

The Northwestern Lutheran

The Lord our God be with us, as He was with our fathers; let Him not leave or forsake us. 1 Kings 8: 57.

Vol. 4.

Milwaukee, Wis., June 21, 1917.

No. 12.

"FATHER, TAKE MY HAND"

The way is dark, my Father! Cloud on cloud
Is gathering thickly o'er my head, and loud
The thunders roar above me. See, I stand
Like one bewildered! Father, take my hand,
And through the gloom
Lead safely home
Thy child!

The day goes fast, my Father! and the night
Is drawing darkly down. My faithless sight
Sees ghostly visions. Fears, a spectral band,
Encompass me. O Father, take my hand
And from the night
Lead up to light
Thy child!

The way is long, my Father! and my soul
Longs for the rest and quiet of the goal;
While yet I journey through this weary land,
Keep me from wandering. Father, take my hand;
Quickly and straight
Lead to heaven's gate
Thy child!

The path is rough, my Father! Many a thorn
Has pierced me: and my weary feet, all torn,
And bleeding mark the way. Yet Thy command
Bids me press forward. Father, take my hand:
Then safe and blest
Lead up to rest
Thy child!

The throng is great, my Father! Many a doubt
And fear and danger compass me about;
And foes oppress me sore. I cannot stand
Or go alone. O Father, take my hand,
And through the throng
Lead safe along
Thy child!

The cross is heavy, Father! I have borne
It long, and still do bear it. Let my worn
And fainting spirit rise to that blest land
Where crowns are given. Father, take my hand,
And reaching down
Lead to the crown
Thy child!

—Henry H. Cobb, 1834.

COMMENTS

Strictly Modern A Japanese girl committed suicide at Long Beach, Cal., and her funeral appears to us as one of the notable things of the month. The girl had been in this country about a year and was in the habit of attending a Long Beach Christian mission. After her death the pastor of the mission col-

laborated with the Buddhist priest, who was called in by the family, in the funeral offices. This is simply emphasizing what the Japanese say of our faith: it is one of the many religions which are all good.—Christians who find no obstacle in heathenism to prevent them from approving of it, are the kind of "Christians" that are the result of the leveling process which has been under way for many years and which strives to bring about a mutual understanding among all religions. Of one thing we may be sure, if Buddhist and Christian agree to collaborate it is not the Buddhist that gives up anything characteristic of his old beliefs; agreement is always had at the cost of the Christian doctrines. Just why Christians that are willing to go that far should support missions remains a riddle that defies solution.—Some time ago an English girl had her head shaved and became a Buddhist nun. She went through all the dreary and humiliating ceremonies that the old oriental cult imposes. Buddhism made no concessions to her; she had to change her diet and mode of life, had to memorize pages of precepts, and finally had to pass through a novitiate that required her to beg her way on her pilgrimage to "the forty-eight temples in Shikoku". The wily orientals know that their "religion" is only a system, but they cling to all its formalism because they know that to modify it is a confession of error.—Christians have a nobler and truer motive in keeping their faith undefiled by fraternizing with the heathen, but it seems our moderns have truly become fools in their vaunted wisdom. They want to rejuvenate Christianity by knocking it on the head, they want to revivify it by draining its life-blood. We can only pray that all missions conducted by such moderns may come to naught and that our own missions may so increase in numbers and strength that the loss which the mock-Christians bring to the Church of Christ may be offset.

H. K. M.

* * * * *

Quadri-Centennial Postponed in Germany Quite naturally Germany had made great plans for the coming Luther Jubilee. Especially the Saxon cities Eisenach and Wittenberg had been preparing for years to celebrate. Now we hear that all official celebrations are postponed for a year. The great war has dwarfed all other undertakings and it was felt that the people, all of them, had a share in this celebration and therefore it would be better to

wait until they could give it their undivided attention. There will be local celebrations but nothing in the way of concerted and official recognition of the great anniversary.
H. K. M.

* * * * *

A Calendar Record Statisticians have computed that on Sunday, July 8th, of this year we celebrate an odd event: the one hundred thousandth Sunday. Since the birth of Christ 100,000 weeks have passed and the Lord's day has come that many times. The matter of leap years causes some uncertainty. It is also generally accepted that the year 1 A. D. is not the year in which Christ was born. But since we count as we do, we note in passing that we are living in the one hundred thousandth week of the Christian era.
H. K. M.

* * * * *

"Elks Would Seize Boy Scouts" "Elks would seize Boy Scouts"—this is the heading the Christian Cynosure places over a news item taken from the Pharas Reporter, Logansport, Ind., April 26, 1917:

"Scoutmaster Charles D. Chase of Logansport Boy Scouts of America will appear before the regular meeting of Logansport lodge No. 66, B. P. O. Elks tonight and present the matter of the Boy Scout movement. The Elks have under consideration the taking of the Boy Scouts under their wing as a part of the Big Brother program of the B. P. O. Elks."

We were not at all surprised to find this item, for to us it was clear at the very beginning that the Boy Scout movement is a movement in the direction of the lodge. But many of our Lutheran parents failed to see this and could not understand that their pastors opposed an organization whose aim seemed to be to benefit the boy. Bitter experience will possibly lead them to understand, what they have always been taught, that they cannot safely permit their children to join any movement outside of their church. J. B.

* * * * *

Missionary Zeal? In the June number of the "Evangelist" we find a note, signed by F. Soll, which relates a story of conditions in the particular missionary field which is under discussion that must make Christians very sad. "At the last United States Census 68.8 per cent of the population of the State of Washington" were not reported as church members; in Oregon it was 74.7 per cent, and in Idaho 63.7 per cent. Appalling figures! All the more if we consider how easy it is in some denominations to become a member. (Shake hands with the minister and give him your name and address and promise a contribution.) As long as two-thirds of our population is not even loosely connected with any church, thousands may be regained by our work.—On May 20th, a new Lutheran church was dedicated at North Yakima, the fifth Lutheran church within a radius of

six blocks. If two-thirds of the population of North Yakima is outside of the churches there is certainly a field for another church. But, dear reader, the General Council put up the new church and is working the field in General Council ways, that is, from the start they were hot after the members of the little flocks that now comprise the other four churches. Having partially succeeded they no doubt feel gratified. The question arises, Did those Christians who by their little gifts made possible the Church Extension Fund intend them for such "missionary work"? And since all true mission is the work of the Holy Trinity, is it really missionary work to build up a new organization with the debris gained by wrecking other churches—and then call it Trinity church? All over our country in this year of the Reformation jubilee we hear the voice of many earnest people that our Evangelical-Lutheran church should be re-united; the General Council claims to furnish the basis for such reunion. But then it must work differently and not create new dissensions. Success to Trinity church of North Yakima in so far as it succeeds in winning over churchless people to become soundly Lutheran, but while we are living we do not want to be the object for their dissection."

* * * * *

Will You Read This Poem?

If you are like many other readers you will skip this paragraph because it has the three little verses. Make an exception this time. We are very thankful that our habitual distrust of ordinary versifications did not cause us to miss these beautiful lines. Our "Comment" column is not usually given to literary criticism, else we might say that this poem should be treasured as a matter of art. It is offered you because it says what you may be trying to say some few months hence. Many of our young men may be dying over there in Flanders—will they die in vain? Will their finished lives have found the substance of life when they are taken off in their prime? When their bodies stiffen in painless death, will their souls be among those that die in pain? Not if they know Him who died on the little hill in Jewry and were saved by Him.—The poem is called "Three Hills", Everard Owen is the author, and it first appeared in the London Times last Christmas.

There is a hill in England,
Green fields and a school I know,
Where the balls fly fast in summer,
And the whispering elm trees grow,
A little hill, a dear hill,
And the playing-fields below.

There is a hill in Jewry,
Three crosses pierce the sky,
On the midmost He is dying

To save all those who die.
A little hill, a kind hill,
To souls in jeopardy.

There is a hill in Flanders,
Heaped with a thousand slain,
Where the shells fly night and noontide
And the ghosts that died in vain.
A little hill, a hard hill,
To the souls that died in pain.

H. K. M.

THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION

Article XIII—Of the Use of the Sacraments

"Of the Use of the Sacraments, they teach, that the Sacraments were ordained, not only to be marks of profession among men, but rather to be signs and testimonies of the will of God toward us, instituted to awaken and confirm faith in those who use them. Wherefore we must so use the Sacraments that faith be added to believe the promises which are offered and set forth through the Sacraments.

"They therefore condemn those who teach that the sacraments justify by the outward act, and do not teach that, in the use of the Sacraments, faith which believes that sins are forgiven, is required."

The sacraments were instituted by our Savior in order to help us to believe that God is gracious to us for the Mediator's sake; divine grace and a full pardon are proclaimed in the Word, and by the Word the sinner is taught to believe in his Savior: the sacraments are added signs to make faith certain and firmly established. For this reason the sacraments may be called the seals of divine grace which a merciful God has appended to His proclamation of pardon, made in His Word, to give it additional power and clearness with the sinner.

Our Catechism says, a sacrament is "a sacred act, ordained by God, wherein He by certain external means, connected with His Word, offers, conveys, and seals unto men the grace which Christ has merited." In the Sacrament of Holy Baptism we find the water, in that of the Lord's Supper the bread and the wine—as the external means. In, with, and under these earthly elements heavenly gifts are bestowed upon us. Our eye cannot see, our reason cannot understand, how this is done; nor is this necessary, for we have a better witness—God's own word. This is here present in a two-fold sense, as a command and as a promise. Man can elect to call his own acts sacred, if he so will; but he can never exalt them to be sacraments. It is Christ Himself who in the latter bestows heavenly gifts; thus any act, no matter how sacred in the eyes of man, if it lack divine command and promise, is no sacrament. On the other hand, if man use the earthly element according to Christ's institution, His com-

mand and promise are ever effective and the sacred act is a sacrament; what makes it such is not man's act, giving or receiving, but God's word. It is solely because God has ordained it and because His almighty word promises, works, and gives, that the sacrament by the employment of external means bestows the gifts which He has placed in it, forgiveness of sins, life, and salvation. Thus it is beyond man's power to make or mar the sacrament: his position toward his Savior, the condition of his heart, may hinder him from receiving the blessings it offers, but the institution of God suffers no loss of efficacy by it.

The doctrine of the Reformed Church and many of the sects is different from what the Bible teaches. They teach that all heavenly gifts, the Holy Ghost, the forgiveness of sins, and salvation are bestowed on man directly, and not through the medium of the means of grace—the Word and the sacraments. Thus, to them the sacraments are merely ceremonies and symbolical acts in which, strictly speaking, man receives nothing over and above the earthly elements. They hold that the believer, just as he receives the external means, so does his soul spiritually rise to God for bestowal of heavenly gifts; the sacrament is not a means of grace, but a sign, symbolical of an inner process going on in the heart of the believer. According to this doctrine the sacrament is in reality without real importance and significance and its very being is made conditional on the faith of him who receives it, for the real presence of the Savior's body and blood depends on whether you eat and drink in faith; while the unbeliever is held to receive nothing but bread and wine; faith makes the sacrament.

The church of Rome errs on the other side. Holding fast to the divine power of the sacrament, this church exaggerates its efficacy to such a degree that it is supposed to give salvation where there is no faith; the mere outward act of receiving makes you a partaker of all the heavenly gifts the sacrament contains: to attend mass, to receive extreme unction, etc., is to accept salvation, even though penitence and faith be lacking. True, penitence and faith are also spoken of; but penitence is only a voluntary submission under the necessary penances imposed and a performance of the good works through which salvation is to be earned, while faith means no more than that you willingly do or suffer your part in the holy office of the church.

In conclusion we would draw attention to the words of our article which describe the faith that receives the blessings of the sacrament: "faith which believes that sins are forgiven, is required." Of course, this is not faith in general, that there is a God, or even faith in the Real Presence in the sacrament, but faith in the Mediator and Redeemer Jesus Christ. By His blood are we cleansed from all sin in Holy Baptism. 1 Pet. 3: 20, 21. The fruits of His life and death are assured

us at His Table. 1 Cor. 11: 26. The sacraments are "instituted to awaken and confirm faith in those who use them." These signs are a gift of God's mercy. The solemn declaration of His merciful intent regarding the objects of His loving-kindness as made in His Word, were, as far as He is concerned, enough to remove it from doubt and change for all time to come: that He has, however, for the sake of the outcast, sealed the Word of His forgiving love to us by added symbols—that, indeed, is mercy; that is making assurance doubly sure. Small occasion has the rebel to declare that he has no need of such abundant mercy to keep him ever assured of his pardon. Our Father has come so near His prodigal children in His dear Son, yet how distant would our sins and weakness make Him appear when the trials, temptations, and afflictions of life would drag us down into the darkness of despair. May we ever be assured of the bounty of His mercy by the means of grace which he has given us. G.

SACRAMENTAL WINE AND THE PROHIBITION LAWS

The Iowa "Kirchenblatt", inquiring of the Department of Justice how congregations can under the prohibition law of the State obtain wine for sacramental purposes, received the following reply:

State of Iowa.

Department of Justice. — Des Moines, May 2, 1917.

"The Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Iowa, Clinton, Iowa.

Gentlemen: Replying to yours of the 30. ult., addressed to the Attorney General, will say that the law does not authorize the transportation of wine for sacramental purposes. Under Section 2385 of the code, such wine may be procured through a registered pharmacist holding a permit to sell same for such purposes. Such pharmacist is the only person to whom the same can be lawfully transported.

Yours truly, C. A. ROBBINS."

Though the congregations are somewhat inconvenienced by this law, they are satisfied as long as they are able to obtain wine for the Altar; but there is danger that the agitators for prohibition will not be content with the success they have won, but will attempt to restrain us from using fermented wine in the Lord's Supper. The Living Church expresses this fear, and not without warrant, as it is characteristic of these reformers that they will not rest until they have persuaded everybody to adopt their views, or—and this is equally satisfactory to them—until they have forced these views on all others by legislation. It were well for our churches to keep their eyes open for any such attempts in their respective States. The Living Church says:

"A grave difficulty in connection with the widespread demand for 'bone dry' prohibition is that of obtaining proper wine for use in the Holy Communion. This difficulty is becoming acute in several states. The Bishop of Georgia is asking the clergy and others throughout the state to demand that in any legislation on the subject which a special session of the legislature is expected to enact, the right to obtain wine for sacramental purposes shall be carefully safeguarded. Unhappily it is by no means certain that the leaders in the prohibition movement are willing to grant this safeguard.

We feel that the most careful thought must be given by Churchmen to the whole question of prohibition on both the ethical and the practical side. Churchmen cannot hold that the use of wine is sinful or necessarily evil without thereby indicting our Lord Himself. They cannot take a position which even admits a question as to the legitimacy of a use that has been made an integral necessity in the sacrament of the Holy Communion.

But Churchmen may stand for prohibition as a measure justified by the widespread abuse of liquors, by the shameless practical alliance between the liquor traffic and vice, by the grave evils latent in the modern saloon, and by the long-continued and insolent defiance of law, order, and good government by the liquor interests. Years ago The Living Church declared that the brewers and distillers were the strongest factors in this country in producing prohibition sentiment, and spoke of them as 'first aids to prohibition.' What they sowed by their continued contempt for social and personal purity and by their equally contemptuous defiance of law and of the legitimate demands of progressive citizens they are now reaping in a widespread and successful demand from all parts of the country that the whole traffic be wiped out root and branch as being too bad for toleration—as it is. The liquor traffic is beyond reclaiming now, and those who have promoted it must assume the blame.

But, notwithstanding all this, the Church cannot take the ground that the production or the proper use of liquor is necessarily sinful, and she is bound to see that pure wine is made available for sacramental use in every county, town, and village in the country, no matter how ironclad may be the regulations against its sale or use as a beverage. Certainly our bishops, our clergy, and our people must take it upon themselves to see that the prohibition laws now being enacted or proposed so generally do not infringe upon this requirement." J. B.

—"Our duties are like the circle of a whirlpool, and the innermost circle is home."

—"He is not only idle who does nothing, but he is idle who might be better employed."—Socrates.

HAS ROME CHANGED?

Archbishop Ireland is reported to have addressed the following eloquent words to recruits for the army and navy, May 13, at St. Paul, Minn.:

"To defend America is to defend not only the Nation that protects you, that nurtures you, but the Nation that stands in the universe for the highest ideals, the noblest principles governing mankind. When we speak of our country we have in mind not only our homes, the homes of our fathers, but we have in mind the grand and noble things for which America stands—liberty and order, and order in liberty. America rises before the nations of the earth as that great country which, above all others, gives democracy to mankind, which makes every man feel that it is pleasant to walk upon the earth, and which showers blessings untold upon all its people. Great and good our country, and sacred is the duty to defend it, to make sacrifice for it."

These are, indeed, eloquent words in praise of Americanism with its liberties; and considering that they are spoken by a Roman Catholic dignitary it would appear that America with its **free institutions** has ever been approved by the Roman See to which the Archbishop is subject as its most obedient servant.

But we would ask: Is the Archbishop cognizant of the declarations which have proceeded from the highest seat of Roman authority, whose decisions, by the way, the Vatican Council has made infallible and irrevocable—cognizant of papal declarations which condemn our **American free institutions**, such as a free church in a free state, religious liberty, freedom of worship, freedom of conscience, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and the separation of church and state, as evils and sources of evil? Is he aware of the fact that the Roman Pontiff has again and again declared all these liberties, which under the Constitution of the United States we possess and enjoy and cherish, and for which we thank God and pray that they be preserved to us and our children, as at variance with justice and reason; that he has stamped it to be a wrong to claim, to grant, and defend these liberties, declaring their temporary toleration on the part of the Catholic church a matter, not of right, but of expediency until, under improved circumstances, they be abolished?

If not, let this representative of the Roman Church follow up the Encyclicals issued by the Pope in the last century. Let him review the Encyclical of August 15, 1832, issued by Pope Gregory XVI, in which it is expressly stated: "From the noxious fountain of indifferentism flows that absurd and erroneous opinion, or, rather, that form of madness, which declares that liberty of conscience should be arrested and maintained for everyone. For this most pestilential error, that full and immoderate liberty of opinion paves the way which, to the injury of sacred and civil govern-

ment, is now spread far and wide, and which some, with the utmost impudence, have extolled as beneficial to religion."

Let him read the Papal Syllabus of 1864, issued by Pius IX, which condemns among the eighty errors of the age the following propositions, which are among the fundamental principles of our Government:—

"Every man is free to embrace and profess the religion which he believes to be true according to the light of reason." Sec. 3, 15.

"The Church ought to be separated from the State, and the State from the Church." Sec. 6, 55.

"In the present day, it is no longer expedient that the Catholic religion shall be held as the only religion of the State, to the exclusion of all other modes of worship." Sec. 10, 78.

Let the Archbishop read some of the more recent Encyclicals of Pope Leo XIII, in which the latter expressly condemns what he calls the modern liberties, such as liberty of worship, of speech and of the press, of teaching, and of conscience, and of which he concludes: "From what has been said, it follows that it is in no way lawful to demand, to grant promiscuous freedom of thought, of speech, of writing, or of religion, as if they were so many rights which nature had given to man."—"That unrestricted freedom of thought and of the press is not in and of itself a boon in which human society might rightly rejoice, but the source and origin of many evils." Encyclical on Liberty June 20, 1888.

Comparing the eloquent words of Archbishop Ireland on American liberty, on "the highest ideals, the noblest principles governing mankind," for which our "Nation stands in the universe," as he puts it, with the attitude which the Roman Church is taking to this day towards our free institutions, are we justified in raising the question at the head of this article: Has Rome changed?
J. J.

IS THE POPE INFALLIBLE?

Bishop Strossmayer

A Bold Speech Delivered at the Vatican Council of 1870

Venerable Fathers and Brethren:—It is not without trembling, yet with a conscience free and tranquil before God who lives and sees me, that I open my mouth in the midst of you in this august assembly.

Penetrated with the feelings of responsibility, of which God will demand of me an account, I have set myself to study with the most serious attention the writings of the Old and New Testament, and I have asked these venerable monuments of truth to make known to me if the holy pontiff, who presides here, is truly the successor of St. Peter, vicar of Jesus Christ, and the infallible doctor of the Church. To resolve this great question I have been obliged to ignore the

present state of things, and to transport myself in mind, with the Gospel torch in my hand, to the days of St. Paul, St. Peter, St. James, and St. John—doctors to whom no one can deny the divine authority without putting in doubt that which the holy Bible, which is here before me, teaches us. To my very great surprise, I find in the apostolic days no question of a pope, successor to St. Peter, and vicar of Jesus Christ, any more than of Mahomet who did not then exist.

Reading then the sacred books with that attention with which the Lord has made me capable, I do not find one single chapter, or one little verse, in which Jesus Christ gives to St. Peter the mastery over the apostles, his fellow-workers. If Simon, son of Jonas, had been what we believe his holiness Pius IX. to be today, it is wonderful that He had not said to him: "When I have ascended to My Father, you should all obey Simon Peter as you obey Me. I establish him My vicar upon earth."

Not only is Christ silent on this point, but so little does He think of giving a head to the church, that when He promises to His apostles to judge the twelve tribes of Israel, Matt. 19: 28, He promises them twelve thrones, one for each, without saying that one shall be higher than the others—for Peter.

When a Council is assembled at Jerusalem to decide on the questions which divide the faithful, who would have called together this Council if St. Peter had been pope? St. Peter. Who would have presided at it? St. Peter, or his legates. Well! nothing of this sort occurred. The apostle assisted at the Council, as all the others did, yet it was not he who summed up, but St. James; and when the decrees were promulgated, it was in the name of the apostles, the elders, and the brethren, Acts 15. Is it thus that we do in our church? The more I examine, O venerable brethren, the more I am convinced that in the Scriptures the son of Jonas does not appear to be first.

Now, while we teach that the church is built upon St. Peter, St. Paul—whose authority cannot be doubted—says, in his epistle to the Ephesians, 2: 10, it is built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief cornerstone. The same apostle, counting up the offices of the church, mentions apostles, prophets, evangelists, doctors, and pastors. Is it to be believed, my venerable brethren, that St. Paul, the great apostle of the Gentiles, would have forgotten the first of these offices, the papacy, if the papacy had been of divine institution? The forgetfulness appeared to me to be as impossible as if an historian of this Council were not to mention one word of his holiness Pius IX.

The apostle Paul makes no mention, in any of his letters directed to the various churches, of the primacy of Peter. If this primacy had existed, if the church had in its body a supreme head infallible in teaching, would the great apostle of the Gentiles have

forgotten to mention it? What do I say? He would have written a long letter on this all-important subject. Then, as he has actually done, when the edifice of the Christian doctrine is erected, would the foundation, the key of the arch, be forgotten?

Neither in the writings of St. Paul, St. John, nor St. James, have I found a trace or germ of the papal power. St. Luke, the historian of the missionary labors of the apostles, is silent on this all-important point. The silence of these holy men, whose writings make part of the canon of the divinely-inspired Scriptures, has appeared to me burdensome and impossible, if Peter had been pope; and as unjustifiable as if Thiers, writing the history of Napoleon Bonaparte, had omitted the title of emperor.

What has surprised me most is the silence of St. Peter. If the apostle had been what we proclaim him to be—that is, the vicar of Jesus Christ on earth—he surely would have known it; if he had known it, how is it that not once did he act as pope? He might have done it on the day of Pentecost, when he pronounced his first sermon, and did not do it; neither in the two letters directed to the church. Can you imagine such a pope, my venerable brethren, if St. Peter had been pope? Now, if you wish to maintain that he was the pope, you must maintain that he was ignorant of the fact.

But it is said on all sides, Was not St. Peter at Rome? Was he not crucified with his head down? Are not the pulpits in which he taught, the altars at which he said the mass, in this eternal city? St. Peter having been at Rome, my venerable brethren, rests only on tradition; but if he had been Bishop of Rome, how can you from that prove his supremacy? Scaliger, one of the most learned of men, has not hesitated to say that St. Peter's episcopate and residence at Rome ought to be classed with ridiculous legends. We have a dictator before whom we—even his holiness Pius IX.—must prostrate ourselves and be silent and bow our heads. That dictator is history. This is not like legend, which can be made as the potter makes his clay, but is like a diamond which cuts on the glass what cannot be cancelled.

Finding no trace of the papacy in the days of the apostles, I said to myself, I shall find what I am in search of in the annals of the church. Well, I say it frankly—I have sought for a pope in the first four centuries, and I have not found him. None of you, I hope, will doubt the great authority of the holy Bishop of Hippo, the great and blessed St. Augustine. This pious doctor was secretary in the Council of Melvie. In the decrees of this venerable assembly are to be found these significant words—"Whoever wills to appeal to those beyond the sea shall not be received by any one in Africa to the communion." The Bishops of Africa acknowledged the Bishop of Rome so little that they smote with excommunication those who would have recourse to an appeal. These same bish-

ops, in the sixth Council of Carthage, held under Aurelius, Bishop of that city, wrote to Celestinus, Bishop of Rome, to warn him not to receive appeals from the bishops, priests, or clerics of Africa; and that he should send no more legates or commissaries; and that he should not introduce human pride into the church.

That the Patriarch of Rome had from the earliest times tried to draw to himself all the authority is an evident fact. Unfortunately he very nearly reached it; but he had not succeeded assuredly in his pretensions; for the Emperor Theodosius II. made a law by which he established that the Patriarch of Constantinople should have the same authority as he of Rome. The fathers of the Council of Chalcedon put the Bishops of the new and the old Rome in the same order on all things, even ecclesiastical. The sixth Council of Carthage forbade all the bishops to take the title of prince of the bishops, or sovereign bishop. As for this title of universal bishop, which the popes took later, St. Gregory I., believing that his successors would never think of adorning themselves with it, wrote these remarkable words, "None of my predecessors has consented to take this profane name; for when a patriarch gives himself the name of **Universal**, the title of patriarch suffers discredit. Far be it then from Christians to desire to give themselves a title which brings discredit upon their brethren!" Pope Pelagius II. calls John, Bishop of Constantinople, who aspired to the high priesthood, "Impious and profane." "Do not care," he said, "for the title of universal, which John has usurped illegally. Let none of the patriarchs take this profane name; for what misfortunes may we not expect, if among the priests such elements arise? They would get what has been foretold for them—He is the king of the sons of pride." These authorities, and I might add a hundred more of equal value, do they not prove, with a clearness equal to the splendor of the sun at midday, that the first bishops of Rome were not till much later recognized as universal bishops and heads of the church?

I say no more, my venerable brethren; and I come now to speak of the great argument—which you mentioned before—to establish the primacy of the Bishop of Rome by the rock (**petra**). If this were true, the dispute would be at an end; but our forefathers—and they certainly knew something—did not think of it as we do. St. Cyril in his fourth book on the Trinity, says, "I believe that by the rock you must understand the unshaken faith of the apostles." "God," says St. Jerome in the sixth book on St. Matthew, "Has founded His church on this rock, and it is from this rock that the apostle Peter has been named." After him St. Chrysostom says in his fifty-third homily on St. Matthew, "On this rock I will build My church—i. e., on the faith of the confession."

Of all the doctors of Christian antiquity St. Augustine occupies one of the first places for knowledge and

holiness. Listen then to what he writes in his second treatise on the first epistle of St. John: "What do the words mean, I will build My church on this rock? On this faith, on that which said, Thou art the Christ the Son of the living God." In his 124th treatise on St. John we find this most significant phrase—"On this rock which thou hast confessed I will build My church, since Christ was the rock." The great bishop believed so little that the church was built on St. Peter that he said to the people in his thirteenth sermon, "Thou art Peter, and on this rock (**petra**) which thou hast confessed, on this rock which thou hast known, saying, Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God, I will build My church—upon Myself, who am the Son of the living God: I will build it on Me, and not Me on thee." That which St. Augustine thought upon this celebrated passage was the opinion of all Christendom in his time.

Therefore, to resume, I establish—1, That Christ Jesus has given to His apostles the same power that He gave to St. Peter. 2, That the apostles never recognized in St. Peter the vicar of Jesus Christ and the infallible doctor of the church. 3, That St. Peter never thought of being pope, and never acted as if he were pope. 4, That the Councils of the first four centuries, while they recognized the high position which the Bishop of Rome occupied in the church on account of Rome, only accorded to him a pre-eminence of honor, never of power or of jurisdiction. 5, That the holy fathers, in the famous passage, "Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build My church," never understood that the church was built on Peter (**super Petrum**), but on the rock (**super petram**), that is, on the confession of the faith of the apostle. I conclude victoriously, with history, with reason, with logic, with good sense, and with a Christian conscience, that Jesus Christ did not confer any supremacy on St. Peter, and that the bishops of Rome did not become sovereigns of the church, except by confiscating one by one all the rights of the episcopate.

If I have said anything which history proves to be false, show it to me by history, and without a moment's hesitation I will make an honorable apology; but be patient, and you will see that I have not said all that I would or could; and even were the funeral pile awaiting for me, I should not be silent, and I am obliged to go on.

(To be continued.)

—"A true Christian and a hypocrite may both come to a stand in their course, through temptation; but there is this difference:—the true Christian is like a watch that was going right, but some dust clogs its wheels; directly it is removed the watch will go right again. The hypocrite is like a watch which is so badly made that it stands, or goes wrong, from its very nature, and the only cure is to give it a new inside."—Salter.

**FOURTEENTH BIENNIAL CONVENTION OF
THE EV. LUTH. JOINT SYNOD OF WIS.,
MINN., MICH., a. o. St.**

(Official Announcement.)

If the Lord will, the fourteenth biennial convention of our Joint Synod will be held Aug. 15-21, 1917, in Trinity Lutheran Church of St. Paul, Minn. A special anniversary celebration will be held in the St. Paul Auditorium August 19, 1917, at 3:00 p. m.

According to our new constitution the various synods are entitled to the following representatives:

	Pastors and Professors	Parochial School Teachers	Lay Delegates
Wisconsin	31	10	26
Minnesota	9	2	8
Michigan	4	1	4
Nebraska	2	1	2

All pastors, professors, and parochial school teachers are now eligible as delegates. Every faculty, board, and commission of the Joint Synod shall be represented by its respective chairmen at the convention.

Themes for doctrinal discussion:—

- 1) "The Practical Application of the Law According to Christ's Example." Prof. Th. Schlueter.
- 2) "How can we arouse greater interest in Synod's work?" Prof. J. Schaller.

The members of Trinity will provide free quarters for the delegates. The delegates are requested to send notice of their coming to the secretary before July 25th, 1917.

A. C. HAASE, Secretary,
14 Iglehart Ave., St. Paul, Minn.

A NEW RELIGION

"Yes, I agree with you. We need a new religion. The old doctrines of 'saved and lost,' of 'heaven and hell,' of 'atonement' and 'forgiveness,' and all that, are played out. The people of to-day demand a really modern theology and religion."

The two men who were discussing the need of a new religion appeared to be well-educated and cultivated. When they parted, one of them said, with a laugh, "There's nothing like progress. Better drop a word to our minister. He needs to read up and get some modern ideas."

Twenty-four hours later one of those men knocked at the door of his pastor's study in the city church to which he belonged. The look on his face was not one of easy-going complacency, but a look of fear and terror and almost of despair.

The moment the minister admitted him he cried out, "O Mr. Parker! My boy is in disgrace! He writes

me he's contemplating suicide! He went on a drunken spree after one of the football games, and he's been suspended from his university. I need your help. I didn't know where else to go. To think that my boy—"

The minister knew just what to say and what to do. He emphasized the great doctrine of forgiveness and redemption, and when the father went away he carried with him on his way to his son a song of hope for the disgraced boy.

On his return he was able to tell the minister that his boy, by the grace of God, was beginning a new life.

"After all," said Mr. Parker, in reply, "there's nothing like the power of the old gospel. It endures through the centuries."

"Yes," replied the father. "It is good enough for me. It is the only thing that can save the lost."

It is one thing to discuss in a fashionable club the need of a new religion; it is another to create a religion as useful as the old gospel when your own son is a sinner.—Youth's Companion.

WHO IS THE FOOL?

Association Men quotes a little incident that is worth passing along: "A young student who was on an express train between Frankfort and Basel sneered when he saw a church in course of construction in a village. 'It's only imbeciles who attend church,' he insisted. 'Then I'm an imbecile,' quietly answered one of the men in the same coach. 'I too,' broke in a third traveler. 'I go to church every Sunday, and although an imbecile am, nevertheless, professor in the University of Leipsig.' Another added, 'I am chief councilor in the city government of Strassburg, and a church-goer.' And still another chimed in, 'I'm head of the Berne Gymnasium (high school) and a convinced Christian.' Are you this kind of an imbecide? comments the editor of a Swiss paper."—Selected.

—"Old Christians are much in praise."—Romaine.

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.