

(2) "Thine iniquity is taken away, and thy sin purged."—Isa 6, v. 7.

(3) "I, even I, am He that blotteth out thy transgressions for my own sake, and will not remember thy sins."—Isa. 43, v. 25.

(4) "By Christ's stripes we are healed."—1 Peter 2, v. 4.

(5) "He is the propitiation for our sins."—1 John 2, v. 2.

(6) "When He had by Himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high."—Heb. 1, v. 3.

(7) "If we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness."—1 John 1, v. 9.

(8) "He hath made Him to be sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him."—2 Cor. 5, v. 21.

(9) "And ye are complete in Him."—Col. 2, v. 10.

(10) "Ever man perfect in Jesus Christ."—Col. 1, v. 28.

Numerous other Scriptural quotations might be added, among them the story of Lazarus and Dives. Also Luke 16:22-23; Prov. 11, 7; John 9, verse 4. 1 Peter 1-6-7 shows that Christians are cleansed in this life.

In "The Smalcald Articles, Part 2, Art. 11-12 we read that purgatory with all its pomp, display, and traffic is to be thought of as purely an hallucination of the devil, for it is also against that chief article, that Christ alone, and not the work of man, should help the souls. Besides, nothing is enjoined upon or commanded unto us regarding the dead.

Well may it be said of these Romanist writers that:

"With frauds that they themselves invent,
Thy Truth they have confounded,
Their hearts are not with one intent
On Thy pure doctrine grounded."

While they accuse Protestants of "wresting the Scriptures to their own destruction", let us rejoice and give thanks to God for His unspeakable gift: The Holy Bible. Let us be grateful that we are permitted to hear His Word preached from our Lutheran pulpits in its truth and purity, and that He has crowned the ceaseless toil of His chosen instrument, Dr. Martin Luther, with such abundant blessings.

Purgatory is but one of the numerous frauds and

invented doctrines of Rome from which the Lutheran Reformation has freed us.

Rejoice, fellow Lutherans, and give thanks, not only on the day of our Reformation festivals, or when you hear the Gospel, but daily, for even the civil liberty we enjoy is a direct result of Luther's Reformation.

A. H.

ITEMS OF INTEREST

From the Far West

The Sunday Judica, April 9th, was a day of special rejoicing and thanksgiving for our first English mission parish in the state of Washington. On that day our English St. Paul's congregation of Leavenworth, Wash., celebrated the fifth anniversary of the dedication of its house of worship. The joy of the occasion and the feeling of gratitude for mercies received was heightened by the fact that the little flock has now succeeded in removing the balance of the debt which up to now rested on the church property. The speakers of the day were the Rev. F. Soll of North Yakima, and the Rev. F. E. Stern of Mansfield, Wash.

Stopping Witchcraft

Witches have been called darlings before this.

And darlings have been called witches.

But for the first time since witchcraft came into the world, and for the first time since there were darlings, a Darling has been arrested for witchcraft. She is the Rev. Sadie Darling, Spiritualist reader of Newark, N. J., who is being held on \$50 bail for trial as a witch.

Four hundred years ago in Salem town witches were burned at the stake. Or sometimes they were ducked. If they drowned they were guilty. What will happen to this plump, gray haired little woman nobody knows. Dressed in a black cashmere gown, with a little gray bolero, with a fluted edge like an apple pie, she hardly looks the part, say those who have met her.

"Well, whether she looks it or not, she's a witch according to the law," declares Chief Michael Long of the Newark police force. "The information she gives out at the meetings she conducts breaks up homes. One man complained to us that his wife had become a raving maniac as a result of the things the Rev. Darling had told her. We arrested her only after we had received many complaints. And Newark has made up its mind to put a stop to witchcraft."—Milwaukee S

CULLED BY THE WAY

Three Sermons Enough

A village clergyman, walking round his parish, met an old parishioner. "Well, John," he said, "how is it I have not seen you at church for several Sundays?" "Hain't got no Sunday trousers," answered John. "Well," said the clergyman, "I think we can remedy that. I have a pair at home which will just about fit you, and I will have them sent to you today." "Thank'ee!" said John.

The trousers were duly sent, and the following three Sundays John was seen at church. Then, after being absent for some time, the clergyman again met him.

"Well, John," he said, "you have no excuse for not coming to church lately. How is it I have not seen you there?"

"Look here, parson!" said John. "I like a man to speak plain; you're a-thinking about them trousers. I came to church three Sundays, an' if you don't think I earned them trousers, just tell me how many more Sundays I shall ha' to come afore they're mine altogether!"—Philadelphia Inquirer.